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Notations and Transcript Symbols

Since several types of data have been used in this study, I will begin with an explanation of the way I have documented my sources.

The first mark in the brackets after a quotation, data excerpt, or reference indicate what data has been used. The most commonly used symbols have been abbreviated. Thus, "I" in brackets stands for interviews, "D" for diary, "E" for e-mail, "A" for audiotapes, and "Ai" for audioimages. When I have referred to other types of data, I have specified that data in more detail. After the source, I provide the date. Finally, there are line numbers that indicate the place of the data in the appropriate file, whenever I have transcribed some piece of data into such a file. Thus, "[D 9/16/94, 20-22]" refers to lines 20-22 in an ASCII file that contains my diary notes from September 16th, 1994. Completed in a restaurant, this diary entry contains an example of a researcher, Mira, who has just told me about her problems with a questionnaire she is currently working on. A fellow researcher Matti soothes her by noting that it is always a good idea to gather data instead of doing what economists typically do:

20 ...[it's good] that someone collects data, unlike most mainstream economists, who just walk into Statistics Finland and pick up data from there. It's understandable, but...

Obviously, my whole data is not in ASCII files. For example, what
I have called "audioimages" are in a dossier only. In these cases, I have just dated the reference and denoted the page I am referring to.

For documenting references to audiotapes, I have used a considerably more complex system. An example will show my usage better than an explanation.

```
[A 5/19/95:1 2(2) A:2, 1-3]
│ │ │ │ │ │ └
│ │ │ │ │ └
Line numbers in the file
│ │ │ │ │ └
The number of the transcript, if
several episodes were transcribed
│ │ │ │ │ └
The side of the episode on
the cassette
│ │ └
The number of the recording that day
(here the first)
│ └
The number of the event
(= recording day)
│ └
The number of cassettes used
to record the event
└ If more than one cassette was needed
 to record an event, this number specifies
 the number of the cassette
```

In this excerpt, we are dealing with an audiotape from May 16th, 1995. The tape in question is the second recording on that particular day. Two cassettes were needed to record the whole event, and the point referred to is on the first of these tapes. The event of interest is on side "A" of the cassette, and the transcript is the second one from that side. Lines, again, are marked at the end of the indicator line. In the text file, these lines read as

```
1 J Mul on viel asiallinen >kysymys< (e-) (. ) ootsä (. )
   I have a businesslike >question< (e-) (. ) Are ya
2 puol u e s i h t e e r i kilpai lussa
   still in the race for party sec retary
3 ?
```

These words are directed at a visitor who has just given a paper in the House. Jari, a research chief, is in the process of closing the talk by asking about her current, well-publicized
plans for running for party secretary of one of the country's major parties.

I have transcribed audiotaped conversations using a system that follows, but is slightly simplified, from the system developed by Gail Jefferson (1984). In simplifying the notation, I have relied on a convention used at the Department of Finnish at the University of Helsinki. Some symbols are not intuitively clear.

(. ) Micropause, or interval of 0.1 second in talk.
(0.4) An interval of 0.4 seconds.
'n she said Overlap begins and ends.
[But th=] I'm saying
[I'm saying But no:::]
What=t Utterances start simultaneously.
What=t A colon indicates an extension of the sound it follows. Each colon is about 0.1 seconds.
. A period indicates a stopping fall in tone.
, A comma indicates a slight fall in tone.
? A question mark indicates a rising inflection.
?,, A combined question mark/comma indicates a slight rising intonation.
/ \ Rise and fall in intonation
What=t Underlining indicates emphasis.
WHAT Loudly.
*what* Quietly, or in whisper.

hhh .hhh .nhh Outbreath, inbreath, and inbreath through nose respectively. Each "h" is about 0.1 seconds.
(what)( ) say Single parentheses indicate transcriber's doubt or best guess.
((door slams)) Double parentheses indicate various features of the setting or transcriber's comments.
.mt .pt Click or a smack of tongue, and the same in English.
.nff Snuffling.
#that's true# Creaky voice.
@what@ Markedly different tone than elsewhere.
$what's that$ Laughingly.
W(h) hat Within words, (h) is a laughter token.
he HEH HEH hah Laughter tokens.
wh- Cutoff of a word.
And th( )< The speaker halts some unit in progress.
>she said< Quickly.

The first line (marked with a dollar sign below) is the original transcript, which is always in Finnish. The bottom line
vi

(provided below with a yen sign, ¥) provides an English translation of the original Finnish utterance. These are relatively free translations, and if they sound clumsy to an English-language reader, it is because of my attempt to retain some sense of the original Finnish line in translation.

Occasionally, there is a middle line in the transcript, located between the Finnish original and the translation. This line is marked below with a centime (¢) mark.

52 A pystyt*ään* (n- ) tehokkaasti vetä*mään läpi,*
¢ we+can efficiently draw through
¥ we *can* (n-) run 'em through *efficiently,*

This middle line is a "gloss" line, which translates the original Finnish utterance not just word by word, but translates each original word with its near English counterpart or word combination. The reason for this practice is that Finnish, which is not an Indo-European language, often uses word order that departs so radically from English word order that a "normal" translation would grossly misrepresent the order in which things are occurring in the original Finnish utterance.

Finally, a few words about the languages used in this study are appropriate. In the setting I have analyzed, English was used with those foreign guests who did not speak Swedish. I have one seminar held in English on tape [A 05/22/95:2]. There was only one permanent native speaker of Swedish in the setting. Although she spoke Swedish with at least one temporary worker [I 3/30/94], I do not have these discussions on tape. Neither of these members belonged to the managerial team. In addition, there was a Swedish-speaking conscientious objector in the House at the end of my research period, and one member had used Swedish "with
her aunts in her childhood" [I 5/3/95]. All these members were bilingual and used Finnish in their daily work. I did not audiotape language training sessions. Thus, with three exceptions, my data is in Finnish. These exceptions are the seminar mentioned earlier, papers written in English by some members and in German by one member, and some brochures which were translated into Swedish as required by Finnish law. All translations are mine.
Preface: The Topic, Objectives, Perspective, and Structure of the Study

This book deals with how managers evaluate the features of their workplace, be these workers, work, or their whole organization. Specifically, I am interested in those moments in talk and in text where managers make evaluations. The following rather graphic example is from Charles Bosk's ethnographic study, but illustrates well the phenomenon I am after in this study. Here, attending surgeons in a teaching hospital have gathered to discuss which students and residents will be given a grant to continue working in their program. Josh Carter, the student talked about by the attendings, is technically capable, but has demonstrated personal characteristics which have not been well-liked, and these become prominent features in the attendings' evaluation of him.

Example 1. (Bosk 1979: 160-161).

Dr. Pines commented: "I agree with Fred in almost everything he says. This guy is talented and likeable. There's no question about it. But I had to jump all up and down on him this spring to get him to do the work. If he operates, he does a good job managing and observing the patient. But if he's not operating... [doesn't finish the sentence, just shrugs his shoulders]... Dr. Arthur: "He's great when he's interested. But if he's not, he doesn't give you or the patient the time of day." Dr. White: "I don't know about that Bill. He worked hard for me and Ollie in September, which was our busiest time. He really stayed on the top of the things and really pulled a few chestnuts out of the fire."

The attendings get increasingly ambivalent about Carter in this discussion. A month later they decided to shift him to another, less prestigious, program (Bosk 1979: 162-163). Apparently, this example comes from a meeting. As we shall see in this study, meetings are one important environment in which managerial evaluations are made. However, we shall also see that evaluations are made in other environments as well.

This study analyzes managerial evaluations as they are done in various activities at one workplace which I shall call "the House." It is a research institute of about 40 people located in Helsinki, Finland. Since the House will be described in detail in Chapter 2, I will not dwell on it here.
Instead, I will look briefly at the term "management," the second main concept of the study. When I talk about "the management" or "managers" in this study, I will mean six persons in the House. In this study, then, "managers" are an identifiable group of individuals rather than a process or a function within the workplace. In the same vein, I will treat as "managerial" those evaluations that are done by these six persons regardless of whether they acted in their institutional roles or not, and regardless of the context in which these evaluations are made. "Managerial evaluations," then, are evaluations made by these six individuals. This restriction, of course, neglects some of the situated features of managing the workplace (see Hosking 1988) as well as more impersonal views of power (Foucault 1982), but has the virtue of being clear and coherent in the House's case. A further restriction is that I will only focus on those managerial evaluations that are directed at targets that are formally underneath the authority of these managers. Thus, although these managers occasionally evaluated the actions of the President, the European Union, or paid evaluative attention to Diego Maradona's most recent exploits, I will not focus on these evaluations. They cannot possibly be a part of the control processes operating in the House.

The second main concept of this study, "evaluation" -- the analytic heart of the study -- is analyzed in more detail in Chapter 3. Chapter 3 will also present the perspective used in this study.

Objectives. As this chapter will show, existing literature has not paid attention to in-situ evaluations as they are done in interaction. Consequently, it has missed several features of the phenomenon of evaluating. For that reason, this study is primarily interested in situating managerial evaluations in the on-going realities of one workplace, and will utilize methods and concepts borrowed from conversation analysis (see Zimmerman 1988; Heritage 1989: Ch. 8) to do so. The reason for this choice is that evaluation is an action that takes place largely in language, and is thus amenable to a conversation analytic study, which also provides the best currently available technique for analyzing action as it happens.

Thus, the primary aim of this study is to describe and make explicit one practice of talk, evaluation, as it is done by managers at the House. In more concrete terms, this means that I will study the "how's" of evaluation as it is done by managers at this workplace. These "how's" include the targets of
evaluations, the methods used by managers to make evaluations, and the ways in which evaluations are received in interaction in various the House activities. My secondary aim is to situate evaluation as a practice in the House's various organized practices. My tertiary aim is to study whether evaluations have consequences, and how this consequentiality is achieved in practical talk, and through this analysis make visible several assumptions in current literature on evaluations.

The Perspective of the Study. When it comes to the analytic technique of this study, a final conceptual note is needed. As the very title of this study shows, it is an "ethnographically situated" conversation analytic study of evaluations at the workplace. The reasons for this stipulation are analytic in character. When I worked with conversational transcripts, it soon became apparent that the problem with following a strict conversation analytic procedure was that evaluations in the House took place in various activities. Of course, there is nothing new in the realization that order at any modern workplace is based on multiple, loosely overlapping procedures such as meetings, work group discussions, press conferences, internal reports, memorandums, administrative practices, and so forth. The constitutive processes of any modern workplace are massively variable and constantly organized through a social machinery that often assumes formal organizational features as well. For my study this feature meant that I could not justifiably concentrate on evaluative practices in any one context only. Thus, I decided to gather evaluations in various House activities. Still, for analytic accuracy, I gathered the main portion of my data with a tape recorder, not just by writing ethnographic field notes (see Chapter 2).

Due to this ethnographic background, this study is not a pure conversation analytic study, which is apparent in several ways throughout. First, the phenomenon of evaluating is described at length. Secondly, I have used ethnographic knowledge throughout the study in my analyses, and in situating data in its context. Third, the ethnographic background of this study is manifest in its organization. To give an ethnographically adequate view of evaluation in the House, I had to go through evaluations in several activities, which broadened the analytic scope of this study beyond the normal conversation analytic boundaries (to see what these "activities" mean, see Chapter 2). Therefore, I've been concentrated in my detailed data analyses; to save space,
I have not analyzed each example turn-by-turn, and thus probed every conceivable analytic possibility. Instead, I have occasionally utilized ethnographic background in my analyses, and skipped over those features of interaction that are not relevant, given my ethnographic understanding. Thus, for a conversation analyst, many of my analyses are far from comprehensive; they are not intended to be. It would not have been possible to analyze all examples thoroughly using conversation analytic standards while simultaneously honoring my ethnographic aims.

The strengths of ethnographic situating are, of course, apparent, and well justify the analytic impurities that are apparent to a more conversation-analytically inclined reader. When the practice of talk called "evaluation" is situated in an actual workplace, it is possible to get a more comprehensive look at this practice in this setting. First, this broad view makes possible several inferences concerning the way in which people making evaluations orient to various contextual circumstances. Secondly, this solution makes it possible for me to find several continuities in the House's descriptive practices. One finding of this study is that House managers formulate work for evaluative purposes in highly bureaucratically formulated terms. Also, departures from this descriptive practice get practical interactional explanations. These features would not have been exposed had I concentrated on one activity only. Also, several features of the finely-tuned and subtle descriptive apparatus I have described in this study would also have been missed, had I concentrated on one context only.

The Structure of the Study. In Chapter 1, I will first review existing literature on evaluations and then take a closer look at the ways in which professional social scientists use the concept "evaluation." The main thesis of this chapter is that, to borrow an ethnomethodological expression, "evaluation" in social scientists' accounts has been used as a resource rather than as a topic of analysis. Consequently, it is precisely the phenomenon that should have been studied that has been assumed in these studies. Chapter 2 provides a brief ethnographic description of the setting of this study, the House, and the methods used in studying it. Chapter 3 details the perspective of the study. Chapter 4 classifies the targets of evaluations as well as the criteria used by managers in making evaluations in the House. Chapters 5 and 6 take a look at evaluations in formal activities, Chapter 7 in non-formal
activities, and Chapter 8 in House texts. Chapter 9 returns to the issue of whether and how evaluations come to have consequences, and how this consequentiality is produced as an endogenous feature of evaluation as a situated activity. Chapter 10 will present the results of this study, and compare them to existing literature.
Chapter 1: Evaluation as a Resource and a Topic in Studies of the Workplace

Studies of managerial work have come a long way from the early conceptual elaborations by Fayol and Gulick. Building on Fayol, Gulick maintained in a well-known paper that what managers do can be captured in an acronym POSDCORB, which means planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting (Gulick and Urwick 1937: 13). For decades, this acronym came to embody what managers do at the workplace in academic discourse. As Mintzberg, writing some twenty years ago, notes, "POSDCORB took hold and lives on. It continues to dominate the writings on managerial work to the present day" (Mintzberg 1973: 9). However, in Mintzberg's own opinion, the classical school exemplified by Gulick is of little use for anyone who wants to understand what managers do. In his own study, built partly on Carlson's early study (Carlson 1951), he found that managerial work is in fact epitomized by the sheer quantities of work done at an unrelenting pace, by brief spurts of variable and fragmented action, and by managers' preference for verbal communication and "news." According to his study, managerial work is characterized by ten roles, consisting of the three interpersonal roles of figurehead, leader and liaison, the three informational roles of monitor, disseminator, and spokesman, and the four decisional roles of entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator (Mintzberg 1973: esp. Ch. 4). In brief, managers act in situ, trying to push their agendas in the middle of a loosely-structured environment. POSDCORB barely does justice to this situational quality of managerial action.

Recently, most studies on managerial action have maintained the situationist view so well represented by Mintzberg. However, this view has recently been criticized by several researchers. In a Giddensian critique of this activity-oriented point of view, Willmot notes that this perspective abstract[s] the activities of individual managers from the institutional arrangements in and through which they act. In doing so, such studies generally disregard how the work of the manager is
accomplished by enacting, and thereby reconstituting, institutionally produced rules and resources. (Willmot 1987: 249).

From another angle, Carroll and Gillen (1987) criticize Mintzberg for a naive theory of observation: it is as if he thought he could infer action from observing manifest action, a notion which is seriously questionable. This flaw is reflected in his misunderstanding of the fact that managerial work is largely mental work, and that "mental time is not the same as physical time. Even though an observable activity may have a cycle time of only a few minutes, this does not mean that a good deal of work was not accomplished." The brain works continuously, which is missed in an observational study (Carroll and Gillen 1987: 43). A similar argument holds for conversation, also gravely misunderstood by Mintzberg. Thus, although it is certainly true that individual managers "do make brief contacts with a wide variety of people during the day, this does not mean that they are not planning, or controlling, or investigating" (Carroll and Gillen 1987: 43). They can achieve a lot by engaging in seemingly inefficient behaviors.

Based on this critique of Mintzberg, Carroll and Gillen argue that the best way to understand what managers do is still in terms of the functions proposed by Fayol and Gulick. Instead of an a priori analysis of these functions, however, Carroll and Gillen propose an empirically grounded notion of managerial action. This schema, captured in the mnemonic PRINCESS (planning, investigating, coordinating, evaluating, supervising, staffing, negotiating, and representing), is displayed in Picture 1. Picture 1 shows how managers at various organizational levels spend time with various components of the PRINCESS schema. For Picture 1, the notions of staffing and representing have been replaced with multispecialist and generalist job types.

Picture 1 suggests one reason for focusing on evaluation. Evaluation is a necessary and a rather prominent component of managerial work, especially at higher levels of management. (At small workplaces, the levels distinguished in Picture 1 are intermixed). Similar results have been achieved in various other studies (see Penfield 1974; Allen 1981; Carroll and Gillen 1987). None of these studies, however, has gone beyond an attempt to measure the proportion of evaluation in the way managers allocate their time. Reading this research we know that managers spend time evaluating, but learn little about what managers achieve through evaluations at the workplace, how they do evaluations, or how
these evaluations are linked to consequences for workers or for the workplace more generally.

**Picture 1. Distribution of Managerial Actions at Three Organizational Levels**


In addition to the fact that managers spend a significant proportion of their time evaluating, there is another important reason to focus on evaluations: their role in maintaining social relations at the workplace. The most sophisticated analyses of managerial action at the workplace all concur in depicting evaluation as a necessary part of managerial control. In particular, two dominant branches of studies are relevant for understanding the link between evaluation and control. The first branch consists of studies influenced by Max Weber, and neo-Weberian "organization theory." Another branch builds on Marx, and it customarily known as labor process literature (see Thompson 1989). Obviously, this is not the place to get deeper into the history of these two traditions; I will review representative writings from both traditions, given my focus on evaluations. Interestingly, we shall see that these traditions essentially converge in how they understand the concept of control. Both traditions also give evaluation a prominent place in the process of control at the workplace.
There is little need to go into Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy here in detail. It is enough to say that for him, bureaucracy was the most efficient and rational means of organizing human activities (Weber 1964: 337). Bureaucracy's legitimacy lies on rational grounds, in the belief that those who run the bureaucracy rely on impersonal, universal, and written rules (for a fuller account, see Weber 1964: 329-333). Because members believe in the legitimacy of this mode of ordering work, they accept the authority of their superiors, who in turn are tied by impersonal rules. This mode of organizing activities contrasts with other types of legitimate orders, traditional and charismatic. Legitimate traditional authority rests on "an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority under them," and legitimate charismatic authority on "devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him" (Weber 1964: 328). It is also well known that Weber saw the history of Occidental civilization in terms of a gradual increase of rationalization, extending over various spheres of life. The increased prevalence of bureaucratic forms of administration was for Weber both a symptom of and one driving force behind this rationalization (see Kalberg 1980).

An influential view that builds on systems theory but is closely related to basic Weberian concepts has been put forth by Kast and Rosenzweig (1985). For them, monitoring is an essential part of control at work. Without monitoring and constant assessment, managers cannot hope to keep action in line with the rules, orders, and other directives they hand down. Although different workplaces need different amounts of monitoring and assessment, without such monitoring, any organization would face the threat of disintegration:

In an organizational context, control includes coordination or individual and group activities. We can use the concepts discussed so far to define organizational control as that phase of the managerial system that monitors human performance and provides feedback information that can be used in adjusting both ends and means. Given certain objectives and plans for achieving them, the control function involves measuring actual conditions, comparing them to standards, and initiating feedback that can be used to coordinate organizational activity, focus it in the right direction, and facilitate the achievement of a dynamic equilibrium. (Kast and
In this approach, control consists of four elements, depicted in Picture 2. There must be some standards to which actions are compared, a means of measuring activity, a means of comparing performance to standards, a means of evaluating performance, and a means to set in motion changes in performance to make it better correspond to the standards. These are minimal requirements; obviously, there may be variations in them. For example, standards may be set higher if performance proves to be too good for the present standards.

**Picture 2. The Basic Elements of a Control System**

(1) A measurable and controllable characteristic for which standards are known; (2) a means (sensory device) of measuring the characteristic; (3) a means of comparing actual results to standards and evaluating differences; (4) a means of effecting changes in the system in order to adjust the pertinent characteristic.

1) Source: Kast and Rosenzweig (1985: 510).

In this conceptual framework, then, "control" is understood as a process consisting of four phases. At the workplace, it is a managerial job to take care of these functions. "Controlling is the managerial function concerned with maintaining organizational activity within allowable limits, as measured from expectations." Kast and Rosenzweig also note that "controlling is intertwined with and dependent on planning. Plans provide the framework against which the control process works." (Kast and Rosenzweig 1985: 405).
Kast and Rosenzweig's general ideas about control and evaluation as its necessary component have been noted in various sociological studies of control at the workplace. In a study that specifically focused on evaluation, Dornbusch and Scott (1975: 134) see organizations as power structures, noting that at the heart of organizations is a "differential access to rewards and penalties" and that some people are given the power to control other participants. Evaluation is a necessary component in control:

Evaluation is required if power is to be employed to control behavior. If A has power over B and wished to use this power to control B's behavior, A must indicate to B what he or she wants B to do, determine what criteria to employ in judging B's success or failure, and make some attempt to ascertain the extent to which B's behavior conforms to these criteria. A may then sanction B, rewarding conformity or success, or punishing nonconformity or failure. (Dornbusch and Scott 1985: 134).

More importantly, they distinguish evaluation as an everyday activity from organizational evaluation, calling the latter "performance evaluation" (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 134). They also break performance evaluation into four distinct parts. Allocating a task to someone specifies who is to be evaluated for it. Criteria-setting involves deciding which aspect of performance is to be evaluated; mere conformity is only the basic line. Criteria-setting consists of three decisions. Evaluators need, first, to determine "which task properties should be taken into account in making the evaluation." Second, if multiple criteria are used, they have to indicate how they weigh these criteria. Third, performance needs to be given a certain value (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 138-139). Sampling consists of choosing indicators for ascertaining performance value attained and selecting the sampling technique for gathering the relevant information (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 140). Finally in appraising performance, an evaluation is assigned to a performance (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 142).

Furthermore, they note that since performance is never a disembodied set of activities, but "is always capable of being attributed... to some individual or set of individuals," it "always entails the evaluation not only of a performance but of a performer as well... a performance evaluation is, by definition, an evaluation of a person" (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 135). Of course, a performance evaluation may be annual or semiannual; then it is usually general or global in character, and relies on standardized schedules or
forms. Often, sanctions are tied to these evaluations (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 135; see also Smith 1990: 126-134). The other extreme are those cases in which "the evaluator casually wanders into the work area, momentarily observes an ongoing performance or quickly scans the outcome, and indicates an evaluation to the performer with either a smile... or a frown of displeasure" (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 135). "Performance evaluation" means both extremes.

This model is based on and is basically similar to that shown in Picture 2. However, Dornbusch and Scott also list some complexities that affect the evaluation process. In particular, task characteristics vary. For instance, the more complex the task, the more complex the evaluation process becomes (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 145). Similarly, if the goals are unclear, evaluation becomes a difficult process (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 146). Some organizational arrangements also affect the evaluation process. In some cases, tasks may be difficult to observe, which makes sampling difficult or costly (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 149-151). Sometimes communication between the evaluator and the target takes place so infrequently that it is difficult to gather a clear picture of what is happening (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 152-154). If an authority system is complex, evaluation becomes multilayered and susceptible to errors in interpretation, and interdependent tasks are difficult to break down into individual responsibilities (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 156), and power differences affect whose performance can be scrutinized reliably (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 157). In practice, evaluation focuses on outcomes rather than on performance whenever performance is too difficult to be observed.

Thus, it appears that evaluation is not an easy task. A further difficulty is that workers may resist all attempts to evaluate each other. In a study of collegial controls in a pre-paid group practice Freidson, building his analysis of evaluation directly on Dornbusch and Scott's study, found that, among physicians, both administrative and collegial controls are particularly weak (Freidson 1980: 98-101). Physicians' work, of course, is complex and demanding, and thus difficult to monitor and to control. Still, another doctor may be able to appraise even the tiniest details of another's performance, which makes control possible. However, in the clinic studies by Freidson, physicians resisted any form of administrative controls, describing the managerial attempts to acquire information about their work with words such as
"Gestapo" and "police action" (Freidson 1980: 178), and retreating from any conscious attempts to learn about their fellow physicians' performance. Due to this collegial etiquette, they refrained from evaluating their fellows in gossip, labelled stories about colleagues they heard from their patients as unreliable, and frustrated any attempt to learn about their work through records by keeping bad medical records (Freidson 1980: Ch. 11; see also Garfinkel 1967: 192-197). Thus, although these physicians had evaluative opinions about each other, these evaluations did not become part of social control at the workplace. Complex professional work, then, appears to be an exception to the idea that evaluations are necessarily linked to social control.

2. The Labor Process View on Control and Evaluation

In a review of labor process literature, Thompson cites T.J. Johnson (1972, 1980) who argued that Weberian organizational theory has tended rather single-mindedly to see bureaucracy as a coordinating mechanism while downplaying the fact that bureaucracies are largely set up to control workers in the production process. As Thompson points out, this argument is not new: it was already expressed by Marcuse (1964), who maintained that bureaucracy should not be seen in terms of rationalization, but in terms of the development of the capitalistic economy and its tendencies (Thompson 1989: 27). In labor process literature, the idea of control is at the forefront.

Since the days of its Bravermanian revitalization in the seventies, labor process literature has assumed that managers seek to increase their control over workers. This position, of course, is consistent with the theoretical background of this literature. In Marx's thinking, the capitalists seek to maximize the surplus value. In the pursuit of profits, it is necessary to control workers in ever greater detail to make sure that they waive the fruits of their labor to the capitalist, who is driven by the profit motive and by competition to gradually usurp even more out of his workers (Marx 1976). At the workplace, workers' capacity to work is transformed into a means of producing value for the capitalist. Derived from Marx, these basic ideas form the starting point for Braverman, who maintained that what the capitalist
buys is infinite in potential, but in its realization it is limited by the subjective state of the workers... The work actually performed will be affected by... many factors, including the organization of the process and the forms of supervision over it, if any.

Thus when the capitalist buys buildings, materials, tools, machinery, etc., he can evaluate with precision their place in the labor process.... But when he buys labor time, the outcome is far from being either so certain or so definite that it can be reckoned in this way, with precision and in advance... It thus becomes essential for the capitalist that control over the labor process pass from the hands of the worker into his own. This transition presents itself in history as the progressive alienation of the process of production from the worker; to the capitalist, it presents itself as the problem of management. (Braverman 1974: 57-58)

A few pages later, Braverman notes that "to manage" originally meant to train a horse (Braverman 1974: 67). In a capitalist society, workers' pride in their skill plays a weak role, as the manager seeks to increase his control over the worker. Braverman likens the manager to a rider who "uses reins, bridle, spurs, carrot, whip, and training from birth to impose his will," and goes on to note that "the capitalist strives, through management, to control. And control is indeed the central concept of all management systems" (Braverman 1974: 68).

For our purposes, a writer more important than Braverman is Edwards (1979), who has presented a full-fledged account of what controls capitalists use to seize command over the labor of the workers they have hired. Edwards shares Braverman's basic point of departure, originally derived from Marx, that when the capitalist purchases labor power, workers only sell their potential labor to the employer, not actual labor. The worker seeks to work only to maintain himself and to avoid boredom, while it is in the employer's interest to wring out as much work as he can from the worker (Edwards 1979: 12). This antagonism forms the basis of the struggle over who controls the workplace.

In contrast to Braverman, however, Edwards notes that control may be achieved in a variety of ways. Only when labor power is purchased is it, in Edwards' opinion, proper to talk about capitalist production. He defines "control" as "the ability of capitalists and/or managers to obtain desired work behavior from workers. Such ability exists in greater or lesser degrees, depending upon the relative strength of workers and their bosses" (Edwards 1979: 17). According to Edwards, any system of control consists of three elements:

1. Direction, or a mechanism or method by which the employer directs work tasks, specifying what needs to be done, in what order,
with what degree or precision or accuracy, and in what period of time.

2. Evaluation, or a procedure whereby the employer supervises and evaluates to correct mistakes or other failures in production, to assess each worker's performance, and to identify individual workers or groups of workers who are not performing work tasks adequately.

3. Discipline, or an apparatus that the employer uses to discipline and reward workers, in order to elicit cooperation and enforce compliance with the capitalist's direction of the labor process. (Edwards 1979: 18).

In his book, Edwards patiently traces how controls have evolved at the workplace during the last hundred of years or so. In competitive, small-scale capitalism, control was "simple": even in the need for control was great in nineteenth century, entrepreneurial firms, the mechanisms for achieving it were "informal and unstructured. The personal power and authority of the capitalist constituted the primary mechanism for control... the entrepreneur 'saw everything, knew everything, and decided everything'" (Edwards 1979: 25). The entrepreneur, with a few foremen, was the control apparatus (Edwards 1979: 31).

In contrast to the early nineteenth century shop, the mechanized factory of the century's last decades was characterized by technological control, which "involves designing machinery and planning the flow of work to minimize the problem of transforming labor power into labor as well as to maximize the purely physically based possibilities for achieving efficiencies" (Edwards 1979: 112). The line sets an unambiguous direction and pace in which control becomes masked in that it is not easily visible in the form of supervisory staff (Edwards 1979: 118). Hierarchical control remained, however: "[when] inadequate work... was detected, the old mechanisms of hierarchical control came into play" (Edwards 1979: 121).

A new problem arose when production grew large enough to give jobs to an increasingly large clerical and managerial staff. To make them work, a new form of control was emphasized. Bureaucratic control, according to Edwards, is implanted in the social and organizational structure of the organization. It is taken care of by a system of "job categories, work rules, promotion procedures, discipline, wage scales, definitions of responsibilities, and the like." Under bureaucratic control, "the impersonal force of 'company rules'" becomes the basis for control at the workplace:

In its most fundamental aspect, bureaucratic control institutionalized the exercise of hierarchical power within the firm. The definition and direction of work tasks, the evaluation of worker performances, and the distribution of rewards and imposition...
of punishments all came to depend upon established rules and procedures, elaborately and systematically laid out. (Edwards 1979: 131)

Bureaucratic control created a stratified work force that has lost much of its nineteenth century social standing (see Mills 1956; also Zeitlin 1989: 152-155). During the last decades of the nineteenth century, clerical workers were for the most part skilled and trusted workers, who shared many of the attributes of the owner-manager, and usually defined their relation in personal rather than occupational or class terms (Davies 1982: 19-24). Clerical jobs were also a route up in society (Davies 1982: 24-27).

With the increasingly large "office factories" of the twentieth century, bureaucratic controls were created to handle the increasingly large clerical staff. Job classifications, vocational training, and job descriptions were created, and pay schemes were fitted to the controlling purpose. Supervisory and evaluatory systems were similarly routinized. Thus, the Polaroid corporation, studied by Edwards more closely, appraises every worker's performance regularly once a year. Polaroid's evaluation system provides incentives for those "who accept the system and seek... to improve their lot within it" (Edwards 1979: 145):

The new method of evaluation was built on two elements. First, it introduced the principle that the workers should be evaluated on the basis of what was contained in the job description. And second, those who were formally charged with the responsibility of evaluating -- foremen, supervisors, and managers -- were themselves subjected to bureaucratic control; that is, they were directed and supervised in how to evaluate their subordinates by the job descriptions for their own jobs. (Edwards 1979: 139).

An interesting feature of bureaucratic controls is that they often focused on a worker's personality: the system is based on what firms expect from "good workers." At Polaroid, for example, "actual work output... counts for half or less of this evaluation" (Edwards 1979: 149). Instead of focusing merely on output, Polaroid's evaluation system rewards rules orientation, dependability, and identification with the workplace. In this evaluation system, self-directed and self-controlled leader-types who are loyal and committed get ahead (Edwards 1979: 149-150). Thus, while in previous systems, workers could be whatever they liked to be, under bureaucratic control, workers with "suitable" characteristics get ahead. The paradox, of course, is that this system is highly subjective (it is based on supervisors' and managers' feelings about
workers' personal characteristics), but is still seemingly impersonal and "objective" and thus is easily legitimized (Edwards 1979: 141). The system is geared towards average, not exceptional performances but, as Edwards notes, firms are usually interested in guaranteeing minimally acceptable performances, not supporting virtuoso performances (Edwards 1979: 146).

3. Foucauldian Analyses of Evaluation

In both traditions reviewed above, evaluation is depicted as an activity that is a necessary but not a sufficient element in an attempt to explain managerial control of the workplace. More empirically-minded research converges on this point. For example, Storey's extensive analysis of literature on managerial prerogatives shares this view. For Storey, "control" at work consists of (1) policy formulation and strategic planning, (2) execution, consisting of supervising and directing current operations, and (3) monitoring feedback, appraising, and taking corrective action (Storey 1983: 84-86). Similarly, in an empirical study of control in organizations partly influenced by Dornbusch and Scott, Ouchi (1977) maintained that only about one third of control can be reduced to organizations' structural characteristics and to its environment (its clientele). A proper understanding of control, he concluded, is based on a view of control as a function of the evaluation process rather than on a view that reduces it to a structure.

It is also noteworthy that researchers building on other traditions share this conviction. For example, Townley (1994), who has studied various Human Resource Management (HRM) practices from a Foucauldian perspective, put disciplinary practices at the workplace into three main categories: the production of knowledge about the population (of workers), about work, and about individuals (Townley 1994: 13). The techniques of acquiring knowledge about the population, in her analysis, can be divided into "the creation of an order through a taxonomy... [and] the establishment of an order through measurement (mathesis)" (Townley 1994: 30). Taxonomy, or classification, partitions the population into homogenous units whose performance can then be measured. In Townley's analysis, "both taxinomia and mathesis facilitate management or governance," but not alone:
there is necessarily an evaluative dimension to the table, a process of attribution and judgement, and it is this which provides the true disciplinary function. Evaluations result from measurement in relation to the denominator (less than, more than, etc.) and suggests the possibility of establishing a progressive series... Lists in themselves are an ordering, and a taxinomia states the assumed relationship between things; a disciplinary matrix or disciplinary function, however, is only achieved when the individual is linked to the population [i.e. workers, IK]. The latter provides the means through which both the object or individual and its population may be assessed and directed" (Townley 1994: 32, italics in original).

From this perspective, Townley studies the techniques propagated by HRM specialists for governing workers, guiding work, and assessing and directing single people. For Townley, who has studied the directions given to evaluators and the forms they used in 30 universities, evaluation illustrates well those technologies that are actively used in constituting managing through "rendering aspects of existence thinkable, calculable, and thus manageable" (Townley 1993: 235-236). In her analysis, evaluation individualizes people and departments, places them under constant observation, supervision, and invigilation, and helps to establish a system of control that works at a distance, allowing "face to face contact without the absence of control" (Townley 1993: 233-234). In this view, evaluation is a managerial technology that stresses numerical information and ensures control over the whole organization. Simultaneously, evaluative technologies are impersonal and do not have any clear "point of origin," and thus no identifiable "centre." Rather, evaluation allows the operation of control in scattered, overlapping locations (Townley 1993: 234).

Townley notes that power is not a unidirectional concept, but something counterbalanced by various forms of resistance (Townley 1993: 235). However, as the quote above shows, she essentially shares the assumption that evaluation is a necessary part of control with the sociological literature reviewed above. Intriguingly, then, Townley's Foucauldian perspective is largely similar to that of systems theory and that held by the labor process theorists in that, even for Foucauldians, evaluation is a necessary part of social control at the workplace. This fact is rather remarkable, given that the cardinal Foucauldian presuppositions -- such as the construction of the self and the importance of knowledge and power in this construction -- are vastly different from the conflictual assumptions of any analyses of the workplace inspired by Marx, and certainly different from the cooperative assumptions of systems theory as exemplified by Kast and Rosenzweig.
4. Evaluations as a Necessary but not Sufficient Part of Social Control at the Workplace

Despite differences in background assumptions the most important current theories of the workplace all share the assumption that evaluation is linked to social control at work. These research traditions converge on seeing evaluation as a necessary, but not necessarily a sufficient condition of control at the workplace. However, the literature reviewed above seldom studies evaluations directly. If we want to learn about evaluation as an activity, the above analyses remain essentially theoretical, and offer us little foothold to understand how evaluations are actually done. If the activity of evaluation is explicated at all in the current theories, it is done through conceptual elaboration rather than empirical study (Kast and Rosenzweig, Edwards), through an analysis of employee’s perceptions of being evaluated (Dornbusch and Scott and Freidson), or through an analysis of the guidelines for evaluators (Townley) rather than by studying evaluation as it is done at the workplace. We can justifiably focus on evaluation as an activity and go on to explicate its features. Such an analysis promises a refined understanding of evaluation. It also promises to ground current analyses in the complexities of on-going action.

Three Concepts of Evaluation

Next, I will look briefly at existing research on evaluations at the workplace. As implied above, perhaps the most typical sociological way of understanding "evaluation" is in terms of more or less formal appraisal systems, consisting of quantitative measures and qualitative data about some performance. Another important way to understand evaluation is in terms of evaluation research (see Rossi and Wright 1984). The above analysis has also implied that evaluation is an interactional practice.

1. Evaluation as Evaluation Research

There is no lack of literature on evaluation research. During the
last forty years or so, such concepts as "evaluation research" (Rossi & Freedman 1989), "program evaluation," "performance auditing," and "policy evaluation" (Leeuw 1992), have thrived in applied social science literature. Note1 The practices denoted by each concept in this family share a set of fundamental presuppositions about evaluation. Most importantly, these concepts denote large-scale efforts to measure the success of various mainly governmental projects, laws, or programs (for-profit companies tend to measure their successes using monetary measures). Also, evaluations are done by people who specialize in evaluation research methods. Indeed, there have even been views that see evaluation as a possible profession (Light 1994), a view grounded in some features of the practitioners. For example, evaluators have traditionally been recruited from universities, from companies specializing in evaluation research (Light 1994), or from in-house departments in the government (Lovell 1995). These more or less full-time evaluators are supposed to conduct evaluations largely relying on such social science methods as surveys, quasi-experiments, and qualitative methods.

Although the evaluation movement awaits its historian (but see Chelimsky 1994), several themes recur in participants' accounts of evaluation. In addition to case studies and methodological discussions, there are four themes that characterize the literature. First, the field of evaluation research has expanded gradually from its humble beginnings in the fifties. By the eighties it had become a large-scale applied social science. In this development, there has also been an element of professionalization involved (Light 1994; Worthen 1994). Also, there are consulting firms and several journals that specialize in evaluation (Evaluation; Evaluation Practice; New Directions for Program Evaluation, to mention a few). Secondly, the methodology used in evaluation has gradually expanded from technical methods to more permissive social scientific methods. In the early days, evaluation was most often seen either as a form of operations research, or as a cost-benefit analysis. In the sixties, surveys and quasi-experiments came along (see Posovac 1995). By the end of the eighties, postmodernism and standard qualitative methods were the stock of the trade (Guba and Lincoln 1989; for a view that evaluation is argumentation, see Van der Knaap 1995). Third, evaluators have recognized that they can scarcely take a neutral role in doing their work. Their activity is seen by its audiences in non-neutral terms. Indeed, today's
evaluators often see themselves as partisans instead of technical experts, although differences of opinion about evaluators' tasks exist even at the level of the evaluation community's basic conceptual distinctions. For instance, some evaluators routinely distinguish "summative" from "formative" evaluations (Reichardt 1994; for the concept of "developmental evaluation," see Patton 1994). That stakeholders use evaluations for their own purposes, and that in so doing, they may misuse evaluations, has attracted attention (Stevens and Dial 1994; Stevens 1994; Palumbo 1994; Duffy 1994). Finally, there is a growing recognition of this possible profession's involvement in the power structures of government, and increasingly, the private sector (Bickman 1994), and countries outside the U.S. (for Europe, see Smith and Spenlehauer 1994; Duran, Monnier, and Smith 1995).

One instance in the House fits this paradigm. An evaluation study, explicated in more detail in Chapter 2, was ordered by House managers in 1992, in part as a preventative move against the ministry funding it. The ministry was in the process of evaluating all of its institutes and authorities, and management in the House figured that it could get a more favorable researcher to conduct the evaluation if it would act before the ministry assigned its own evaluators to conduct the study. To get a respectable evaluation, the House hired a local economics professor, Mari Santala, to conduct the study. She started her work in 1993 and finished it in 1994, just before I entered the House for my fieldwork. The final study consisted of three reports, two written by the evaluator [Working paper 9/2/94a; Working paper 9/2/94b], and one by a conscientious objector who was in the House at the time [Working paper 9/2/94c]. The content pages of the main reports are in Picture 3. They give a fairly good idea of the evaluator's strategy.

![Picture 3. The Tables of Contents of the Main Evaluation Reports](Working papers 9/2/94a and 9/2/94b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Housing Research Institute's Research Activity 1.7.1989 - 1.1.1993</th>
<th>The Housing Research Institute's External Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contents</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Introduction</td>
<td>2 The Background of Interviewees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 General Objectives</td>
<td>2.1 Generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Research Topics</td>
<td>2.2 Knowledge of the HRI's Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 House Price Studies</td>
<td>2.2 Knowledge of the HRI's Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Appliances Studies</td>
<td>2.3 Knowledge of the HRI's Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Consumption Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The Quality of Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first report tried to evaluate the House by looking at whether its research fulfilled the tasks assigned to it by the Law and the Statute (see Examples 1 and 2 in Chapter 2, that cite the Law and the Statute given for the Housing Research Institute). The second report was a survey of how the House's most important interest groups perceived its research. These two reports were written by the main evaluator. The third report was a job satisfaction study, consisting of a brief list of questions about various facets assumed to influence job satisfaction. This survey was based on a job study scheme devised by the Ministry of Finance for the whole government.

The first (and the main) report compared the House to another research institute, which had conducted a comparable study about a year before. Mari Santala's general assessment of the House was fairly positive (see Chapter 2), although it was clear that a small institute could not respond to all the objectives set for it. Still, the House was about as productive as other government-financed research institutes [Working paper 9/2/94a, 8]. Also, in her opinion, the House's short history and its developmental work promised a bright future [Working paper 9/2/94a, 19]. The second report, a study of the House's image among the most important stakeholders, was also positive. Most stakeholders gave a positive assessment of the House, although many respondents apparently did not know much about its research [Working paper 9/2/94b, 36]. Those who knew about its research, however, thought that it was good and useful for them, and its results were considered reliable [Working paper 9/2/94b, 36-37], although many respondents wished for research on more urgent social and
other problems [Working paper 9/2/94b, 36-37]. Finally, the job satisfaction study showed massive satisfaction towards the House and its management. Almost every item gave very good results. For example, peer relations and the management style [Working paper 9/4/94c, 8-9], the small number of regulations [Working paper 9/4/94c, 7-8], and the House information policy elicited very positive responses [Working paper 9/4/94c, 10], if members' responses are compared to another, much larger institute.

In general, then, these evaluations were positive. Still, these reports contained a series of criticisms of the House. In terms of content, the public sector's impact on housing had not been properly observed in the evaluator's opinion [Working paper 9/2/94a, 9], and research reacted too slowly to relevant changes in society (reports tended to be too large to be responsive) [Working paper 9/2/94a, 10]. In terms of quality, the evaluator pointed out that most research in the House was descriptive rather than analytic or explanatory, which led to serious interpretive and conceptual difficulties. For example, since researchers did not utilize more advanced tools available in their respective disciplines, they could not relate diverse phenomena to each other well [Working paper 9/2/94a, 13-14]. Finally, in terms of resources and research-related activities, the House's structure did not create collective expertise: people worked alone, and expertise did not spread in the House due to this working style [Working paper 9/2/94a, 16-17]. Also, in her opinion, the House did not have enough contacts with the academic world [Working paper 9/2/94a, 18]. The work satisfaction study showed that job descriptions were not clear (new job descriptions were prepared afterwards), pay schedules were unfair [Working paper 9/2/94c, 6, 17], and grounds for evaluation were not clear [Working paper 9/2/94c, 18], among other things. I will come back to the consequences of this evaluation in Chapter 2. Note2

2. Evaluations as Performance Appraisal

Sometimes evaluations focus on individual workers. These evaluations, usually called "performance appraisals," are typically performed by in-house staff, supervisors, and managers. Normally, they are meant to assess workers' performance, identify areas of improvement, and to suggest rewards and sanctions. Today, the most commonly used terms for these types of
evaluations are "performance appraisal" or "performance assessment" (see Berk 1986). Performance appraisal tools form an important ingredient of what is commonly known as "human resource management" (see Weiner 1987; also Townley 1994). Most work concerning performance appraisal is done in schools and in classroom settings, but I will focus here on the uses of performance appraisal at the workplace. Notice that in modern corporate life, the fact that we are dealing with evaluation is usually handled euphemistically. Thus, instead of the term "evaluation," the corporate world uses terms such as "empowerment [of employees]," "personal development" (see Watson 1994: 114-120), "employee development," "mentoring," and "nurturing" (see Townley 1994: 119-126. She also more generally reviews the techniques corporations use to achieve their goals in pp. 83-137 of her book).

There is a bag of techniques that are usually relied on when work is appraised, and both discussion and research concerning the merits of various methods and assessment instruments is flourishing. If there is a single most commonly used instrument for performance appraisal, it is probably written narrative evaluations, this term capturing attempts to write down a "narrative describing an employee's strengths, weaknesses, past performance, potential, and suggestions for improvement" (Robbins 1991: 547). A somewhat more complicated performance appraisal practice consists of making the evaluator focus on "those behaviors that are key in making the difference between executing a job effectively or ineffectively" (Robbins 1991: 547). Only specific behaviors, not personality traits are focused on, and this method promises a less personal evaluation style. An old and popular method of evaluating workers is based on graphic rating scales (Picture 4). Here a set of measurable dimensions, ranging from the quantity and the quality of work, loyalty, and attendance, is listed. The evaluator "goes down the list and rates each [worker] on incremental scales" (Robbins 1991: 547).
Behaviorally anchored rating scales are another evaluation method. Instead of evaluating performance on scales (as in graphic rating scales), behaviorally anchored scales are based on definite, observable, and measurable behaviors in that "the points [on the scales] are examples of actual behavior on the given job rather than descriptions of traits... These examples are translated into a set of performance dimensions, each dimension having varying levels of performance" (Robbins 1991: 547). These examples of behavior are then translated into a set of performance dimensions, each having varying levels of performance. Finally, in multiperson comparisons each person's performance is evaluated against the performance of one or more others. There are group order rankings that place individuals in such classes as "among the best five percent," individual rankings that rank each individual from best to worst, and paired comparisons that compare each worker with every other worker, after which a summary ranking is created (see Malka 1990; Wiehe 1980). In practice,
multiperson evaluations can also be conducted by the workers themselves (see Haas and Shaffir 1987). Example 1 is from an observational study of the uses of small groups, or teams, as an evaluation tool at a Johnson & Johnson's Ethicon factory, located in Albuquerque, New Mexico where Ethicon, a subsidiary of Johnson & Johnson, had opened a new plant. At this new plant, Johnson and Johnson attributed many evaluation-related tasks to teams consisting largely of other workers.\footnote{Note 3}

**Example 1.** (Grenier 1988: 47)

Team members rated their peers on forms passed out by the facilitator. Various aspects of performance were evaluated according to four performance criteria: quality of production, quantity of production, absenteeism, and support of the team. Quality was checked by randomly sampling an individual's work; quantity was based on work output; absenteeism was calculated as a percentage of total work days; support of the team was measured by one's participation in team issues and one's attitude toward team members and company policy.

On the evaluation form, workers indicated whether they felt a fellow team member's performance was satisfactory, unsatisfactory, or poor. Most of the evaluation items on the sheet seemed like standard measures for a high-quality operation like Ethicon... [but] other items were more questionable, considering that evaluation results determined whether a worker got a raise or not and that an unsatisfactory evaluation by one's peers supposedly destroyed one's chances. Included in these items were "maintains positive attitude towards self and others," "commitment to company philosophy," and "understanding of quality-of-work-life philosophy."

This example vividly illustrates how an evaluation system works. It is important to note that performance evaluation may have more sinister uses as well. At Ethicon, for example, teams were designed to keep unions out of the factory. Team discussion provided team leaders with a plenty of opportunities to find out about workers' possible union sympathies. In a survey of large American companies, the five most important performance appraisal techniques were found to be goal setting (used in 85.9% of companies surveyed), essays (81.5%), critical incidents (79.4%), graphic ratings (64.8%), and weighted checklists (56.4%) (Eichel and Bender 1984: 33).

Performance appraisals may have multiple consequences at the workplace. In a survey conducted for the American Management Associations, Eichel and Bender (1984) mapped several main uses of performance appraisals in modern American firms (N=588). The results of this survey are displayed in Table 1. Inspecting the table, we get a fairly good idea of the uses of evaluations. Generally, it appears that most human resource policy instruments listed in the Table are somehow related to evaluations. It appears that human resource instruments, if meant to act as incentives for workers, need to be
linked to performance, and performance assessment seems to be an important tool in achieving this link. The results of Eichel and Bender's survey largely corroborate the earlier results of Locher and Teel (1977).

Table 1. Primary Uses of Performance Evaluations¹,²)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance feedback</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel planning</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention/discharge</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹) Source: Eichel and Bender (1984: 12).
²) An illustrative case of retention/discharge is provided by Smith (1990: 126-134), who describes how an American bank tried to "manage out" more unproductive workers. Workers were ranked relative to each other, and placed in a normal curve, which made it possible to identify the least productive workers. She also described how the effects of this system were damped by middle managers.

This list shows that performance appraisals may, and often do, have multiple consequences at the workplace. However, the list remains suggestive in that it does not tell us how those firms that responded to the survey linked performance assessments to the uses displayed in Table 1. Discretionary work that has to be done before performance appraisals are linked to certain outcomes remains outside the scope of this survey. However, there is ethnographic evidence that shows that managers, for instance, manipulate evaluation rules to make the system less rigid (Smith 1990: 128-132), may forgive certain types of defects (Bosk 1979), and refrain from criticizing colleagues (Freidson and Rhea 1963; Freidson 1980: 160-165; Haas and Shaffir 1987: 40-44). Thus, important variables are left out of the study of performance appraisal.

The list in Table 1 leaves little doubt about the importance of performance appraisal systems for a workplace. However, there are further things that need to be noted before we can arrive at a full understanding of the impacts of these performance appraisal systems. Obviously, whether performance evaluations are communicated to the worker or not is crucial. Only if they are communicated can workers choose to change their behavior accordingly. "Without such communication, unknown evaluations could produce variation in rewards and punishments without providing clear guidelines to performers, who would be left wondering what they did or did not do" (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 164). Existing research concentrates heavily on the impact of...
communicated evaluations that are supposed, according to the above logic, to have multiple impacts on workers' attitudes and behavior (see Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 164). Indeed, much research on the effects of evaluations on workers has been related to such factors as worker satisfaction and commitment (see Tziner and Latham 1989). Researchers have also been interested in the impacts of evaluation's perceived fairness on workers (Paese, Lind, and Kanter 1988), and on how performance evaluation impacts various people. For example, it has been argued that insecure, approval-seeking persons seek evaluative information more than persons whose self-confidence is higher (Klinch and Feldman 1992). Generally, it has been argued that performance evaluation enhances performance (Eichel and Bender 1984: 57). The theoretical basis of this result is usually found in Edwin Locke's goal-setting theory (Locke and Latham 1990). Critics have argued that performance appraisal leads to short-term thinking stifling teamwork, and (statistically) unfair evaluation (Deming 1986: 101-120).

Other areas related to performance appraisal that have received attention are various biases in evaluation practices. It has been pointed out that executives evaluate others quite routinely, but that they are themselves seldom evaluated, although they would prefer to have feedback on their performance (Wiehe 1984; Longenecker and Giola 1988). As usual, gender issues seem to be a complicated matter in the current context (see Top 1991). For example, Heilman and Stopeck found that being attractive did not appear to impact evaluations of men's performance, although it did have a negative effect on managerial women's performance, and a positive impact on how non-managerial women were evaluated. Also, it has been argued that the target's marital status affects evaluations about poor performance. Among poor performers, married mothers received more favorable evaluations than single females (Russell and Rush 1987). These results confirm Dornbusch and Scott's notion that performance can be, and is, evaluated on non-performance criteria as well (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 187-188).

3. Evaluation as an Interactive Practice

There is a third, and even more elementary layer of evaluation. An example of evaluation as an interactive practice is given below in Example 2.
Here, evaluation is an interactional achievement, done in talk in real time. That there exists this type of evaluation is recognized in research. Dornbusch and Scott, for instance, write that "evaluation is one of the most commonplace of human acts. Each of us evaluates many things and many others, and each of us is evaluated many times a day by others" (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 134). This, indeed, is the case, as my data will show. In this study, I will focus on how evaluations are produced in situ by House members who are busying themselves in interaction. The most important ramification of this perspective is that the hub of the study becomes the ways in which evaluations are produced by the people working at the House.

Evaluations as an interactive practice typically take the form exhibited in Example 1 in the Preface. This example is from a remarkable study of social control in a teaching hospital by Bosk (1979), who reports discussions from evaluation meetings and analyzes them in terms of a specific "sorting logic." After 18 months of clinical training, surgical residents are evaluated for their performance. In evaluation meetings, some of these residents are refunded and allowed to stay, while others are ousted. Bosk, who sat in on one such meeting, reports that in the first phase, those residents with deficient technical skills were ousted. Those technically non-qualified residents who had displayed proper normative concern for patients and an eagerness to correct their mistakes were transferred from surgical clinics to other clinics, while those who displayed an "immature" disposition were expelled entirely.

In Example 1 in the Preface, the attending surgeons evaluate Josh Carter, and dismiss him on the basis of their evaluation. The evaluative statements made by the attendings make each attending's opinion visible for the others and allows them to compare their views and suggest courses of action towards Carter. These evaluations, then, provide grounds for the department chairman (Dr. White) to reach a decision concerning Carter. The opinion assembled justifies a harsh form of social control, dismissal. Thus, although "decisions" may not cause action, they provide grounds against which future activities can be analyzed for their coherence and logical properties. Notice that it is in interaction that single opinions are expressed and formed into a common opinion that provides grounds for some managerial action. Obviously, institutional identities are presupposed in the course of
action. It is the fact that this evaluation was done by attending surgeons in a department meeting that make it so consequential. Still, the final conclusion is reached in interaction. Notice also that the fact that we are dealing here with a piece of interaction does not make this case trivial. On the contrary, it is definitely consequential for Carter, given surgeons' high prestige and pay level. Routinely, such rewards as pay raises, promotions, open appreciation, and honorifics of various kinds are decided upon and justified in interaction. Similarly, sanctions such as firings, dismissals, "talking-tos" (Freidson and Rhea 1963; Freidson 1980), withholding pay raises, etc. are also justified in interaction. These justifications make a difference in one important sense: without them, action could not be taken. These justifications, then, may and routinely do, provide grounds for subsequent managerial action. Note5

Conclusions and Discussion

In this Chapter, we have seen that in most existing analyses, evaluation is depicted as a necessary, although not sufficient part of social control at the workplace. In this research, control is seen as a managerial activity that consists of several separate activities. An important part of control is the setting of directions which action is bound to follow, and another the monitoring and evaluating of activities to make sure that plans are fulfilled. Corrective action may follow these evaluations, if action is found wanting. In this line of thought, managers are supposed to plan work and make sure that workers do it along the guidelines set up in these plans. We have also seen that existing research concentrates on evaluation research, and on performance appraisal rather than on evaluations as they are done in interaction. Thus, there is a rich literature on evaluation that uses this concept as a resource in building a social scientific account of an activity.

However, we have also seen that evaluation is a concerted activity on its own. In existing accounts, however, evaluation has not been studied as an activity in its own right but, rather, it has been used as a resource in theorizing about the workplace. What is missing is an understanding of evaluation as an activity done by people in situ in the midst of action. Due to this neglect, our understanding of evaluation remains tied to inadequately
controlled common-sense understandings, which makes these accounts inescapably integral features of the very order of affairs they seek to describe (Zimmerman and Pollner 1970 [1990]: 82; see also Bittner 1975: 72-75). As a consequence, a vast order of activity has been excluded from analysis (Zimmerman and Pollner 1970 [1990]: 86). Thus, several reasons justify focusing on evaluations as they are done in interaction. First, as we have just seen, evaluations are a part of an important social process at the workplace. Secondly, while there is a large, though largely prescriptive literature on evaluation research, there is little research on evaluation as an interactive practice. It is impossible to understand this on-going, taken-for-granted, largely unnoticed practice by extrapolating from a knowledge of evaluation research or performance appraisal; these practices, however, have important consequences. Finally, there are reasons associated with the workplace I have studied. Only one evaluation study had been done in the House. Although it launched an organizational change described in Chapter 2, everyday managerial control in the House was certainly not based on it. Formal performance appraisal techniques were not used in the House either. To understand evaluations in the House, then, we need to direct our attention to in-situ evaluations as they are done in interaction.
1. There is one exception to this pattern. The concept "performance evaluation" is used mainly in computer science, where analyses aimed at measuring the efficiency and speed of systems are lumped underneath this rubric.

2. This study can be questioned on multiple grounds. The instrument was apparently designed for larger bureaucracies, with an assumption that there is segmentalism present (Kanter 1983: 27-28). The House, however, had only about 30 workers at that time. Therefore, its main problems did not lie in information channels and bureaucracy, but rather in such social organization aspects as favoritism which, however, were barely measured by the instrument. In fact, questions that elicited criticism were all related to pay differences. For example, the principle of "the same pay from the same job" was not seen to be true by one-fifth of respondents in the House, and for 17% of respondents, there was a group of respondents who said that there was a favorite system in the House [Wp. 9/2/94c, 5-6].

Sources of satisfaction definitely do not end here. As I have already mentioned, the House was heavily administered. Researchers did not have to take care of clerical duties. Similarly, the clerical staff did not have to put much effort to administration. Finally, computer budget was large enough to keep the network in excellent condition. Programs were new, working under a Windows environment, there were people to take care of troubleshooting, and hardware was both powerful and for the most part new. Thus, there were not complaints about computers. In fact, in an interview, a member of the management once complained to me that although she tries hard to squeeze initiatives from workers, there is always more money reserved for initiatives than there are targets [I 5/4/95]. These factors were barely measured in the instrument. Also, the instrument did not relate the responses in any way to the bad conditions of local job markets. In the early nineties, Finland went through a depression that was deeper than the great depression of the thirties, and unemployment was close to 20% in 1993. For most workers in the House, there were really no alternative job opportunities, and in the crisis atmosphere that then permeated the country, most people were just happy to have work. Finally, the House's financial basis was secure. It was overbudgeted still in 1995 for the simple reason that being a new institute, its budget still contained starting-up monies [I 5/15/95c].

The instrument's possible psychological biases notwithstanding, there were other problems in this survey. In a replication at the end of 1996, people were specifically told to put their names to the answer sheet, which surely made respondents wary. In the original report, there was a line in which the respondent was supposed to put his or her name. Also, at a small workplace in which some members knew each other well, handwriting may have been recognizable (there were several open-ended questions).

3. For people in the academic world, the best known evaluation method is probably peer review (see Gibson 1979; Gillett 1989), wither in career-related contexts, or in publishing. Peer review, however, does not loom large in other kinds of workplaces. It is still worth mentioning here, although it does not deserve a separate paragraph in the main text.

4. Bosk's analysis, however, is atypical in two respects. Attendings in a teaching hospital are people who are exceptionally sure of their position. Surgeons and professors of medicine in an elite teaching hospital, they are honorable and honored up to the point of awe. They have little reason to doubt the justification of their evaluative activity, or to think of its consequences. They are in charge of complex operations of the clinic, they are teaching future elite, and their professional norms profess excellence in performance. Also, given the high bonuses of being a surgeon, residents and medical students under their jurisdiction have powerful incentives to comply to their wishes. Finally, errors in their profession may be fatal. Thus, these attendings have multiple justifications for evaluating the students, whom they also know well. Social control in this setting proceeds with ease.

5. That most planning, guiding, meetings, etc. is essentially ineffective has certainly not escaped the notice of researchers. Boden (1994: 33-43) reviews
"institutional" and "symbolic" theories of decision-making. These views are essentially premised on the idea that most "decision-making" is essentially only weakly related to action. Therefore, these theories conclude, "decision-making" must have other, symbolic and ritualistic functions. These views, however, skip over the fact that "decisions" may be essential for further control regardless of whether this further control takes place or not. Also, this ironic view seems to retain a "decisionist" premise in a manner described by Boden (1994: 179-198). Finally, these views have difficulties in explaining why managers go to meetings at all, if they know they waste their time in them. Managers must be either unaware of the conditions of their action and act on biased opinions, or they must be cynically keeping up a symbolic and ritualistic front that legitimizes their uses of power. Both views, of course, are familiar to sociologists. Still, both views have their problems too.

The view taken here sees these activities in non-ironic light. True, evaluations are done at the workplace, and often these evaluations are not based on such activity's "structural grounds" as plans or commands. However, often evaluations are based on these grounds. Also, even when such relation is not evident, evaluations can be heard by members to be related to structural grounds and, as I will argue later in this chapter, to speakers assumed "identities." Evaluations are consequential actions, and it is the way in which this consequentiality is achieved at a workplace that I am after in this study.
Chapter 2: Description of the Setting and the Methods of the Study

This study was done in a research institute, or the House, as it is called here. Financed by a major ministry, the House was set up by the government to study housing at the end of the eighties. What it was set up for is specified in a Law and in an accompanying Statute. The law mandates that the main task of the Institute is to do research on housing, and the Statute specifies this task in the following manner:

Example 1. [The Law concerning the Housing Research Institute, 2/19/1988']
1 § The Housing Research Institute shall conduct research and studies on housing, its effects on policy, the prices and quality of housing, house-buyers position, and handle information services related to housing, under the authority of [the ministry funding the institute].
2 [The financing ministry] can assign tasks to the Housing Research Institute.

Example 2. [The Statute concerning the Housing Research Institute, 4/6/1988']
1 The Tasks of the Housing Research Institute
2 § The tasks of the Housing Research Institute are:
3 1) to conduct research on housing and on other activities of families, on the pricing and quality of goods related to housing, on the position of house-buyers and the effects of housing policy;
4 2) to develop research on housing together with universities, colleges, and other research institutes;
5 3) to publish research on housing;
6 4) to develop and coordinate information services concerning housing research;
7 5) to participate in national and international cooperation and standardization in this research area;
8 6) to participate, together with the Academy of Finland, universities, and colleges, in graduate training in this area; and
9 7) to conduct other tasks given to the Housing Research Institute.
10 The Housing Research Institute also conducts research in its area on a contractual basis.

In practice these ordinances meant that the House conducted research on such matters as housing, use of living space, appliances, real estate market prices, and the effects of pricing on citizens' decisions related to housing. For a few studies, the House gathered its own data. For the most part, however, it bought data from Statistics Finland (the Government's main statistical agency), or from market research firms.
1. House Personnel

The Institute was located on two floors of a large office complex located just outside downtown Helsinki. Both floors had several work rooms. The upper floor had 25 work rooms and the lower floor 14 rooms. In addition to these rooms, there were two small meeting rooms on the upper floor and one large and one very small on the lower floor. Both floors had a cafeteria and a kitchen, although the one on the lower floor was not regularly used. There were a few storerooms on both floors. The library was located on the upper floor. The management in its entirety was on the upper floor, a fact that aroused some speculation about a status distinction between these two floors. Some held that people on the lower floor might feel as though they were considered second-class [D 9/1/94, 16-18]. When probing about this, I was repeatedly informed that people on the lower floor did not experience their location as a status degrading feature (Garfinkel 1956) [I 6/12/96]. Still, people gathered on the upper floor for coffee breaks, and for other social purposes. People moved between the floors using two elevators. There was a restaurant on a still higher floor, shared by the whole office complex of which the House was but a small part.

The best data available for describing the personnel comes from the background work of the job satisfaction study briefly mentioned in Chapter 1. \(^\text{Note}^1\) This study, done by a (then) conscientious objector (who, for reasons of conscience, chose to perform his compulsory military service in a civil setting), gathered not just information about various facets of job satisfaction, but also background information from the 28 members who were in the House at that time (1993). Eighteen (18) were on a permanent payroll, while nine (9) were temporary. In addition, there was a conscientious objector. Out of these 28 respondents, 79% were women, while only six were men. Six workers were younger than 30 years old, and 12 were in their thirties. There was only one worker who was approaching retirement age (over 55 years). Years of work experience varied accordingly; in all, there were 8 members who had left school less than two years before, and an additional 7 workers had been working for less than five years. At the other extreme, there were 5 workers with more than 20 years of work experience. Although the House was only six years old when I entered it, some of its staff had already changed. There had been no changes in the permanent staff; all changes concentrated on the younger end of the staff.
Thus, when I entered the House, it had 38 workers, 20 of them permanent, the rest more or less temporary. Most temporary workers were working on projects, and some of them were student trainees who were paid by local universities rather than by the House.

The House could boast of a qualified staff. Again, we may turn to the job satisfaction study referred to above. According to this study's 28 respondents, 24 had a high school diploma, and three others had a diploma from a secondary level (vocational) school. To my knowledge, all permanent workers or long-term members with a high school diploma also had a Master's Degree or research-oriented graduate training (a foreign reader should consult Note 2 for details). The administrative staff consisted of three secretaries and one planner who did not have a tertiary degree, one methodologist who had a Master's Degree in the social sciences, and a manager who had a Master's Degree in economics. The library and publications staff consisted of two secretaries working in the library, and one publications secretary, none of whom had university-level training. In addition, there was an information scientist in the library, and a manager with a Master's Degree in agricultural sciences. The two research managers had Ph.D.'s, one in housing economics and another in business administration. Finally, the Director had a Master's Degree in social policy and a Licentiate's degree in housing economics. Note 2

Researchers had varied backgrounds. All but two had university-level training. Most were trained in the agricultural sciences, especially housing economics and housing technology. Aside from two nutritional scientists, nobody else had training in the natural sciences or in biology, although a few had taken classes in animal anatomy and had done extensive course work in chemistry. There were a few researchers with degrees in the social sciences. There was one economist on the permanent payroll, and another on a long-term temporary assignment. In addition, there was a former student trainee working on a project about the impact of competition on prices, who was at the end of his undergraduate studies in economics. Also, there was a conscientious objector who was an economics student; he left the House soon after my fieldwork was over, taking a job at the Bank of Finland. In addition to these economists, one researcher had a degree in the human sciences. She was an anthropologist hired for a project concerning the meanings people give to their homes, and the various gadgets in them. Three researchers had a degree in various branches of business economics, and two had advanced training in
economics (although one of them thought himself a historian). At the end of my fieldwork, another conscientious objector, a lawyer by training, joined the House. Another late arrival was a student trainee who was a sociology student. Other temporary workers were student trainees who had backgrounds in the agricultural sciences. As already mentioned, two permanent research managers had a Ph.D. In addition, there were at first two, then three, researchers with a Licentiate's degree. Two were actively working towards doctorates, one in housing economics, the other in history. The third licentiate, an economist, thought it was too much of a hassle to do a Ph.D. thesis, but he nevertheless planned on earning a Ph.D. degree. Although he did not make much progress during my fieldwork, he left the House in 1997 to write a dissertation. One researcher had almost finished her licentiate's thesis by the end of my fieldwork.

2. House Organization

Prior to December 1994, the House had been organized into three lines, or "offices", as some managers called them. Each was headed by a research chief and had a varying number of researchers. One group, focusing on the price of housing, had seven researchers, consisting of three academically-trained economists, and three persons with an administrative rather than academic background. Another group focused on housing conditions. Headed by a research chief, this group had six researchers, all of whom were trained in various agricultural sciences. The final group studied various appliances used in households. Formally, this group was assigned to the second research chief. This group had five researchers. Picture 1 names the managerial group; I have used these names throughout the study. When I talk about "chiefs", I mean managers under Karita. Note that Mikko (r3) became a research chief in February, 1995.
1) Organization before the 1994 change. Individual employees are identified by a letter abbreviation and a number. For example "d" stands for the director, "r3" for researcher #3. "t" shows that the worker in question is temporary. Source: The House phone book, 1994.

In addition to these "offices," there was a library and publications department of five persons, one of whom was the head of the group. The library had three workers, one of them an information scientist. One person took care of preparing publications and other communications. Finally, there was a "data administration manager" who took care of the House's computers and its network. Another computer person was added to the payroll a few months before my field work began. Formally, he was to help with computer work, but having good skills in statistics and some understanding of qualitative methods, much of his time was spent on methodological consulting rather than on assisting members with computers. The data administration chief was also in charge of the office personnel, which consisted of four persons.

Although I have described the evaluation done by a local economics professor, I have not dealt systematically with the consequences of this evaluation. As I mentioned briefly in Chapter 1, this study had pointed out several problems with the House's research. The evaluator had pointed out that although the House was relatively young, it was already well known among its major administrative, non-profit, business, and academic audiences. Also, its
research was for the most part considered to be good, and both its output and the quality of its research compared well with other government-financed institutions in Europe [Working paper 9/2/94a,b]. In an accompanying job satisfaction survey, working conditions, managerial style, pay, and co-worker relations all were rated as good or excellent [Working paper 9/2/94c]. As I have also pointed out, there were negative comments as well. No wonder, then, that the management decided to take some rather drastic action using the results of this study as a justification for these actions. In an interview, one managerial member summarized the consequences of this evaluation in the following way:

When Mari Santala was asked to evaluate us, her work was related to other evaluations. There was an internal evaluation, there was a job satisfaction study and everything else... But one thing that arose from all these studies was something that could've been gotten without them as well, but was displayed more strongly, was that research is too isolated, researchers work alone too much, without any support whatsoever. Internally, I mean. But there was also criticism that researchers are isolated from academic researchers and administration too. We did not have connections with them. This, I think, is the most important thing in our reorganization. We're grouping ourselves into projects, and when we are building connections, it's not just a matter of administering research in the sense that people with same research area or training work together. Rather, we have tried to connect people who get along well. If people do not enjoy working together, that's a major problem. Should their training not match, well, that's a secondary problem. [I 10/21/94, 6-31]

Regardless of the motives for pushing the change, the management decided to launch an organizational change process. As the change proceeded, the House transferred from a line organization to a team-based research organization. After this reform, a new organization was built around first six, then five, research groups. Each research group consisted of about 5 researchers and of several "projects" (studies) running simultaneously. These research groups were more or less thematically coherent. This organization should have destroyed the earlier hierarchical organization depicted in Picture 1. The idea was that when some researcher finished a study, her next study should determine the research group in which she would be working in the future. Also, the assignment of the two research managers was to change: instead of having a position that brings authority, their influence should now be based on an advisory role, and on their own research. Each research group was assigned a "head" and a "coordinator," whose positions were somewhat formalized in the working order of the institute at the end of 1994. Both of these were to come from the ranks of researchers.
The change did not affect library and publications staff, nor computer staff. The office, consisting of five persons, went through some change in that in the new organization three office workers were assigned to various research groups. One office worker was assigned to be the director's secretary, and one was assigned to various administrative duties and to work with the computer staff.

These research groups were to organize themselves. During my research period, the main working methods groups used were regular meetings and seminars. However, only one research group was active during my research period. It held two meetings in Fall 1994, and five meetings and one seminar in Spring 1995. Another project took off in Fall 1996, and already had two in-house seminars before the end of June. Other research groups were mainly on paper; researchers in these "research groups" worked on their studies, but did
not have any systematic research group meetings.

Judging from the most productive research group, the main ways in which project organization changed research can be grouped into four categories. First, in active research groups, the amount of talk related to research increased and became more systematic. One project, in particular, went at great lengths to discuss conceptual issues. Before, most systematic research-related talk had taken place between researchers and research chiefs. The most important unfocused setting for interaction had been the cafeteria. Now, instead, there was a forum in which sustained talk about research could be maintained. Secondly, managerial control increased. It was easier to follow five research groups than thirty researchers. Previously, a manager's main chances to control research had been in the planning phase and at the end of the research process. That is, managers read and commented on plans and manuscripts [I 11/21/95]. Now, they were able to see developments in the research process as they were taking place. Third, the experience of the more experienced but non-managerial members was better utilized in the new system, since it gave them opportunities to use their expertise to influence on-going work in meetings. Fourth, it was easier to invite visitors to the House. At least four significant research contacts were established by projects during Spring 1996.

These developments were applauded by management in several ways. First, the House was reorganized along research group lines in 1994-1995. Secondly, the most advanced group was consistently presented as an example at various occasions [for example, A 1/24/95; A 5/30/95, 11:00-11:28]. Third, academic standards were increasingly valued by management as proof of good research. Open meetings, for example, were opened by listing on-going dissertations, while other studies were buried in team reports given by research group coordinators [A 11/17/95].

3. House Work

The work of the House can best be characterized in terms of the organizations displayed in Pictures 1 and 2. Basically, this work can be divided into four categories: research, work related to the library and publications, work related to computers, and office work. Next, I will briefly
describe the House's work using two more encompassing categories, research and office work.

3.1 Research

In terms of its major work, research, the House can be characterized as a split entity. Most research concentrated on various aspects of Housing. During my field work, researchers published work on the consumption levels of various types of household goods, labels used in appliances, energy consumption, the environmental friendliness of appliances, the causes of variations in the prices of apartments, the impact of the country's recent membership in the European Union on consumer prices of food stuffs and drugs (Finland joined the EU on Jan. 1, 1995), and the impacts of the recession of the 1990s on household consumption behavior, among other things. In addition, the House published research which was not done by in-house staff. For example, one study on the plant trade, another on the impact of the value-added tax reform on the prices of some goods, and a third on mortgage loan interest came out during my fieldwork. House researchers, in addition, gave papers at various administrative meetings mostly throughout Scandinavia, and a few papers at scientific conferences mostly in Finland, and at in a few international conferences as well.

Behind this topical variation, characterized by several members as large for a small institute, there were some clear quantitative and qualitative patterns. In terms of quantity, some simple counts show that the House's main work was distributed rather unevenly among researchers. Picture 3 presents an analysis of House research in terms of the number of research reports written by various members. The most productive member is marked with "1" in the left margin of the picture, and others are ranked in the picture in decreasing order of productivity. The residual (see Haberman 1973), if not zero, shows whether and in what direction each researcher's productivity deviates from the mean. Notice how strongly research is concentrated on a few persons. The two most productive researchers had produced about 41% of publications during the three years reviewed. The most productive five researchers produced 64% of publications, although they formed only 17% of the staff. The ten most productive researchers were responsible for 86% of the publications. Note3
1) Contains data from publications in 1993, 1994, and 1995. These figures are counted generously in two ways. Co-authored papers have been counted for each writer separately. Also, various types of publications are not weighted in any way. Thus, a major publication in a scientific journal gets the same weight as a publication in the House's own series. x=5.12, N=128.

In terms of quality, the same split holds. In the evaluation of the House done in 1993, the evaluator Mari Santala noted that only one member had had publications in refereed international journals, and even these were related to work that fell outside the tasks outlined in the Law and in Statute, shown in Examples 1 and 2 above [Working paper 9/2/94a, 12]. Most studies, in her opinion, were descriptive rather than explanatory, and made little use of the theoretical tools that could be found in more academic studies [Working paper 9/2/94a, 12-14]. Also, she noted that although descriptive studies could well serve administration by being concrete and detailed, House studies tended to be large basic explorations which its audience felt were too large and not sufficiently responsive to its needs.

This criticism was rather mild and qualified. Also, this judgment was criticized in the House, but mostly by its more academically-qualified members [I 10/30/95, 80-85]. Still, there was more than a grain of truth in it. In particular, the most productive two researchers published 8 articles in foreign-language refereed journals during the period analyzed in Picture 3.
(1993-1995 in contrast to the Mari Santala's period 1988-1993). None of the other members had such articles. Similarly, articles in refereed Finnish-language journals were also produced by a limited number of writers. Out of 11 papers published in such journals, 7 (or about 64%) were written by one person (two of these were co-authored, and interviews of eminent former politicians and economists rather than original research). This member, obviously, was one of the two most productive researchers. Furthermore, out of 19 articles in Finnish-language academic channels, 7 (or 42%) were published by the two most productive members. Finally, discounting the ten most productive researchers, there were only 9 papers that were published outside the House's own series, which makes less than 10% of these papers (N=91). The concentration of productivity and contacts to outside channels is thus considerable.

There are some obvious explanations for this concentration, with training and academic connections probably the best. Researchers with a licentiate's degree or a Ph.D. (see Note 1 in this Chapter), in addition to their experience in academic writing and solid grasp of the theories and concepts of their respective disciplines, had academic connections, know-how about publishing, and wide research interests. Thus, of the six persons with some graduate training, only two were not among the more productive group. Both of them had extensive managerial duties, and another was actively involved in guiding research. On the other hand, of the five most productive researchers, three had graduate training, and one was currently in graduate training. (The fifth member in this group came from a prominent academic family, and entered graduate school in 1996, "for financial reasons," as she put it). Thus, members with a Licentiate's degree (roughly equivalent to an M.A. thesis) or a Ph.D. were more productive. In qualitative terms as well, it was their work that received praise in the evaluation referred to above. Another explanation is simply other work. For example, some were busy with, say, Nordic cooperation, which left them little time for research. Still, this fact does not explain away the importance of academic skills. For example, only a few persons had demanding non-research assignments, and most researchers in the House could not have done solid academic research even if they were freed from all non-research duties.

3.2 The Work of the Office and Administrative Work
In addition to these tasks, researchers and managers had several other tasks. The House's Annual Review (1995) lists underneath the heading "expert tasks" contacts made outside the country (called "International tasks" in the Annual Review), and "Memberships and Representations" in various administrative organizations. These tasks fell to a few researchers, the Director, and the two research chiefs mainly. Most international tasks were related to cooperation with other Nordic countries. In addition to the Director, two researchers travelled around Scandinavia during my field work several times, and one researcher participated in several EU-related administrative meetings. Memberships and representations, in turn, although plentiful (N=84 in 1995, this figure contains international contacts which, then, are listed twice in the Annual Review), were less important in terms of the work they caused. Still, a few researchers were heavily burdened by these tasks. These contacts varied from mere memberships to various government ad hoc work groups [The Annual Review 1995, 12-15].

Some workers did not conduct research at all. The non-managerial staff, which was rather large given the size of the institute, consisted of 9 persons doing basically three types of tasks. First, there was a library staff of three people, and one staff member who took care of publications. Secondly, there were secretaries, whose job consisted of a variety of tasks, ranging from transcribing, coding questionnaires to computers, typing, and bookkeeping to running errands and watering plants. Third, there was a computer staff that took care of the network and the personal computers attached to it.

To give an idea of what non-research staff did, we may take a closer look at one unit's work. Before the 1994 re-organization, three information administration employees took care of routine computer tasks, but had a number of other duties as well. Table 1 contains a description of the tasks as they were defined after the 1994 re-organization. SUPERMAN (and so forth) are my pseudonyms for some software products developed and maintained by the House. I have chosen these silly names to do justice to the (sometimes) funny names given to programs.

### Table 1. Information Management's Job Description  
[The New Working Order, given on 11/17/94]
- Financial administration services: budgeting, results evaluation, follow-up of assets, follow-up of projects, product selling and invoicing, controlling stocks, inventory of movable assets, contracts...
with outsiders (archive maintenance, monetary transactions), cooperation with other officials; [dac,m1]
• Tutoring new employees; [unclear who was in charge]
• Office services: archive maintenance and administrative record-keeping, secretarial services, graphical services and word processing, purchasing and ordering, photocopying, errands, mailing, meeting arrangements, room arrangements, "the general atmosphere" of office space and maintaining coziness, travel services; [s1, s2, t1]
• User support and training: user support (software, hardware, ergonomics), training related to computers; [dac, ml, c2]
• Data administration's projects: SUPERMAN, DONALDDUCK, SPIDERMAN, BUGSBUNNY, Focus groups, electronic internal archive system (data, publications, correspondence), address registers and distribution registers, selling and marketing of ADP products, customer services, register maintenance, and updating related to ADP products; [dac,m1]
• Systems maintenance and development: software updating, hardware maintenance and services, purchasing hardware and software, network maintenance and development, developing information management. [dac, partly c2]

1) Numbers denote persons in the data administration group. For legend, see Pictures 1 and 2 above.
2) c2 was a new worker.

There were six persons responsible for these tasks. Also, those administrative duties that required legal and accounting experience were largely handled by the Housing Office, a parent administrative unit that had specialists in accounting and law. Thus, most of the administrative tasks listed in the table essentially consisted of routines in the House although, as we shall see later, the House constantly struggled to develop some financial follow-up schemes of its own.

Generally then, behind the rather impressive-looking list displayed in Table 1, the information administration's tasks essentially fell into three main groups, administrative duties, consisting mainly of routine bookkeeping and office tasks, maintaining the network and updating PC programs, and assisting in some developmental projects. One computer person, however, had increasingly assumed the role of a methods advisor for non-economists. In terms of money involved and work caused, the maintenance of data bases and the development of the focus group project were the most time-consuming projects during my field phase. In particular, SUPERMAN, a data base of research related to housing, consumed much of the managerial group's time [The Annual Review 1995, 10-11; A 5/9/95:3]. Another project, called the Focus group project was based on gathering a pool of respondents who could be called into the House at any time for focus groups. This project had been in preparation since 1993, but this instrument -- as far as I know -- was used for the first time at the end of 1996.
4. Non-Work Activities

The House, just as any workplace, provides "places" and "times" that are defined as more or less "off-duty." The most important daily "times off" are coffee breaks and lunch hours, and the most important "open space" was the cafeteria, in which people could be approached at will at any time. In contrast to the rather concentrated and task-focused interaction during "working periods," consisting of such activities as meetings and quiet work by the computer, activities during coffee and lunch breaks exhibited a remarkably less concentrated pattern. In general, too, there was little evidence of normative orientation towards the occasion during these "times off," save those typical to any conversation (see Rawls 1989). Talk proceeded on a conversational basis, topics varied constantly, and there was little attempt to coordinate action. In these usually relaxed activities, different people could do different things at different times.

The main activities in the cafeteria and in the restaurant were, of course, drinking coffee and eating. However, these activities allow for side activities (Goffman 1963: 44). Also, people engaged in them usually present themselves as persons who can be approached at will. In Goffman's terminology, they are in "exposed positions" (Goffman 1963: 125-128). Thus, talk and other mutual locally-ordered activities routinely arose in these occasions. Still, behind these dominant activities, other participants could maintain several lines of activity in the background simultaneously with the dominant activity. A most typical background activity in the cafeteria was reading newspapers, which was interrupted for various other activities.

More recreational activities mainly took place after the day was over, with the major exception of weekly aerobics, mostly attended by younger women, and floorball, mostly attended by younger workers of both genders (see Picture 4). These were the main regular recreational collective activities in the House. More occasional recreational and leisurely activities were, during two weeks in late Spring, playing miniature ice-hockey and pool [D 4/18/95, 113-114], celebrating birthdays [A 11/17/95; D 9/29/95; D 10/6/95], graduation days [D 6/1/95, 60-70], and weddings [D 11/22/94, 108-113; D 22/23/94, 8-10, 22-25]. Some members occasionally went to a local pub to have a beer or two (and sometimes many more) after the workday [D 3/12/96, 104-112]. For the most part, however, these pub meetings took place after such occasions as the annual
meetings [A 11/30/95], and floorball games [D 10/12/94, 30-48, 64-70; D 3/12/96, 1-194]. Occasional pub tours (van Maanen 1992) also took place, especially after office parties (van Maanen 1992) [D 1/6/95, 58-112] and Christmas Parties [D 12/16/95].

It is important to note that these recreational activities provided "slots" of varying characteristics for several side activities. For example, floorball games routinely provided the following kinds of slots for side activities. Right before going to the old sausage factory in which we played this game, we divided ourselves in groups according to who happened to have a car that day. When going to the sausage factory, there was routinely talk in elevators, in corridors, and in the parking garage located in the cellar of the House. We continued talk during the three minute ride to the sausage factory, and talk often continued while parking, getting into the locker rooms, in the locker rooms, during warming-ups, and during rest pauses in the midst of the game. Talk went on after each match in the locker rooms and on the way back to the House. Much of this talk focused on the game, but the management in particular tended to "talk shop" even during the rest pauses. By contrast, restaurant and train trips provided a setting for more sustained conversation. Thus, House activities constituted a complex field of activity in which
management activities took place, evaluation being one of these activities.

5. The Management and its Work

As Pictures 1 and 2 showed, the House management consisted of five persons. In addition, Mikko replaced Jari in February 1995 and became a research chief for the rest of the year. Since Jari spent his sabbatical in the House, he was not able to leave all of his managerial duties behind. Therefore, the managerial team consisted of six persons for most of my research period. The management's former positions were described in Picture 1. In the new organization, their positions were more difficult to visualize; however, the managerial group continued to function as before even in the new organization. All through the change, the managerial team represented continuity.

A brief description of the House managers follows. This description only aims at giving an outline of the managers, not a full account of their mutual relations and working habits.

5.1 The Managers' Typical Activities

The most influential member of the managerial team was Karita, the Director. Formally, she was in charge of the whole House, and alone accountable to the Board, the ministry funding the institute, and the Council of State. She was also the most active manager in terms of sheer hours put in, and in terms of participation in various House activities. She chaired formal meetings, and most informal ones too, if she was there. Thus, much of the House's managerial activities revolved around her. In practice, however, other managers took part in these activities, although differently, and thus assumed something like a set of stable "roles." Table 2 gives a rough outline of their participation in these various activities.
### Table 2. How the Management Participated to the House's Major Activities (Meetings Excluded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Activities</th>
<th>Non-Work Activities</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Corridors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project meetings</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Karita$^{1}$ | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ |
| Jari$^{2}$ | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ |
| Mikko | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ |
| Maria | + | ++ | + | - | ++ |
| Anita | - | + | + | + | + |
| Petri | - | - | - | - | + | |

1) The number of pluses denotes activity. A minus sign displays no action or negligible activity.
2) Jari was on sabbatical for most of 1995. Since he spent his leave in the House, he could not detach himself from managerial activities wholly. Therefore, I have included him in the table.

All members of the managerial group put in long hours and performed their duties in various, often rather unexpected activities. These activities included not just research group meetings, but also other kinds of activities, including "non-work activities." Examples of the latter kinds of activities were the restaurant and the cafeteria, the House's corridors, sports, and related activities, like an after-floorball beer in a nearby tavern. The nexus of managerial activities in the House took place around Karita and Jari and, to a lesser extent, Mikko. Maria, Anita, and Petri were less prominent members of the managerial team; they tended to stay closer to their own designated areas of responsibility.

The most influential construct used by House members to account for the benefits of this hands-on style was that "it helped them to know what is going on currently." "To see the forest from the trees" was in this construct facilitated by the knowledge elicited from discussion [I 10/21/94, 301-313]. Of course, a variety of more consequential things took place in these brief encounters. For example, managers could invent new ideas, analyze the markets for these ideas, and start planning in these situations, all in the same session. Thus, these exchanges could be enormously consequential when looked at in aggregate terms.

#### 5.2 Managers and Meetings in the House

Attending meetings was a distinctive feature of management work in the House just as at any other workplace (see Boden 1994: 81-83). First, some meetings were restricted to managerial members only. In particular, workers attended the managerial group meetings and the Board only on invitation.
Secondly, other members could, but often did not, appear at other meetings. For example, the office staff only took part in the annual meetings and other, more specific General Assemblies, which closed down other House activities. Similarly, only researchers regularly participated in the research groups' meetings. Thirdly, managers were the only group that habitually attended all kinds of meetings in the House. There was a managerial member present at every meeting I observed although, naturally, the whole managerial group was not present at each meeting. Still, as a group, they were the only group in the House that fully utilized on-going discussions that went on in the meeting life of the House.

Thus, a participation hierarchy was constituted around these meetings in that only those open access meetings to which everyone was invited were attended by most members consistently. In contrast, when invitations were shared selectively, meetings tended to be attended by the specified group only, or, in the case of research group meetings, only by researchers in their respective research groups. Restricted access meetings were a managerial world, closed to others, except by invitation. Thus, while the office staff attended Class 1 meetings only, and researchers meetings in Classes 1 and 2, managers participated in all three Classes on a continuing basis. Table 3 lists the major types of meetings and other organized gatherings in the House.

Table 3. Major Types of Meetings in the House

**Class 1. Open access. Everyone invited.**
- **General Assemblies** For handling administrative documents and other administrative affairs [A 11/39/94; D 3/10/95; A 11/17/95]
- **Internal information sharing conferences** For sharing information about single matters, like the present state of the focus group project [for example, A 05/05/95]
- **Press conferences** When new studies came out from the press, press conferences might be arranged [A 3/28/95; A 4/4/95; A 6/19/95]

**Class 2. Open access. Only a task-related group invited.**
- **Research group meetings** For discussing research-related matters, such as seminars attended [A 1/18/95], news from other organizations [A 3/2/95], discussing plans [A 4/24/95; A 5/12/95], and attending presentations [A 5/9/95]
- **Working meetings** For various purposes, such as reviewing and planning the library's work [A 4/6/95] and for planning the focus group project [A 1/18/95; A 3/28/95; A 4/25/95]
- **Training sessions** For various projects, such as the focus group project [A 1/19/95; A 1/26/95; A 2/15/95; A 3/22/95]. Also training in Swedish and English.

**Class 3. Access restricted by formal position.**
- **The Managerial Group** Managerial meetings [for example, A
In terms of evaluations, the most important meetings were the managerial team's progress review meetings, where the managerial team specifically set out to review the House activities to see how well it had done during some period. Again, interaction in these meetings was not evaluative all through. Instead, as we shall see in Chapter 3, these meetings were explicitly evaluative only under some rather specific circumstances.

Data and Methods

My initial contact with the House was with one of its workers, a former friend of mine whom I knew from my previous studies. Also, I knew Jari, whom I had met several years before. In preparing for my field work, the House was one of the settings I considered. In late Spring 1994, I decided to study the House instead of some other alternative sites because I thought that my rather intensive field work technique would prompt people to change their behavior easily in these other settings. In the House, which was a research institute, I figured, I would face many fewer reactivity problems. Thus, I e-mailed Jari (I was in the United States at the time) and asked whether I could study the House. He gave my project a green light, and promised to obtain the necessary permissions, which he did. Therefore, I was able to start my field work when I returned to Helsinki in Summer 1994.

1. Working in the Field

I entered the House on September 1st, 1994, and maintained contact with it until the end of June, 1995, when most of its members headed for their annual vacations. This part of my fieldwork can be characterized as the "active" part. After this period, I kept in contact with the House in two ways. First, I continued playing floorball with the House team for the next two years. In addition to this weekly contact. I also followed those formal meetings which were essentially involved with those processes that I had followed during the active field phase. For example, I audiotaped the annual meeting in November 1995, since it was this meeting in which the Annual Report
for 1995 was drafted.

During the active field phase, I maintained daily contact with the House, except for a brief period in December 1994 and January 1995, when I withdrew from the field for two weeks. Due to its flexitime arrangement, members could punch in between 7:00 am and 10:00 am, and leave after eight hours. Although some House members spoke jokingly of two "shifts," by which they meant that some members had the habit of arriving early and leaving early, while some others came and left hours later, there was only one shift in the House. Thus, there was a slight need for "sampling" in the sense that I made sure that I followed for some time both early mornings and late afternoons. In addition to sampling over these various times, I followed the House members to some conference trips and seminars, which explains some rather exotic field notes written, for example, on trains and planes late at night.

My fieldwork proceeded in several phases. In Fall 1994, I began by just trying to learn people's names and getting acquainted with the House. After this six week period, I began to read through the House's main documents, and its main products, studies. Since the house is a research institute, I had lots of work in reading through its materials, even thought most of them were not esoteric to me in the sense that I would have had insurmountable difficulties in trying to understand them (most research, after all, can be described as applied social science). In Fall, I also began to interview several persons I considered strategic in trying to get an accurate description of the House. All through this period, I kept fieldnotes using standard techniques of the trade (Schatzman and Strauss 1973; see also Emerson et al. 1995).

As I mentioned, I "withdrew" from the field over Christmas in 1994 to review my data, and to prepare a plan for audiotaping materials in the House. From mid-January until the end of my field work, my main data gathering method was audiotaping, although I still kept fieldnotes and collected various kinds of documents. I began audiotaping meetings before taping less structured conversations in, say, the cafeteria or the workers' and managers' rooms. In all, the fieldwork produced data which are described in Table 2. I will describe the uses of this rather formidable data when we are already familiar with this Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 2. Description of Data Gathered During the Fieldwork
Audiotapes: Approximately 70 hours of audiotapes, out of which about 10 hours transcribed (1,614,539 bytes). Audioimages\(^1\) consist of 161 pages, mostly in handwriting.

Documents: Approximately 1.5 meters on my shelves, out of which 53 pages consisted of minutes taken during my fieldwork. This documentary material consists of all studies published during my field phase and ½ year after, leaflets, handouts, administrative documents, memorandums, and so forth. In electric form, I have abstracts of all studies done in the House since 1988\(^1\).

E-mail: I saved every message I got during my fieldwork, and at the end of the fieldwork, I printed every fourth message in this log. In addition, I printed several debates during my fieldwork. Finally, I made a selection of messages written by those members who were not captured by my selection procedure. In print, this data consists of 168 pages.

Diary: 280 printed pages in 161 files (707,855 bytes).

Interviews: I interviewed every member at least once, and the most important managers several times. In addition to 73 semi-formal interviews, out of which 62 are on tape, I conducted dozens of brief informal interviews. Since it is often impossible to distinguish "informal interviews" from "fieldnotes," I have not counted these interviews.

\(^1\) Refers to abstracts of the contents of audiotapes. I used these as a map in maintaining a rough content-based view of the tapes.

A few words about the selection and the representativeness of these data are needed. Since the researcher can only be in one place at a time, there are obvious "logistical" difficulties in keeping a research diary. To reduce the effects of this source of trouble, I sampled not just over time, but also over people and, in particular, over places during my fieldwork. That is, I concentrated my diary-keeping around some specific location at any one time (this practice served to relieve boredom as well). It is more difficult to analyze the representativeness of the documents I gathered. I have all studies and administrative documents written during my field phase, and most memorandums written during the same phase. I gathered leaflets, unfinished manuscripts, and so forth, conservatively to avoid overloading my research with textual data. I tried to keep up more systematically with only one group's unsystematic notes, records, and jottings (the "R5" in group Picture 2). When it comes to audiotapes, again, there were obvious logistical difficulties in obtaining representative data, given the large possible range of situations in which members talk to each other. I took a more modest tactic with these activities, making sure that I had tapes from the major types of conversations, save the restaurant in which noise levels were too high for audiotaping. When it comes to tapes from formal settings, I tried to audiotape all kinds of situations, ranging from seminars and press conferences to formal meetings,
small group discussions, and methods training sessions. Judging by the Director's secretary's calendar (reservations for rooms were done by her) and my knowledge of unannounced, spontaneous meetings, I managed to audiotape about 50% of all meetings in the period of March-June 1995.

This last figure is obviously biased towards scheduled meetings, which may not be a handicap for the present study, due to my transcription practices. Out of these tapes, I transcribed a selection designed to cover the most important activities in terms of evaluations. First, I transcribed two managerial meetings [A 5/22/95; A 5/30/95] that formed the most important systematic review discussions in the House during my field period. In addition to these meetings, there was only one review discussion in Spring 1995 [managerial group minutes 2/13/95, item 2, p. 2], but it was brief compared to these two meetings. Secondly, I transcribed a selection of tapes from non-formal activities. These data consist of a pre-meeting exchange [A 5/30/95:1 1(2) A:1], a post-meeting exchange [A 5/29/95 2(2) A:1-6, A7], a semi-formal meeting [A 1/24/95], part of an informal meeting with outsiders [A 3/2/95 2(2) A:1], an informal meeting with only the House members present [A 1/18/95], and a work session with three members [A 2/2/95]. Due to the ambulatory quality (see Goffman 1983: 7; see Peräkylä 1997a: 204) of many conversations, I did not use tapes from the cafeteria, the elevator, or the corridors; these conversations were difficult to understand because people moved from one place to another, and the microphone captured only part of the conversation. However, in terms of turn-taking, these discussions were similar to the pre-meeting and post-meeting exchanges that, then, will do the job of representing mundane conversation data.

2. Reactivity Issues

With good reasons, it has been argued that fieldwork is not particularly prone to reactivity problems. In particular, people in real settings have work to do; they are not free to change their behavior only because of a researcher. Also, fieldworkers gather diverse and varying data, which helps to cross-check any analysis aimed at analyzing some hypothesis (see Becker 1970: 42-44). To control reactivity, I still did several things. First, I chose to work in a research institute where people are accustomed to researchers. Secondly, I gave two presentations of my aims in the House, one
immediately after I arrived [D 9/6/94, 55-89], and another at the end of January, when I had decided to work with conversation analytic data rather than with ethnographic data, and I had finished my first transcripts [A 1/18/95]. Thirdly, during the very first days of my field work, I wrote an article for *House News*, a monthly in-House newsletter. In this article, I introduced myself, described the methods I was going to use, and described my research interests. I also detailed some of the ethical principles I was going to follow in my work [*House News* 10/10/94, 1-4]. Fourthly, I chose to proceed cautiously; I began by familiarizing myself with the House by reading work done in it and observing its activities, and went on to audiotaping only later. I first audiotaped open-access meetings, and went gradually to more sensitive settings such as the cafeteria and informal group work. Finally, when I began to audiotape, I chose to audiotape as much material as I could to make my activity as inconspicuous as possible.

In all, reactivity did not become a problem in this study. People did ask me questions about my study mainly in the early weeks, and I overheard comments about my work whenever I changed the data gathering routines in a noticeable way. For example, at the end of the field phase, my audiotapings in the House's "public" spaces caused some comments about "snooping" in the cafeteria among a group of three people [D 5/27/95, 42-48]. This commentary partly took place because of my research ethical procedures (detailed below in more detail). A few persons maintained a reserved attitude towards me throughout the study, which I took as a drawback that resulted from my focus on the most important members of management (i.e., the Director, Jari, Mikko, and to some extent, Anita). Still, nobody refused an interview, nor did anyone try to sabotage the study. Instead of the dramatic forms of reactivity that would have handicapped the study seriously that were described by Roy (1965), reactivity remained within acceptable bounds in this study. My choice to focus on younger workers closed doors to some of the more seasoned workers' practices. However, I managed to maintain good working relations with them as well. Also, since workers were not the focus of my final analysis, this shallowness in my data does not seriously impair my analysis.

Audiotaping in particular is a "strong" method in the sense that people attend to what they have to say to each other and to what is being said to them, not to the presence of the microphone. As Maynard (1984) notes,
audiotaping does not need to elicit strong observer effects because participants cannot "suddenly produce a nonstandard form of conversation" and because "participants have a practical interest in what they are doing and are unlikely to let an outsider interfere with the normal performance of their jobs" (Maynard 1984: 21-22). Indeed, people had a tendency to forget that taping was going on, which was a source of some worry for me and for members alike. I tried to cope with this worry in two ways. First, I did not audiotape unless I could get permission. There were no refusals, although a couple of times, my activities were not well received, and I dropped my intent to audiotape [D 6/1/95, 64-70]. Secondly, the day before audiotaping in the House's "public" spaces (for example, the cafeteria), I wrote an e-mail addressed to "everyone" to say where and when I was going to tape. Since people kept forgetting this, I promised that should someone want to erase something from the tape, I would destroy that part of the tape if that person went to the microphone, addressed me by name, and asked me to tape that part over [E 3/18/95 13:37, p.1-2]. No one asked me to do this, but the office staff expressed relief when I developed this procedure.

Other ethical procedures in this study are customary. With the exception of well-known politicians, all names and identifying details have been changed in the hope that readers who recognize the House and its people will respect this ethical commitment even though they can track down its members from my data and descriptions. Also, I have changed some minor identifying details throughout the text. These practices were approved by House members in response to my e-mail query [E 5/29/96 in D 5/29/96, 1-87], and also by the Director [D 10/21/97, 4-54]. I have also used a simple ethical device throughout the study. All changes, save names, have been marked with a superscripted plus sign (+).

3. How the Data was Analyzed

In analyzing these data, I read through all materials with an eye on evaluations. After that, I proceeded to study one subset of data more closely [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1; A 05/30/95:1 1(2) B:2], and made a series of initial analysis using these data. After these initial analyses, I expanded the analysis to the whole data. Thus, I analyzed the data in successive steps, initiating my analysis from formal activities and attempting to generalize
these results to other activities. When I found that some earlier results did not fit in with new activities, I introduced additional contextual concepts to my analysis. The threefold structure of the study, apparent in the Table of Contents, consisting of evaluations in formal activities, in non-formal activities, and in texts, arose from this inductive effort. The final results are written along these lines, and the phenomenon under scrutiny, evaluation, is thus situated in the House's various practical activities (for the logic of an inductive analytic procedure, see Silverman 1994: 160-162).

Throughout my analyses, I have always given precedence to naturally occurring data. Thus, I have used audiotapes and their transcripts, and House texts as the primary source of data throughout the study. This stress has minimized the importance of diary notes and interviews, which have been referred to only if they provide the background needed to analyze naturally occurring data. In fact, this study seemingly uses a relatively small portion of the rather extensive data I gathered. However, my fieldworker's understanding of these data has been indispensable in all analyses of conversations and texts. Ethnographic understanding has been a vital part of the analysis, although this feature has not been apparent in the text, where I have followed the analytic principles of conversation analysis as detailed by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) and by Clayman and Maynard (1996), among others.

Having left the field in June, I spent Summer 1995 arranging my data and making transcriptions of my audiotapes. I fixed the topic of the inquiry at the end of August 1995. Then I began to work on the analysis, which was largely done through a series of essays. In the first phase in August - November 1995, I wrote two basic essays in Finnish: a series of observations of the report format and evaluations' features. Out of these two essays, four themes arose for further analysis, which formed the second phase of the study in Spring 1996, when I wrote four essays in Finnish. One dealt with the targets (and later, the criteria) of evaluations, another with evaluative devices, and the third with the reception of evaluations. In the third phase, another set of essays were written (in Summer 1996). Then I wrote the first manuscript of the study in English. The empirical chapters of this study grew out of the Phase 2 essays. In the fourth phase, in Fall 1996 - Fall 1997, I kept working on the manuscript, which I still treated as a series of essays. I developed these during Winter 1996 and Spring 1997. In approximately April 1997, I began to write out the final manuscript, which was completed in September, 1997. Thus,
the essay-writing technique created and maintained in this study consisted of a series of successive attempts to describe evaluations in detail.

In writing essays, I drew on the precepts of conversation analysis. Any analysis based on this approach involves detailed, qualitative analysis of (here) audiotapes of naturally occurring interaction. This approach, based on an inductive search for regularities in interaction, does not entail the formulation and testing of hypotheses set prior to the study. Instead, conversation analysis aims to describe the methods and the reasoning used by the speakers in producing their own action and in interpreting the actions of others. In analyzing the data, I repeatedly played and replayed audiorecordings, and transcribed them in detail using a system that is described at the end of this chapter. These transcripts do not replace listening to the audiotapes; rather, they are designed to facilitate the analysis of these audiotapes.

The early drafts of this study essentially consisted of analyses of single cases, and attempts to cluster them into nameable categories that would reflect the formal structure of that facet of evaluation being investigated in each essay. That there were successive drafts before I wrote the final chapter reflects the fact that these analyses gradually improved the "fit" between the analysis and the practice it was supposed to describe.

4. Reliability and Validity Issues

Now that we are familiar with the data, and the way in which the analysis evolved, we may turn to a consideration of how reliable and valid the results of this analysis are. In terms of reliability, we may observe that the precedence I have given to an analysis of audiotapes and their transcripts already guarantees that the data is of relatively good quality. Audiotapes are both more accurate than fieldnotes, and can be replayed, which makes it possible to analyze them in detail (see Sacks 1984b). Secondly, the details included here give the reader an opportunity to assess my methods and thus form a reasoned opinion about whether my procedures have been sensible. Of course, no researcher could "replicate" my fieldwork exactly, but the conversation analytic principle of extensive quoting of data upon which my analysis is based gives the reader an opportunity to assess my analyses.

In a discussion of validity in conversation analysis, Peräkylä
(1997a) distinguished five facets that should be observed in an analysis of validity. First, there is the "transparency of analytic claims," which stands for the simplicity of results. It is the reader's task to assess this facet of validity in this study. Second, there is "validation through 'next turn,'" which amounts to the conversation analytic principle of grounding any inference of what is going on in interaction in members' analyses of some turn, as displayed in the following turn. I have been able analyze recipient action mainly in Chapters 5 and 6, and in Chapter 7, but not in Chapter 8 which, then, apparently remains less valid. The third facet, "deviant case analysis" is difficult to conduct in an environment in which there are few recurrent sequences at work. Since evaluations were characterized by variation along various dimensions, I did not conduct deviant case analyses in this study explicitly. The final dimension of validity deals with whether this study's results are generalizable. In general, it has been argued that institutions are historically variable unlike the basic procedures of talk (Heritage 1989: 239-240). If specific interactional patterns are designed to make the work of some institution possible, then any institution-specific analysis may be reduced to a description of a single setting. Of course, the House and its interactional patterns are unique. Still, despite this uniqueness, the social practices that I have described are possibly generalizable which, as Peräkylä notes (1997a: 215), is a better criteria for assessing generality of conversation analytic findings than some strict logical criterion.
Notes for Chapter 2.

1. I did not get access to these data. Instead, a research who had written the original job satisfaction report could conduct analyses for me. All figures reported in the text are from such analyses.

2. For historical reasons, agricultural sciences at the University of Helsinki have applied economics programs. In contrast to social scientists, graduates from these programs may have taken some classes in the natural sciences. Other related disciplines consist of studies of home technology and nutrition. "Docents" have a right to teach at some university, and they may advise students on advanced levels. Their main source of income, however, is outside the university in which they are docents.

"Licentiate" is an intermediary degree between Master's degree and a Ph.D. Since mid-seventies, Master's Degree, not Bachelor's, has been the first, and in some sciences the only degree at undergraduate studies.

3. Interestingly, out of the 11 most productive researchers, six worked on a temporary basis in variously short-term contracts and with little access to job security. Also, their wages were often considerably lower than those of the more seasoned staff who had come from the civil service originally. This fact was a source of some subtle strain in the House. I was told on several occasions after my field period that some of the younger staff protested quietly about this state of affairs. Also, some older workers saw younger researchers' high productivity and other commitments (in Nordic cooperation, for example) as ways to get favors from the management and to uproot the more seasoned staff's influence [I 5/5/95].

4. This solutions accounts for some of the central qualities of this report. Ethnography and conversation analysis stand in a paradoxical relationship in an important sense. An ethnographer moves with ease from one context to another, and gets acquainted with the phenomenon of interest across several contexts. Because ethnography takes the researcher into several contexts, and drives him to see some action (here managerial evaluation) in situated terms, that is, in context, he becomes sensitive to the context of action. Ethnographic methods tend to add contextual variation to data. In contrast, conversation analytic concepts and methods work best when there is an identifiable, rather invariant pattern in talk. In normal cases, this pattern is a sequence consisting of several subsequent turns that are done in certain order. In conversation analysis, this pattern is first described in detail. Then a conversation analyst describes what people engaged in doing that practice achieve by doing what they do; what they do in doing that sequence, and in various parts of that sequence. Then he proceeds to describe "deviations" from this sequence, and studies how members orient to these "deviations." Consequently, it is possible to establish how this sequence is oriented to by members, and how it is maintained in interaction.

Of course, there is nothing antithetical between thee approaches in principle. If there is a large data, the researcher could conduct a strict study context by context. However, at any modern workplace, this the analytic task would be cumbersome if the researcher focuses on an activity such as evaluation that takes place in several environments. Secondly, this solution necessarily produces only a small data set from some contexts, especially with evaluation, which is a relatively infrequent phenomenon (see Chapter 3 and the Appendix). If is difficult, if not impossible, to establish an invariant feature with, say, ten of twenty cases without introducing contextual assumptions into an analysis. The basic premises in the methodic practices of conversation analysis are severely undermined in these contexts. Therefore, although there are two methodic traditions are not antithetical out of necessity, they tend to lead the researcher to opposite directions, and he has to make compromises in the way in which he analyzes his data.

5. I did have additional data from another research institute. I am grateful for these data for Eveliina Saari, University of Helsinki, who generously shared a portion of her data with me. However, I did not use these additional data in this study, but consulted it occasionally in my analyses to check whether the practices I was describing were unique to the House.
A central feature of ordinary conversation is that it consists of "turns" of varying lengths. At their shortest, turns may consist of a single interjection, while the longest turns (for example, stories) may take minutes to unfold. Turns consist of units that may consist of sentences, clauses, phrases, or lexical items (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974: 702; Schegloff 1996b). During some turn, the speaker is entitled to hold the turn, but at the end of this unit, there is a "transition-relevance place" (TRP), where participants have to reallocate the subsequent turn to some speaker. This takes place according to the following rules:

1. At initial turn-constructional unit's initial transition-relevance place:
   (a) If the turn-so-far is so construed as to involve the use of a "Current speaker selects next" technique, then the party so selected has rights, and is obliged, to take next turn to speak, and no others have such rights or obligations, transfer occurring at that place.
   (b) If the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a "current speaker selects next" technique, self-selection for next speakership may, but need not, be instituted, with the first starter acquiring rights to a turn, transfer occurring at that place.
   (c) If the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a "current speaker selects next" technique, then current speaker may, but need not, continue, unless another self-selects.

2. If, at initial turn-constructional unit's initial transition-relevance place, neither 1(a) nor 1(b) has operated, and, following the provision of 1(c), current speaker has continued, then the Rule-set (a)-(c) reapplies at next transition-relevance place, and recursively at each next transition-relevance place, until transfer is effected. (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974: 704).

When people orient to on-going interaction in terms of these rules, they coordinate their actions on a local basis and are doing an activity called "conversation." These rules make orderly conduct possible for them. For example, by observing these rules, they can minimize overlap in talk.

In ordinary conversation, turns are tied to other turns in a more or less coherent manner in sequences of action. Sequences are coordinated strings of action that consist of several actions taken by different people. In some cases, this local coordination takes the form of "adjacency pairs" (Schegloff and Sacks 1973: 295-296). Adjacency pairs are paired actions consisting of two turns where these turns are adjacently positioned, done by different speakers,
ordered into a recognizable first part and a recognizable second part where, if the first part is produced, the second part is expected in the sense that it is noticeably absent, if it is not given. A typical adjacency pair consists of a question (first pair part) and an answer (the second pair part). Many kinds of ordinary orderly actions consist of brief, locally managed and coordinated sequences consisting of adjacency pairs, or their expansions (see Zimmerman 1992). Here, we are dealing with universal, albeit ordinary methods of action that form the basis of the orderly, rational, and meaningful character of action in everyday life. We do not have to go deeper into the organization of ordinary conversation here. Further complications of this model are readily available (for example, Heritage 1989: Ch. 8). It is more important to point out that conversation analysis aims at explicating the orderly character of talk-in-interaction.

While ordinary, mundane conversation is organized in a highly local fashion, this is not true of what has come to be known and "institutional talk," which differs from conversation in several ways. Institutional interaction is characterized by three things:

1. Institutional interaction involves an orientation by at least one of the participants to some core goal, task or identity... conventionally associated with the institution in question. In short, institutional talk is normally informed by goal orientations of a relatively restricted conventional form.
2. Institutional interaction may often involve special and particular constraints on what one or both of the participants will treat as allowable contributions to the business at hand.
3. Institutional talk may be associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to the specific institutional contexts. (Drew and Heritage 1992: 22).

Thus, in contrast to mundane talk, institutional talk is characterized by a task focus that is often accomplished in terms of specific and typical-to-this-institution constraints and inferences. In general, institutional interaction does not allow all possible actions available to participants in conversation, but a "reduced" set of them (Heritage 1989: 239-240). For example, interviewers on television are expected to ask questions while the interviewee is expected to answer them (Heritage and Greatbach 1991: 97-106). This reduced form helps these people accomplish some institutionally relevant things and keep interaction focused on a task-relevant topic for extended periods of time (Drew and Heritage 1992: 26).

The means in which interaction is made institutional are multiple.
In many cases, the most obvious way in which talk is made observably institutional is at the level of lexical choices. In ordinary life, people talk about "broken bones," not of "fractures of [some specific bone structure]." Another slightly more complicated level grows out of ways in which speakers design their utterances. For example, speakers may select their responses to such ordinary activities as greetings in ways that display an orientation to work. In Example 1 below, the patient's (P) response to the doctor (D) clearly displays that she knows that she is talking to a doctor. In ordinary conversation, "how are you" would invoke another greeting, and perhaps a brief description of one's current news. P's detailed description of his physical problem properly "belongs" to the medical setting.

Example 1. (Peräkylä 1997b: 188-189)
1 D .th Mitäs kuu:luu. .th How 're yo[u:u:::]
2 P .hhh] No nyt on >semmonen vaiva .hhh Well now I've >had that sort of
3 ollu vissii kesästä lähtiec et muu painaa, trouble I guess from the Summe< That I've got pressure,
4 (0.2) tähä. (0.2) Here.
5 D Joo:= Uh Ruh:=
6 P =.hh Ja niinku hengittäessäki mul o vaikeeta =.hh And h- even in breathing I've got trouble
7 <*kävelyssä*>. <*> when walking*>.

At a more complicated level, the institutionality of talk may be observable in the ways speakers handle their social relations. For instance, a certain amount of tentativeness and cautiousness is typical to professional discourse. Professionals often avoid assessments even in places that would call for assessments in mundane conversation. Also, professional discourse is characterized by asymmetries that are rare in ordinary conversation. Thus, in TV interviews, questions are allocated to journalists, while it is the interviewee's task to answer them (Heritage and Greatbach 1991: 97-102; for more discussion concerning these asymmetries, see Drew and Heritage 1992: 47-53; Maynard 1991; Linell and Luckmann 1991; Molotch and Boden 1985: 274, among others).

Of course, there are many kinds of "institutional environments."
Drew and Heritage distinguish "formal settings" such as a courtroom or TV interviews from "non-formal settings" such as medical, psychiatric, and social-service settings (Drew and Heritage 1992: 25-29). In the latter type of settings, patterns of interaction exhibit considerably less uniformity than in the former type. For example, there surely may exist an asymmetry in interaction in social work encounters between the professional social worker and his client. Still, in interaction, this asymmetry is not accomplished only with a strict pre-allocation of certain turns to certain speakers. In contrast, in cross-examinations in the courtroom, the witness's job is to answer to the counsel's questions (Atkinson and Drew 1979: 61-81). Each institution has its own "fingerprint," apparent in the ways in which participants make their orientation to this institution reflexively available in their activities with other participants.

Before we close this section, it is important to note that at most workplaces, managers and other workers participate in several different activities on a daily basis. As the literature cited in Chapter 1 shows, managerial work is multi-faceted, and assumes complex forms in varying circumstances. It is done at odd times in several places, ranging from the most humble mundane interactions through various small-group situations to formal meetings, summoned to make decisions concerning the future of the very workplace. Thus, if we follow some set of managers through some specific workplace, we find that they do their job in both formal and non-formal settings. As the chapters to come will make amply evident, this certainly holds for an activity called "evaluation" as well. Next, I will take a closer look at what kinds of activities we are talking about when we use this concept.

The Concept of "Evaluation"

*Webster's Dictionary* defines evaluation as "to determine or set the value or amount of; appraise." According to this definition, evaluation amounts to determining the value of some object or target. Researchers' definitions follow this definition closely. For example, Mahoney, Jerdee and Carroll (1965) define evaluation as an "assessment and appraisal of proposals or of reported or observed performance," and claim that evaluation consists of actions such as "employee appraisals, judging output records, judging financial reports,
product inspection, approving requests, judging proposals, and suggestions" (Mahoney, Jerdee, and Carroll 1965: 100). Preliminarily then, "evaluation" can be defined as an act in which someone judges whether some performance (or performer) is in line with the evaluator's expectations. Needless to say, these expectations may be defined formally, say, in plans. However, they do not have to be defined formally, as this study will amply document.

The trouble with this definition is that this word is used in the English language for many verbal acts and activities, and in highly different ways in mundane and in institutional activities. This colloquial concept of "evaluation" collects various activities into bundles, and treats them as if they were facets of the same phenomenon. However, this is not necessarily the case. In particular, we need to note that if we treat the concept this way, we will get an incoherent collection of cases, and our inferences about their properties would be misguided.

To get a more differentiated view of what kinds of activities are collected underneath the concept of "evaluation," we need to distinguish two main usages of the term, and note that these two definitions do not represent two facets of the same phenomenon, but two different activities. First, there is the mundane sense of the term, where evaluation is used to offer a personal opinion. Secondly, evaluations can be more impersonal, especially when used in more formal types of activities. in this study, I am primarily interested in the latter kind of activity.

1. Evaluative Utterances in Mundane Conversation

First, we need to note that in mundane activities, the concept of "evaluation" normally refers to an expression of an opinion, or to an assessment, with more or less personal and even emotional overtones. In mundane conversation, then, assessing is an activity that is personal, often with emotional overtones. Colloquially, we may talk about "opinions," "positions," or "assessments" when the term is used this way.

To take but one example of such action, we may look at the following type of action that has been studied extensively in the literature of assessments. This action is called the "second assessment," first described by Pomerantz (1975, 1984), who studied in detail those assessments that came in the speaking turn immediately following an initial assessment. These "second
assessments" share the referent with the prior turn (Pomerantz 1984: 59). In Pomerantz's analysis, the "initial assessment provides the relevance of the recipient's second assessment" (Pomerantz 1984: 61) whenever the referent is accessible to the recipient, regardless of whether the initial assessment was done using an interrogative format or not. She formulates a "speaker's procedural rule" from this observation: "A recipient of an initial assessment turns his or her attention to that which was just assessed and proffers his or her own assessment of this referent" (Pomerantz 1984: 62).

Example 2 below offers an instance of an assessment in line 1. In addition, there is an accompanying "second assessment" in line 2. These evaluations are "personal" in that the first evaluation makes visible the speaker's own, private, and emotionally loaded assessment about the object (presumably a baby). B's alignment in line 2 is similarly private and emotional, although due to the organization of this episode, both speakers end up collaborating in their activity.

Example 2. (from Pomerantz 1984: 65)
1 A      Isn't he cute
2 B      O::h he::s a::DORable

This example shows that people do make evaluative characterizations in talk from time to time. In most cases, assessments appear at the end of some topically coherent sequence, but their occurrence is not restricted to these environments (Goodwin and Goodwin 1987: 38-42; Tainio 1993: 59-67). These characterizations or descriptions can take many forms, ranging from such evaluatively loaded words as "good" and "fine" to such words as "a::DORable" in Example 2 above. Another person may join in and make these evaluations not only in a collaborated fashion, but also concurrently (see Goodwin and Goodwin 1987).

2. Evaluative Activities in Institutional Talk

In institutional talk, by contrast, evaluation is something different from the mundane practice described briefly above. In particular, there are several kinds of targets that can be evaluated at the workplace in terms of whether these targets conform to some expectation, standard, norm, or plan. Furthermore, in many kinds of institutional environments, assessing,
evaluating or, more euphemistically, sorting people, objects and so forth into categories is a ubiquitous feature of institutional interaction. A common task set up for a variety of institutional activities is to determine whether some object be characterized as x (or not-x), and whether, given this characterization, it deserves some kind of treatment (see Agar 1985). Here, then, lies the main bureaucratic and administrative usage of the term. It differs from ordinary conversational usage in several ways. While evaluations in ordinary conversation are usually personal, with emotional overtones, these institutional evaluations are usually disciplined, impersonal, and non-emotional.

What is the source of this impersonal and non-emotional tone? A brief look at how Josh Carter was evaluated by the attendings in Example 1 in the Preface reveals some important differences between mundane and institutional evaluations. Since they are based on the attendings' opinions of Mr. Carter, these evaluations are rather close to mundane assessments in some respects. Still, these opinions were essentially based on observations of Mr. Carter at work, and on the attendings' judgment of what qualities make for a good surgeon. Furthermore, these evaluations were done in a "decisional" context, a department meeting. Thus, despite some similarities to mundane evaluations, this evaluation differs in several important respects from evaluations in ordinary conversation.

More importantly, the disciplined, impersonal, and nonemotional properties of evaluations at the workplace are not random elements, but are grounded in several documentary processes that provide the bureaucratic foundations needed for evaluation. To see how these documents provided the categories necessary for making House work visible and manageable, let us take a look at Examples 3 and 4 below. They are examples of some of the ways in which activities were coordinated in the House. Example 3 is from the minutes of the managerial group. Example 4 is from the House's strategic plan for one research group for 1993-1998. "Research group," a term explained in Chapter 2, refers to a set of projects in the House's team-based organization.

Example 3. [managerial group minutes, 6/94, item 6].
1 It was decided that due to high costs, working papers and reports will not be sent by fax, except under very special circumstances.
2 Press releases about publications will be sent by fax, but preferably at night.
Example 4. [The Yearly plan 1995, 7].

Finnish consumer society is relatively young. When outlining present and future housing policies, we must consider the ways this consumer society is developing. Housing policy is facing new challenges in the era of electronic communication, as companies must act on large global markets. Are consumers keeping up with these fast developments? What will the consumer policy of the future be like?

The research group's aim is to investigate the present and future challenges of disseminating information and guidance about housing, as well as to assess the impact of such information and guidance on consumers. In addition, the group will produce information which can be used to plan future housing policy.

Of studies related to the research group in 1995:

**Will be finished:**
- Unmarried men's uses of food stuffs and food expenditures
- Consumption and the changes of consumption of food stuffs from the 1950s onwards

**Beginning or continuing:**
- Households, consumption, and giving advice - from giving advice to households to consumer policy in twentieth century Finland
- The internationalization of Finnish food culture and food stuff use
- The development of home cleaning habits in Finland 1900-1990

Both documents "program" activities in their own ways. As such, documents like these provide the perceptive foundation with which work can be followed and performance at a workplace can be assessed. Activities may be monitored, talked about, and scanned for their properties under the assumption that activities are to "fulfill" such plans and directives. For example, given these documents/programmings, the absence of some (planned) activity becomes noticeable, reportable, and potentially punishable or rewardable, given that an analysis of its properties provides a justification for resorting to such measures (see Heritage 1983, 1987). These bureaucratic procedures, then, may be used to define some sequences as work and to make people accountable for doing certain things in certain ways. This feature was discussed by Bittner under the concept of "gambit of compliance" as follows:

A cursory consideration of the significance of rules as social facts reveals, however, that their meaning is not exhausted by their prospective sense. Aside from determining the occurrence of certain responses under suitable conditions, rules are also invoked to clarify the meaning of actions retrospectively... It is a readily demonstrable fact that a good deal of the sense we make of the things happening in our presence depends on our ability to assign them to the phenomenal sphere of influence of some rule" (Bittner 1978: 77).

At actual workplaces, "rules" in this quote can be taken to mean any management directive, ranging from simple pieces of advice, to commands, and to the organization's rules. The point is that these "rules" may be used as
sanctionable interpretive resources in making sense of work and other on-going activities at the workplace (see Bittner 1975: 76).

Through the use of these artifices as devices for seeing activities as orderly (or disorderly), and by knowing that others rely on these same devices, and by knowing that others know that they, too, rely on these devices, members create a web of accountability in which some activities can be seen to be rational in a "planned" and "organizational" manner. Within this intersubjective and reflexive web, members can also be seen as responsible agents who are held accountable for their activities (for the notion of reflexivity, see Garfinkel 1990 [1963]; Heritage 1989: 109, 117; for the notion of intersubjectivity, see Heritage 1989: 54-61, and Schegloff 1992b).

Of course, evaluations have to be made in order to be effective as devices for making accountability issues bear on action. Managerial evaluations typically take the following form. This simple excerpt is from a managerial group meeting held in May 1995. Here the speaker Maria, a research chief, reports to the managerial team about two studies that are about to be finished (see line 2). "Interest loans" in line 2 refers to government-supported low-interest loans granted to people who have difficulties paying back their loans. In doing this evaluation, Maria names the researchers in question, and notes that they "proceed as planned" (in line 4).

Example 5. [A 5/30/95, 58-63]
1 Ma Ymmärrettävä ja tota?, (1.8) eli meilhän on mihh
understandable and well so we have mihh
2 valmistunut noit korkotukia ja (0.4) tää velkaneuvonta
be+ready those interest+support and this debt+informing
finished these interest loans and (0.4) this debt settlement
3 ja vapaaehtosjärjestelmät eli eli Marian ja (0.3)
and voluntary+systems so so Maria's and
and voluntary settlement systems [studies] that is Maria's
4 → ton (. ) Iran hankkeet etenee suunnitellusti ja
that (. ) Ira's projects advance in+planned+manner and
and (0.3) Ira's projects proceed as planned and
5 käskirjoituksi on (tulolla) *tässä* (0.9)
manuscripts are (coming) *here* (0.9)
6 tässä kesäkuulla vielä? this June?

Example 5 is from a formal meeting. Here Maria first compares two projects to the plans and finds that both projects are doing fine on the terms laid down by the plans (see line 4). She further notes that manuscripts are to come out soon
from both projects. Importantly, no problems are reported. Hearing this report, her recipients learn that both projects are doing fine, and no further attention is needed (at least this is what the secretary wrote down [managerial group minutes 5/30/95, p.3]). Here, these documents are used as an interpretive resource for making sense of House work.

**Situating Evaluations in Workplace Activities**

This train of thought holds primarily for formal institutional encounters that are often explicitly targeted at making a decision on a predetermined issue. In formal institutional encounters, participants are also aware that they have gathered for this purpose, and display their orientation to this task in many ways. However, there are also several kinds of informal situations where people know that organizationally valid decisions may, but need not, be made. Note2 Talk in these "non-formal" types of encounters differs in an important respect from assessing the charm of a newborn baby in mundane conversation. An assessment about the baby does not have organizational implications (except perhaps under some rather extraordinary set of circumstances); by contrast, managers' evaluation of the quality of some worker's work may have such implications even if it is done over a coffee mug. Thus, we need to specify the relationship of the activity in which an evaluation takes place to this evaluation.

At the more formal end of the workplace activity spectrum, there are formal activities (most typically formal meetings) where the management has to make decisions on some predetermined issue. To make these decisions, various targets or objects at the workplace need to be evaluated and categorized according to their inherent qualities. "Evaluation" is almost a definitional property of "formal activity" in interactions between doctors and patients, teachers and pupils, as well as managers and workers. As Agar (1985) has noted, "diagnosis" (or evaluation) is a precondition for giving a directive. To make a decision as to whether something is eligible for something, the managers have to make an evaluation of the situation first. They also know that they have such valuational and decision-making duties.

Non-formal activities, by contrast, are task-oriented activities in which people know that organizationally valid decisions may, but need not, be
made (see Boden 1994: 86). Interestingly enough, in some non-formal activities, evaluation may often be almost a definitional property in that much of organizational sense-making is targeted at making sense of things, their qualities, and their eligibility for some use. However, since informal situations are less structured than formal ones, these situations are often designed, to use Agar's (1985) term, for "diagnosis" rather than for formal decision-making (see also Boden 1994: 86). By contrast to these "semi-formal" encounters, evaluations also take place in managers' mutual talk in the corridors, over lunch, and in various kinds of spontaneous unscheduled gatherings. In these more conversationally organized encounters, interaction is not evaluative at the level of the whole activity, but may be evaluative for brief periods of time within sequences oriented to other tasks.

These distinctions provide a basis for various activities of a workplace in terms of their relationship to evaluation, which can be seen in Table 1. Note that I have added a further dimension to this Table. Since some evaluations take place in texts and some in talk, and these differ in terms of their interactional constitution, I have treated them separately in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. A Classification of the Activities in which Evaluations Take Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. In Talk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Formal Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Formal meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-Formal Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Informal meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Evaluations in activities arranged on a turn-by-turn basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Evaluations in conversational parts of formal meetings,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Pauses of Meetings, and During Pre-Meeting and Post-Meeting Exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Encounters related to but not properly a part of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Private Conversational Encounters¹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. In Texts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Formal Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Memorandums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-Formal Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Most stories in <em>House News</em> (the House's internal news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magazine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Most e-mail messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Texts meant for private uses only¹)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹) Not examined in this study.

Notice that there is a scale in Table 1: the activities in which evaluations can take place can be placed on a scale. Notice further that these are different kinds of activities, not simply different contexts for an abstract activity called "evaluation."
Next I will take a closer look at these activities and show how managerial evaluations take place in each of them in a context-specific manner. Notice that although the distinction between formal and non-formal activities may appear to be connected to the distinction between mundane and organizationally-grounded evaluations drawn earlier, this is not necessarily the case. There is no logical connection between the activity in which some evaluation is made, and the devices used in making evaluations.

1. Evaluations in Formal Activities

As I have used the term, there are various types of "formal activities." First, in some specific formal meetings, interaction is formal in the sense that it is pre-ordered both in terms of turn allocation, and in terms of the devices used in interaction to make things visible and manageable. Secondly, there are several "formal" episodes in informal meetings where someone -- usually the most senior person -- takes care of certain chairing duties such as opening and closing the meeting, and occasionally opening and allocating turns. These tasks are pre-allocated and make the meeting an observably formal activity (see Atkinson 1982).

1.1 Evaluations in Formal Meetings

The most evaluatively dense environment in which evaluations were made in the House consisted of formal meetings, characterized by Boden as follows. These meetings may be "officially convened by written summonses or fixed arrangements, have an organizationally defined composition of members, follow a prepublished or relatively fixed agenda, and be chaired by a designated chair" (Boden 1994: 85). They are also frequently a "matter of record"... in the form of official minutes. For our purposes, a primary feature of formal meetings is the directed and restricted nature of turn-taking, channelled as it is by and through the chairperson... Speaker selection depends on the chairperson, who has both rights and obligations to the assembled members and the purpose of the meeting. The Chair attends to the agenda, taking points of order and information, guiding both discussion and speaker order, and generally maintaining order and temporal pacing. (Boden 1994: 85-86).

These meetings are often explicitly decisional in that they are not oriented to diagnosing some situation or possible action. Rather, they make decisions that
then are supposed to direct action. Most often, formal institutional encounters are targeted at making a decision on some predetermined issue. Participants are aware of the fact that they have gathered for this purpose. Various types of meetings were detailed in Chapter 2, Table 3.

1.1.1 Formal Meetings as an Activity

Formal meetings, indeed, form a peculiar environment for evaluations. As a result of the existence of an agenda for a meeting, and the chair's activity, turn-taking in formal meetings proceeds in quite predictable ways. Although there are spates of talk that resemble conversation, and, as we shall later see, members in formal meetings have ways of departing from the structure imposed by the agenda, talk in formal meetings normally proceeds along a predetermined agenda as a series of items, each consisting of reports and possible elaborating conversations. Table 2 represents an actual agenda. This agenda is from managerial group meeting which took place at the end of May, 1995. Since I will draw heavily on data transcribed from this meeting in Chapters 4 to 6, it pays to look at it briefly.

By inspecting Table 2, it is easy to see that talk in this formal meeting was designed to go through the major House activities. In fact, the House organization is mapped onto it. Item 2 deals with research, the main form of work, while items 3 and 4 deal with information service and computer work. Item 5 deals with "developmental projects," while items 1 and 6 are administrative rather than related to on-going projects. Chiefs are required to report about "projects" within their respective areas of responsibility. Since general categories of the type "The activities and the projects of the Information Service (Anita)" are used, hearers know they are going to get a general overview of all events that are administratively speaking important in the House. Thus, this meeting was designed to survey the House's on-going work in a comprehensive manner.

Table 2. An Agenda for a Formal Meeting
# 4/1995
THE MANAGERIAL GROUP 22.5.1995
AGENDA
1. The use of apportionment and budget follow-up (Petri)
2. Research groups (Maria, Mikko, Karita)
   - progress in projects and results objectives
   - proposals related to the execution of projects
3. The activities and the projects of the Information Service (Anita)
- SUPERMAN: among other things the results of the marketing campaign
- developmental needs of publications
- the preparation phase of year books etc. (Research & Practice, the trade research group)
- information service plans and matters related to the library and its reading room
- other developmental targets (INTERNET)

4. The activities and projects of Information management (Petri)
   - developmental projects of administrative services
   - information management's developmental needs and plans dealing with purchases

5. Other projects and on-going projects (Karita)
   - the developmental plans of the organization
   - Nordic cooperation
   - the propositions of the focus group project group
   - the results of video analysis; preliminary plans dealing with the methods experiment
   - pay negotiation work group

6. Matters for the Board
   - sectoral research institute study; possible opinion statement or statements
   - the HRI's developmental needs and prerequisites for international cooperation
   - other

7. Service engagements and customer protection
   - activity proposals from the HRI's point of view

8. Other

1) Refers to the "Housing Research Institute."

However, there are more to meetings than agendas. First, meetings take place in some specific context. In Boden's words, meetings are "both occasioned by, and constitutive of, the self-same setting in which [they are] accomplished" (Boden 1994: 82). The way in which the 5/22/95 managerial group meeting is occasioned by, and elaborative of, the situation in which it took place can be seen in several features of agenda. For example, it was written just before the Board's Spring meeting (arranged 5/29/95, 16:00-17:30), as item 6 witnesses, which was one reason for arranging this meeting in the previous week. In this meeting, the managerial group started preparing for that meeting, and thus this meeting also elaborated the future course of action. Also, the managerial group members were expected to have read memos specifically prepared to be discussed in the meeting [Memorandum 5/23/95; Memorandum 5/24/95, see Chapter 8 as well as A 5/22/95:1 A: 2-3 and 22-23]. Of course, these memos had to be written and inspected prior to the meeting. Similarly, the secretary and the Chair had to go through the agenda, and schedules had to be fitted to the chiefs' schedules. Secondly, pre-meeting and post-meeting discussions often take place before and after meetings. In these discussions, people may, for instance, clarify schedules, make sure that they know what key individuals talked about in the meeting, and try to sketch the dynamics of the just-closed meeting (see Schwartzman 1988: 136-138). Thirdly, meetings have specific
openings and closings (for a detailed treatment of these, consult Boden 1994: 90-99, 102-106). Fourthly, and this is already implied in the concept of "conversational parts in formal meetings" in Figure 1, there are episodes in formal meetings during which interaction departs drastically from the agenda. However, the agenda given in Table 2 did not pay any attention to these "routine" activities.

1.1.2 Occasioning Evaluations in Formal Meetings

Of the all managerial meetings in my data, only two were specifically constituted to call forth evaluations [A 5/22/95 3(3); A 5/30/95 3(3)]. These two managerial meetings took place at the end of Spring. In fact, most evaluations in my data took place in these two meetings. Most managerial meetings were not evaluative in tone. It was only when agenda items were specifically built to review activities that evaluations took place. In most meetings, managers did other things. Topics to be handled varied from acquisitions and purchases to preparation of budgets to the Board meetings. Evaluations, then, were specifically occasioned when they took place in formal meetings. Usually, this was done using "agenda-setting questions," although by no means did questions have to be used in this task.

In these two meetings, held in late May, the situation was different. There, some activities were specifically designed to prompt evaluations. Example 6 gives the transition to reports on research as it took place at the meeting. Prior to this turn, there had been a fifteen-minute off-the-record pre-meeting strategic discussion that dealt with assumed cutbacks in the House budget for the fiscal year 1996 [A 05/30/95:1 1(2) A:1, 1-734]. The chair moves the meeting from a prior topic to research groups in lines 2-19. First, she marks the transition in lines 2-3, and sets up a new focus of attention in line 4 by taking up "our own work." Then she proposes a more specific new topic ("research groups," line 5). After a pause, she selects Maria and Mikko as targets of her talk, and after another pause, specifies a question for these two. Here are the data:

Example 6. [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1-]

1 :

2 K n- me on TODETTU< MENNÄÄNKÖ ME NYT SITTE NÄIHIN
n- we've NOTED< SHOULD WE GET NOW TO THESE
VAR- VÄHÄN Ö::: (1.5) SISÄISIIN asioihin ja (0.3) (PRO-) A LITTLE EH::: (1.5) INTERNAL affairs and (0.3)

k-KHR::: (0.7) omaan työön,. Nämäkin on tärkeitä k-KHR::: (0.7) Our own work,. These are important

asioita (1.2) Aloitetaanko tutkimuskokonaisuuksista Things too (1.2) Shall [we b<br>egin with] research-groups

(2.2)

K .hhh Maria Mikko,

(1.7)

9 K Ihän lyhyesti miltä tässä:经济体: jos arvioidaan Just briefly how does it look: if we assess

tämän vuoden toimintasuunnitelmaa ja this year's action plan and

tutkimuskokonaisuuksien::: (0.4) asetettuja research+groups' Imposed

the requirements set for the

vaatimuksia h .hhhhhh requirements

research groups h .hhhhhh

(0.3)

14 K → Miten tutkimuspääällikköitten how research+chiefs'

How, according to research chiefs'

(3.2)

16 K → näkemyksen mukaan view/vision According view, How

(0.3)

18 Mi HHH-HHHhh

19 K → vuos on tään saakka kulunut? year is this up+to gone

has the year gone so far?

(1.1)

21 Ma *Alotanks mä: sitten* *Shall I: begin then*

(1.1)

22 K m:m? ühm?

(3.0)

The chair's question calls for a review of research from the two research chiefs present in this meeting as a response here in the sense that any other action by any (other) member would be noticeable and accountable after her turn (Heritage 1983). However, this question does more specific work as well. Its elements here project not just a chiefs' review, but it also proposes a certain
frame to be used in response to it. The Director prefaces her question in several ways, first by marking two persons as the question's targets in line 7, and then by prefacing her question with "this year's plans" and "requirements for research groups" in lines 10 and 11. Her turn, which is done against the background formed by this prior work, then calls forth as a response the research chiefs' comparisons of on-going work with plans. Thus, an organization consisting of a review-occasioning turn, here formulated as a question, and some kind of action designed to answer her turn, was being set up. However, Karita's question is followed not by a single answer, but two strings of reports about research. Both research chiefs, in reporting about their groups' activities, proceeded from one item to another after Karita's turn.

1.1.3 "The Report Format" as the Primary Environment for Evaluations

How chiefs respond to an agenda-setting question depends, of course, partly on how this item was formulated in the first place. However, other aspects are involved in this structuring as well. As we shall see later, the chiefs' action was also sensitive to the target to be reported (Chapter 4), to possible memorandums and various accounting sheets distributed before the meeting (Chapter 5), and to the way in which recipients acted during and after these reports (Chapter 6).

Still, through her formulation, the Chair sets up an agenda that is expected to be followed by the next speakers. Throughout these formal meetings, chiefs responded to the Chair's agenda-setting turn in a rather specific manner, namely through a series of "reports," a unit to be described in this section. Through these reports, they reviewed on-going work and (often) evaluated it, and in so doing, did part of the role set up for them in their job descriptions -- that of overlooking and possibly guiding House activities [Old Working Order 11/30/94, Item 4.1; New Working Order 11/23/94, Item I.1, p. 1]. The concept of "report" has been explicated by Boden (1994: 99, 140-151), who builds on Maynard's original formulation (1984). The agenda of a formal meetings is construed out of these smaller blocks as they are done in interaction (see also Boden 1994: 142). Each meeting is both unique and has a structure that resembles other meetings.

The following fairly simple report consists of a short description of one project in lines 3-6. Here Maria reports about one project, called "the
consumption (.) of these food stuffs." This project, in fact, consists of three studies by two researchers. According to Maria, "Pia's got one coming soon, (1.2) Anita will soon get a (1.1) manuscript?,," which, as I will argue in Chapter 5, performs an evaluation, no matter how neutral this description may appear intuitively. When Anita confirms that she has got a manuscript from Pia, Maria registers Anita's confirmation of a forthcoming manuscript in line 8, holds a pause in line 9, thus giving others a chance to expand on previous talk or ask questions. No one uses the opportunity, and she moves to the next item in her report in line 11. Before doing this, she ties the beginning of her post-pause turn to prior talk ("That's the first part," line 11). Since this reporting format is repeated from one report to another, I will reserve a specific term, "the report format," for it. I will explicate this term after we are familiar with the example.

Example 7. [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1, 182-197]

1 Ma Sitten elintarvikkeitten (.) of these food stuffs [there are] Pia's and Laura's projects and

2 kulutuksest ollut Pia ja Lauran hankkeet ja (.)

3 Pialta ollut tulossa nyt, (1.2) nyt tulee Anitan (.) Pia's got one coming soon, "(1.2) Anita will

4 puolelle?, (1.1) käsikirjoitus (joka lähtee) soon get a (1.1) manuscript?, (which is going to)

5 A We'll get it to you

6 Ma pai(noon)

7 A se tain on Tuesd*ay*

8 Ma yea

9 (1.4)

10 ? *khr* ((clears throat))

11 Ma Se ensimmäinen osa ja sitten hän on That's the first part and then she is

12 siirtymässä siis kansainvälisty(min-) (1.0) transferring to that international(min-)

13 kansainvälistykastelua (jo/ja) (0.4) täsä international(study) (already/and) (0.4) here

14 vielä (0.3) ennen kesää ja h (0.2) (ja) jatkaa still (0.3) before Summer and (0.2) (and) she continues

15 syksyllä siitä,
To put the matter more schematically, reports typically start with an identification of the project to be targeted (in Example 7, lines 1-2). It may, but need not, be followed by "mid-positioned items," consisting of clarifications of projects, stories, logical constructs (see Gill and Maynard 1995; also Chapter 6), more accurate identifications, word searches, and so forth. A more accurate name for "mid-positioned items" would be "post-identificatory pre-evaluation components" but, for simplicity, I will use "mid-positioned items." An evaluation usually follows these mid-positioned items. Evaluations are sometimes followed by additional items, usually by the speaker. These additional matters may reorient and even reframe the evaluation occasionally, and thus put the recipient into a position that differs from the one in which she finds herself immediately after the evaluative item. In schematic form, the report format proceeds as follows. Parentheses denote optional items. In its general outline, the report format is in some ways similar to reports in general. Note4

Figure 2. The Report Format

Identification
↓
(Mid-positioned items; Possible conversation)
↓
Evaluation
↓
(Post-positioned items)
↓
(Possible conversation)

As we shall see in Chapter 6, evaluations do not, however, always follow mid-positioned items. In particular, they may even be absent if there are long mid-positioned items that guide the hearer to start conversation about some issue that took place in these mid-positioned items. If such discussion takes place, then the speaker may even bypass making an evaluation within the report format. Despite these complications, members orient to an on-going report format in various ways. The speaker's major way to orient to the report form is to use it repeatedly. Reports thus have an internal format that not just hands the speakers a slot of time that is long enough for them to do their job -- here a review and an evaluation -- but that also signals that a "longer turn is in
progress and marks the stages" of that turn (Boden 1994: 141; see also Manzo 1996: 116). The recipients display their orientation to that longer on-going unit in several ways, most notably by allowing the speaker to go on until he or she has ended the report. For example, long pauses routinely happen in these longer units, but do not elicit speaker shift, which they would if they occurred in conversation (Jefferson 1989; Boden 1994: 143). Thus, in Example 7 Maria can hold two long pauses (in lines 3 and 4) without being interrupted, and that in line 9, where she moves to the next report, she can hold a pause of 1.4 seconds without some recipient taking action.\textsuperscript{Note5}

However, if the recipients find something that they can formulate as requiring a reply or some other response (for this distinction, see Goffman 1981: 35), they do occasionally take action during the report. Example 7 offers an example of such recipient-participation. In it, Anita adds an informational item about the printing schedule (line 5-7) even though Maria had not asked for it. I do not have the exchange on video, so it is impossible to say whether Anita's comment was prompted by Maria's gaze or some gesture. However, Anita's comment is placed in a spot in which Maria had held a long pause right after mentioning Anita's name (in line 3). Maria's talk is also clearly related to Anita's role as information chief. By the pause of line 4, then, Maria had done lots of work that makes it possible for Anita to add a piece of information to Maria's report. She, however, keeps her interruption to a minimum, and targets her words specifically to Maria, thus restricting the exchange to Maria and herself.

1.1.4 Evaluations in the Reporting Context: Collective and Collecting Turns

To close this section, we need to note that some evaluations take place not in the report format, but in their immediate vicinity. These evaluations will be called "evaluations in the reporting context." Two examples of such evaluative items are given in Chapter 5: Example 10, lines 2 to 7, and also Example 11, lines 1 to 12. It was noted above that in reviewing work in the House, the House's chiefs used the Annual Plan as a memory aid for reporting about on-going work. For example, the Annual Plan grouped studies into projects in two ways. First, studies were grouped according to which "research group" (see Chapter 2) they belonged to. Secondly, they were collected into groups according to their status in that group's plans. As we
saw in Example 4, a study could be classified either as "will be finished," or as "beginning or continuing," depending on its current status. Research chiefs could use this classification as the grounds of their reviews [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1, 21-38; A 05/30/95:1 1(2) B:2, 220-228]. They used these organizational categories and classifications in constituting their activity in meetings.

This practice provided for several kinds of slots for reviews. Most reviews, of course, were targeted at single projects, as Chapters 5 and 6 will show. However, this practice provided another kind of target for reviews as well. In particular, when the research chiefs studied here moved from one research group or class of research to the next, they could open talk about the following research group using what I will call a "collective evaluation" -- that is, an evaluation that represents the chief's evaluation not of any single project, but of all projects in this group. Single projects were presented as elaborations on this collective evaluation rather than as self-standing items. Similarly, the Director could, and did, evaluate all research after hearing the research chiefs' strings of reports, in which case I will talk about "collecting evaluations." Collective and collecting evaluations are analyzed in more detail in Chapter 5.

2. Evaluations in Non-Formal Activities

Evaluations were also made in non-formal activities, consisting here of informal meetings (save some of their more formal turns such as the opening turns), conversational parts of formal meetings, and various encounters that may be related to work, but need not be. What unites these activities is that the turn-taking system is not as restricted as in formal meetings, for several reasons. For example, in these activities, there are no written summonses, agendas, no predetermined "decisional" issue; they are not decision-oriented, at least on the surface.

2.1 Evaluations in Informal Meetings

Sometimes, interaction is not constituted locally as in ordinary conversation, nor is it structured by some underlying form such as the report
format. What Boden calls "informal meetings" (Boden 1994: 83, 86-87) present a case of interaction that has many features in common with ordinary conversation, but which also exhibit enough differences from it that we need to pay special attention to these differences if we want to understand action in these settings. In particular, although informal meetings resemble ordinary conversation in that interaction in informal meetings is not orchestrated with predefined schedules, agendas, or strict chairing practices, there is always a reason for any meeting, which is almost never the case in ordinary conversation. This simple feature is reflected in various ways in interaction in these meetings. In particular, it is reflected in opening statements, topical focus, chairing, turn design, and seating patterns. Still, people act in informal meetings in ways that differ in important respects from formal meetings. These "deviations" are characterized by Boden in the following way:

Informal meetings, in definitional terms, embody the essence of "big" meetings and are understood to do so, yet they are also streamlined and conversational in both conception and organization. They are, for example, typically convened verbally, by telephone, in passing, and face-to-face. They have no fixed membership, though participation by particular organizational members is expectable and accountable... Informal meetings rarely have a designated Chair, although the highest ranking member of the assembled hierarchy usually opens and closes the meeting, as well as providing initial position statements, occasional summaries and topic refocusing... Informal meetings are also generally unrecorded, in the sense of minutes or official report; indeed, they may even be explicitly off-record... Finally, informal meetings rarely have a fixed or written agenda, although, most assuredly, there is a "reason" for the meeting and members orient to this in various observable ways. (Boden 1994: 87).

Informal meetings, then, differ from formal meetings in several respects. In particular, although interaction at any given point in a meeting is neither constrained nor assisted by such schema as "the report format," several activities alien to ordinary conversation can always be found in meetings. The concept of "informal meetings" covers, of course, a staggering variety of meetings, ranging from close-to-formal, (informally) chaired meetings with relatively fixed agendas to free-wheeling idea-building sessions.

That informal meetings are task and decision-oriented is reflected in various features of interaction and in the methods used to mold interaction into this task-focus (see Boden 1994: 86-87). First, there were agendas, although they were markedly less formal and often only verbal. An agenda of one informal meeting is in Table 3. It was a quickly jotted down list of points rather than a formal agenda. The agenda requires some explication, since Laura,
the researcher who arranged the meeting, used it as a discussion memorandum also. Thus, items in lines 1 to 3 and 9 to 14 were added to this piece of paper by Laura during the meeting. Line 8 may also be a late addition. Thus, lines 4-7, and perhaps line 8, form the original agenda of the meeting. Lines 4-7 specify the reason for this meeting, which was that Laura had been visiting a seminar in a distant town, and informed others about her trip. In particular, she wanted to talk about Bergström's talk in the seminar. Bergström has a Ph.D. in civil engineering, and she was a potentially interesting cooperation partner for the House. Thus, the meeting's agenda grew around Laura's report of what Bergström had said in the seminar, and an attempt to find out how the House could cooperate with her and with another institute.

Table 3. An Agenda of an Informal Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mari H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Let’s invite Johanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mikko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What did Bergström talk about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What (another institute) intends to do/does? How is this related to our research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Could there be cooperation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>what cases we could have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-&gt; Sini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-&gt; supply of retail services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Kimmo &amp; Kaisa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-&gt; survey - Minna &amp; Sole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>- SERVICE what it is for a customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>- TO STUDY USERS methodically</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) The original is handwritten by Laura.

This agenda has another interesting feature as well: Laura was the only participant who had it. Since other participants could not use it as a map in trying to figure out where the meeting was at any given moment, it only gave the meeting a loose structure. In addition, other participants could not use it in preparing for the meeting either. This agenda was little more than a mental note quickly jotted down to aid memory during the meeting. However, the items of this agenda were built into the groundwork of the meeting through Laura's activities. The reason for the meeting was reflected in Laura's long opening report [A 1/18/95, 1-965] (see also Boden 1994: 144-145), where she told about her trip. I do not have the first 20 minutes of the meeting on tape, but when I arrived, Laura was still giving her opening report. She continued for another 20 minutes after my arrival. It was this opening report that essentially gave a structure to this meeting. Other activities in informal meetings are usually related and subordinated to this reason.
In informal meetings, the chair (if there is one) is occasionally active, though much of the time she may take a withdrawn position and let the meeting run its course quite freely. However, in some informal meetings there was a chair who opened the meeting, allocated turns in it, and closed the meeting (for example, [A 1/24/95]). Also, informal meetings are characterized by topical drift, talk may go from one topic to another in an unhindered fashion. Still, even in very informal meetings, action differs from ordinary conversation in one important respect, namely in that turns in meetings can be much longer than in ordinary conversation. As Boden notes,

in informal meetings, talk most approximates the conversational turn-taking model, with the general exception that long turns are expectable... These relatively long turns are routine and are typically unmonitored, which is to say that the typical interjection of "continuers" common in casual conversation is notably absent in meetings. (Boden 1994: 99)

There are occasional evaluations in these meetings. For example, they are used to back up arguments. Another main environment in which they appear is related to the management of topic in talk. That is to say, these evaluations appear at points in which some topic is almost closed, or a new topic is about to be opened. Chapter 7 will describe in more detail the ways in which slots in which evaluations could take place arose in various types of informal meetings.

2.2 Evaluations in Activities Arranged on a Turn-by-Turn Basis

Next, evaluations could take place in two types of non-formal environments, if we mean by "non-formal" those environments in which talk proceeds on a turn-by-turn basis so that the conversational turn-taking system is at work. There are two main variants of these environments, the conversational parts of formal meetings, and those encounters that are related to but not properly a part of work. Evaluations in these environments are coincidental, not pre-arranged. For this reason, these activities are not thoroughly evaluative; instead, evaluation is a momentary joint achievement of the members.

2.2.1 Evaluations in Conversational Parts of Formal Meetings, During Pauses of Meetings, and During Pre-Meeting and Post-Meeting Exchanges
The report format's recurrence does not characterize all interaction in formal meetings. Two cases need to be distinguished. First, "developmental projects" (see Table 2, item 5) were usually treated by members in a more conversational way than reports on research, if by "conversational" we mean interaction without a recurrent form upon which intelligibility and order are based. These exchanges often \textit{began} using the same report format that was used for reviewing studies, but they often led to long discussions rather than short summaries of the current state of the project. In fact, several projects were repeatedly brought to meetings "for discussion," which essentially meant that the floor was open for anyone to talk. Secondly, there are conversational sequences within reports, for various reasons (see Table 4). Indeed, even in formal meetings, there was much less order than the above description leads us to expect. Since this feature is important in several ways for understanding evaluations, I will look next at how these conversational environments are initiated in the midst of reports and what happens in them. For clarity, I will call these environments "conversational episodes in formal meetings," by which I mean those exchanges that are not ordered by the report format, but that take place after the report format (or, occasionally, within the report format), and before the next report.

These conversational episodes were initiated from a variety of positions through various activities by speakers and recipients alike. A typology of the ways in which these conversational episodes were initiated is in Table 4. There are two examples of these conversational episodes right after the table. They are selected to give the reader an idea of some of the main types of actions that opened up interaction organized in terms of the report format into conversational episodes in formal meetings.

\textbf{Table 4. A Typology of Ways of Initiating Conversational Episodes in the Report Format}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{During the Report Format}
  \begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{Initiated by the Speaker}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item when the name of a person who is present is mentioned, brief recipient action by the named person usually followed
      \item questions initiated by the speaker could open brief conversational episodes
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textit{Initiated by the Recipient}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item recipients could add information to talk, which usually led to brief conversational episodes in which the speaker acknowledged that piece, and in which she displayed her knowledge of the item
      \item recipients' questions initiated brief conversational episodes
    \end{itemize}
  \end{enumerate}
\item \textbf{After the Report Format}
  \begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{Initiated by the Speaker}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item recipient questions could initiate conversational episodes
      \item information added by the recipient led to brief conversational
    \end{itemize}
  \end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
by treating the project as somehow troublesome, the speaker could call forth conversation oriented to finding solutions to the problem.

2.2 Initiated by the Recipient

• recipients could add pieces of information to talk, which might lead to brief side sequences in which the speaker acknowledged that piece, and in which she displayed her knowledge of the item
• recipients' questions could initiate brief conversational episodes

3. Report Delegated by the Speaker to Some Recipient

• the speaker could "delegate" a report to someone else by displaying ignorance of the project by asking questions, or by saying that he does not know about the project

4. Issues Brought "For Discussion"

• occasionally, some projects were brought to formal meetings "for discussion." These projects were treated in conversational terms rather than reported by some chief (see Table 2, item 5)

Chapter 6 will show that most of these "departures" from the organization of meetings characterized by the report format do not move talk away from an evaluative frame. Occasionally, however, a more drastic departure results, and interaction is ordered turn by turn, using the rules of ordinary conversation's turn-taking system. Then a new topical structure arises, and talk may be targeted at new references. There could be evaluations during these conversationally organized exchanges.

For example, in the following case, analyzed in more detail in Chapter 7, there is a tease by Anita. Anita had been talking about a forthcoming book when Mikko joins her. In lines 1 and 2, Mikko defends a name proposed for the book by Anne, a researcher from one of his research groups, by saying that there are people who might buy the book if it gets this name (lines 1 and 2). Anita thought that the proposed name was worn-out, and goes on to tease Mikko for this suggestion in lines 5 to 9. Mikko treats the tease as an expression of doubt about the quality of the book, and counters Anita by an evaluative "No, it is good" in lines 11 and 12. His turn treats the prior turn as a provocation of some sort. Karita aligns with Mikko in line 14, and Mikko reasserts his position right after receiving this support.

Example 8. [A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 684-704]

1 Mi Joku, (.) joku saattaa ostaa sen pelkästään
Someone, (.) someone may buy it merely because

2 nimen per#usteella.#
of its Na#me.#

3 (0.3)

4 B *(Siit) tulee
*(It's) going

5 A *Pettyäks(h)(h)e
to come ( )*

6 (h)n
e(h)n
d( )isappont(h)ed
Here, the evaluation of the book is produced as a defence against a tease. It was not prompted by the report, nor was it prompted by the target. There would not have been an evaluation without Anita's tease. (Interestingly, the tease here may have been grounded on a standing joke in the House. One manager had once said in the cafeteria that he only buys books that have nice covers, which caused irritation among the information service staff, who were fiscally responsible for the library [A 2/2/95, 1317-1362]).

In addition to these conversational episodes within more formal meetings, interaction followed ordinary conversation's turn-taking system during pauses of meetings, as well as in hurried pre-meeting and post-meeting exchanges.
2.2.2 Encounters Related to but not Properly Part of Work

As Table 3 showed, evaluations were done in still less formal environments. However, these evaluations could be taken to be managerial, not merely private expressions of opinion. For example, managers' conversations in, say, the restaurant were often almost exclusively related to work -- and so were evaluations. Talking evaluatively about a co-worker on a bus is a far cry from a passing evaluative remark concerning a band playing in the restaurant during lunch time [D 10/11/94, 20-22; D 10/12/94, 22-29]. Basically, every activity done together by the management, or a set of managers, could be turned into an evaluative session. These evaluations could, in principle, have consequences for the target (or object) being talked about.

To take one example of these evaluations, we may look at the following exchange. The exchange portrayed in this example took place on a minibus' in April 1995. Maria is a manager, who is talking to another chief, Markus, about Andreas, a younger researcher, whose grant proposal’ she was reading. This example is different from Examples 3 and 4 in several ways, but I will pay attention to just three of these differences. First and foremost, it is not based on plans. Secondly, Example 9 shows that people can be held accountable for features not specified in any documents or task descriptions either. Third, this example is not from a formal meeting; it shows that evaluations are done in non-formal activities as well.

Example 9. [D 4/12/95', 22:00]
1 Maria had Andreas' grant proposal’ with her. "Difficult language," she commented. Andreas was not a favorite in the House, because he's only interested in his own affairs, not of the House as a whole, as Maria explained to Markus. In discussion this opinion shows up all the time. Maria explains Andreas' behavior by saying that he's from an old family from one of Helsinki's better neighborhoods', and that his uncle owns a big chunk of the Finnish appliances industry'. Markus agrees with Maria's assessment, but also defends him by saying that "he's still so young... but still, he's stuck-up."

The comment of "difficult language" allowed Maria to open the discussion in a critical tone. Notice that it is only the Director who, according to law, has the responsibility to think in terms of the whole House. This fact notwithstanding, here a set of common-sense categories are used as an inferential framework in evaluating a young researcher (for common-sense knowledge of social structures, see Garfinkel 1967: 76-103; for an elaboration of this notion, see Sacks 1972a,b). Maria studied Andreas' proposal, and ended
up commenting on Andreas' moral character from the point of view of the House. She made her opinion effectively visible, and thus announced her position towards Andreas to Markus. She also saw that Andreas was not behaving in a responsible way towards his employer, the House, and thus commits an error of character. In this case, the matter was not pursued further, but given the way Maria formulated her opinion about Andreas, she could be expected to find more flaws in him and his behavior in the future (see Sacks 1994, I: 639). Taken from my data, this example shows that managerial evaluations do not have to be done using organizational structures as the only type of reflexive grounds.

3. Evaluations in Texts

The final environment in which evaluations took place in the House was written texts. Managers wrote different texts, and could do evaluations on paper rather than just verbally. This point is of some interests because, as Smith (1974: 257) has noted, "our knowledge of contemporary society is to a large extent mediated to us by documents of various kinds. Very little of our knowledge of people, events, social relations and powers arises directly in our immediate experience." This is true of the House as well, although one reservation needs to be made before Smith's statement can be taken to represent members' knowledge of the House. This reservation is simply that, due to its small size, members in the House entered into social relations with each other with such regularity that much of what they knew about other members was based on experience and hearsay rather than documents. Still, as we have seen, most evaluations in the House took place in settings that were largely closed to all but a few members. In particular, the Board and the managerial meetings were closed to non-managerial members. Therefore, most members' knowledge of evaluations was largely dependent on documentary realities. Consequently, these realities warrant a separate analysis. \footnote{6}

3.1 Evaluations in Formal Texts

3.1.1 Evaluations in the Minutes

Evaluations were made in various types of texts. First and foremost, they were made in the minutes of the Board and managerial meetings.
Numerically, these minutes dominated the scene of textual evaluations. These documents, of course, are designed to preserve the "decisions" made in formal meetings, including evaluations as justifications of decisions. These documents, indeed, are designed to describe or to preserve evaluations made in talk. True, the minutes transform talk in various ways, as Chapter 8 will show. For example, persons are barely mentioned in these documents. Rather, work is mainly described using the categories defined in such constituting documents as Plans and Annual Reports -- that is, the categories like "projects" and "research groups." Example 10 contains an excerpt of the minutes of a meeting.

Example 10. [managerial group minutes, 5/22/95, p. 4, item 6]
1 The projects of data administration, and the plans for
2 purchases
3 DONALDDUCK's new version is ready for distribution. SUPERMAN's
4 WWW services will be considered in the fall. The customer base
5 of the Focus Group Project has been done...

There are several items in this excerpt that make it clear to a reader how the projects listed in this example are doing. In line 2, for example, the expression "is ready for distribution" implies that DONALDDUCK is finished; uncompleted projects are not put out to markets. Similarly, in lines 3 and 4, the reader learns that one facet of the Focus Group Project is finished and, by implication, that there has been progress in the whole project. It is worth observing that this piece of data in various ways represents the House at its most formal -- it is an official document from the managerial group, which is the House's most important decision-making body next to the Director. Obviously, this excerpt of the minutes has some relation to the talk in the meeting it is supposed to describe. How this relation is achieved is analyzed in more detail in Chapter 8.

3.1.2 Evaluations in Memorandums

During my field period, House management wrote four memorandums. One dealt with the European dimension in research [Memorandum 5/24/95], and another with a memorandum given out by the Government's Scientific Council [Memorandum 5/23/95]. The third memorandum -- which came out after my field period -- dealt with an attempt to reorganize the country's whole housing administration [Memorandum 4/12/96]. A continuation memorandum for the "European paper" of 5/24/95 came out later [Memorandum 1/31/96b]. All these memorandums were
distributed to the Board which was formally entitled to have the last word in matters dealing with the destinies of the whole House. Each paper was requested by the Board, by the ministry, or by the government. Since there were not many requests of this type, and the Board had only four meetings each year (on average), there were only a few memorandums as well. Memorandums were barely used internally.

Thus, memorandums always dealt with specific, more or less narrowly focused, and always important themes (importance being defined in terms of their possible implications either for the House, or for policy-makers more generally). Furthermore, the point of view to be used in drafting these memorandums was often set beforehand in the original assignment. For example, if the assignment was to review "The Housing Research Institute's possibilities to engage in European cooperation in 1995," little room was left to the writers of this memorandum to improvise. The importance of these memorandums to the House varied, but was usually high in that their readers were people with access to serious sanctions of various kinds.

This background helps to make sense of some of their features. First, these memorandums contained relatively few evaluations directed at the House, its projects, or its staff. Still, some evaluations were made in them, as we can see in Example 11 which contains several more or less indirect evaluations. All these evaluative components are aimed at showing the readers that the House is well-equipped to deal with the new European challenges, whatever they may be. Thus, although evaluations are not an integral part of these memorandums, there are some evaluations in them.

Example 11. [Sketch for a Memorandum 1/31/96b, p. 5]
1 Despite small research resources and the small size of the institute, 2 it is still possible for the Housing Research Institute to succeed in 3 the face of these challenges. The research institute has a flexible 4 organization, and it has been able to create in a short period of 5 time working relations with other research institutes and with 6 academic research on a multidisciplinary basis ...

Also, it needs to be noted that the role of management, whose responsibility it was to write them (regardless of who actually wrote them), was somewhat complicated in these memorandums. Memorandums were read by people with powers to evaluate -- and sanction -- House management, the Director included. This feature may possibly be visible in that the managers made evaluations in these reports with an eye not just on their own understanding of these reports, but
also with an eye on how they, as managers, would be treated by these readers.

3.2 Evaluations in Non-Formal Texts: House News and E-mail

Evaluations were seldom made in the in-house news bulletin and in e-mail. Stories in House News and e-mail were topically open, their targets varied, the criteria used in making evaluations varied, and the devices for making evaluations varied, as Chapter 8 will document.

House News was compiled of various kinds of texts, ranging from the Director's decisions to sometimes gossipy reports of seminars and trips to foreign countries. The length of these stories varied. Most stories were rather brief (perhaps one page or less), although occasionally they could be much longer (up to four or five pages). Obviously, House News was a general purpose news leaflet that was used for various tasks, some of which routinely provided slots for evaluations as well. In particular, some "decisions" (or "decrees") were often justified, not just announced in House News, and these justifications often consisted of evaluations or, at minimum, contained evaluative components. Other types of House News that routinely provided "slots" for evaluations were book reviews and reports from seminars. These, however, only occasionally dealt with House personnel, and when they did deal with House staff, they did so in passim.

There were few evaluations in e-mail as far as I can tell. I had access to the addresses "everyone" and to the most active research group's messages. On the basis of these data, e-mail was used for various purposes by various people, much like House News. The computer staff's communications usually dealt with computers and networking problems, and the publications staff's communications with House News, press conferences, or with books in print. Researchers wrote about various topics, varying from aerobics schedules to book reviews and invitations to small group meetings. Occasionally, e-mail was used for evaluations too. In Example 12, the Director writes about House News from an administrative point of view. At the same time, she congratulates the publications staff and House News more generally. The evaluative characterization is in line 6.

Example 12. [E-mail 11/10/94 17:36]
1 From: KARITA JOKELA
2 To: EVERYONE
New fascinatingly interesting HOUSE NEWS appears on everybody's desk at regular intervals. THANKS AGAIN TO THE EDITORIAL STAFF. I'd also like to remind us all: let us all write [letters] to the editor regardless of our work - or official duties

1. official news (committees, memberships, greetings from meetings and congresses, which also go for travel reports in the House etc.)
and
2. more informal musings as;;;

In general, the argument that *House News* was used for various tasks and that its messages exhibit relatively little continuity over various activities applies to e-mail as well.

**Concluding Remarks**

In this Chapter, I have provided the framework and some initial conceptual distinctions with which we may study evaluation as a situated activity. We have seen that any attempt to understand evaluations necessitates a data-driven analysis of the very activity of evaluating as "an on-going accomplishment of the concerted activities of daily life, with the ordinary, artful ways of that accomplishment being by members known, used, and taken for granted" (Garfinkel 1967: vii, italics removed). If these details of the production of evaluations are glossed over conceptually, the specificity of evaluating as an activity in its own right gets lost from view. It is this concern with evaluation as the "contingent on-going accomplishments of organized artful practices of everyday life" (Garfinkel 1967: 11) that links the present study to ethnomethodology's program. In this situated work, managers make appearances recognizable and intelligible as appearances of familiar events. This work is "seen but unnoticed" and taken-for-granted in existing social scientific writing on evaluation at the workplace (Garfinkel 1967: 32).
Notes for Chapter 2.

1. Notice that this formulation is not trivial. Sacks (1994, I: 293-4) notes that an absence of some actin should in general never be used to infer the cause of that absence unless there are solid grounds to say that this particular absence is notable in some way. In conversation analysis, "first pair parts" of "adjacency pairs" are though to call forth a specific "second pair part," and the lacking appropriate "second pair part" is a notable thing. If a question is not followed by the answer, interactants look for an account for the lacking part. Similarly so with some bureaucratic devices. When a plan says that X, but X does not take place as laid down in the plan, then there must be an account for the absence of X. Plans are among those "methodic ways that persons arrive at... noticings" of things that did not take place, to paraphrase Sacks (1994, I: 294).

2. By "organizationally valid" decisions, it is meant that these decisions are not necessarily formally valid, but factually consequential [cf. Boden 1994: Ch. 6]. For example, managerial talk in some pre-meeting exchange may prove to be consequential afterwards, but not by definition.

3. For a conversation analytically inclined reader, my phrasing may appear loose here. Indeed, I am deliberately avoiding more exact terminology here. There is such terminology available in conversation analysis, where some actions are said to "project" next actions. Questions, for example, are said to be "first pair parts" of a pair in which the second part is made "conditionally relevant" by the first pair part. After a question, the "second pair part," of course, is usually an answer. A concept used by conversation analysts to describe these pairs is "adjacency pair," which consists of first pair parts that call forth its second. - For relevant articles and discussion, see Schegloff (1968), Schegloff and Sacks (1973), and Heritage (1989: 245-253).

4. The term "position statement" in Boden's study is adapted from Maynard, who talked about "position-reports" (1984: 81-84) that occur in what he called "the bargaining sequence." This sequence consists of a single adjacency pair in which A makes either a firm proposal or a tentative position report to B. B accepts of rejects this "first pair part." This sequence may be elaborated in two ways. When it is elaborated "externally," links between successive bargaining sequences are created. When it is elaborated "internally," *???

5. In Example 3, these pauses are also in the midst of an uncompleted syntactic unit. It is therefore possible to argue that they would not prompt recipient action in ordinary conversation either.

Of course, any sweeping generalization about why recipients withhold from action during an on-going report is risky. Descriptively speaking, it is still worth observing that they do abstain from action during the report format (some exceptions are dealt with in Chapter 6). Whether recipient action is "noticeably absent" (see Schegloff 1968; see also Sacks 1994, I: 294), is also another matter. By maintaining a "withheld" stance, recipients do let the speaker go on with an on-going report format.

6. Of course, evaluations took place in some miscellaneous texts as well. In particular, there were few letters of recommendation, although I could not get any of them for this research for reasons related to confidentiality (but see Bosk 1979: 153-154, who found these recommendations non-specific). Another research-related context in which texts were used as a surface for doing evaluations was comments to manuscripts. I collected several manuscripts from researchers, but since I had very little access to these spontaneously scheduled conversations, and since the dynamics of these evaluations is so different from any other talk-based or
textual evaluation in the House, I will not analyze comments in manuscripts in this study.
Chapter 4: The Targets and Criteria of Evaluations

Any understanding of evaluations presupposes knowledge of their targets and the evaluative criteria used by people to evaluate these targets. Studying the targets of evaluations, then, is the first empirical task of this study. This chapter first presents an analysis of the targets of evaluations, and then an analysis of the criteria used in evaluating. Although I use conversational materials in a few places throughout the chapter, its basic orientation is more ethnographic. In terms of data, I occasionally rely on documents I gathered during the fieldwork. Another and more important feature that makes this chapter more ethnographic is related to its inference. Although I use detailed transcripts of talk in some places, I analyzing these transcripts using the House's common-sense categories and my understanding of them rather than analyze them in a strict conversation analytic manner. Thus, in analyzing data, I have tried to use what Geertz (1983: 56-58), following the psychoanalyst Heinz Kohut, calls "experience-near" concepts rather than the social scientist's typically "experience-far" concepts.

The analysis in this chapter should be readily understandable to House members on their own terms. Still, my categories depart somewhat from House categories. There are two reasons for this. First, there are reasons of research economy. Members in the House could refer to any target in multiple ways...
(at least in principle). Furthermore, they had their own sub-classifications for various types of targets. For example, they distinguished several types of "projects" in contexts such as the minutes and talk. I have used glossed over some of these sub-distinctions, and used deliberately more general categories in some cases. Second, the contextual nature of the House classifications made it necessary for me to gloss over some of the distinctions used by members. For example, when members talked about "developmental projects," they could talk about other projects that were related to these larger projects. In these cases, it is difficult to say which target is the most prevalent. However, we will see here and later in this study that House descriptive practices were not totally situational, which provides a warrant for a more general classification. Still, it is important to remember that members could use various units in reviewing activities. This chapter aims to provide readers with a vivid image of the targets and criteria of evaluations in the House, and an opportunity to check my classifications against their own analyses of these data.

The Targets of Evaluations

Using the House's own classifications, the targets of evaluations by managers can be divided into several classes, some of which are more complex than their names suggest. Table 1 represents an initial analysis of the targets of evaluations in the House. This classification is based on units used in the House. A notable feature of the targets of evaluations is that they can be grouped according to where they take place. When
evaluations are done in the report format or in the minutes, the targets tend to be either research projects, other types of projects, or the uses of money. When evaluations were done in other activities, either within formal meetings or outside of them, a more varied set of targets appear in the evaluations.

Table 1. The Targets of Evaluations and Their Main Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>EXAMPLE 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Evaluations in Formal Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 In The Report Format and the Minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Individual projects or accounts in budgets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.1 Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.1.1 Research</td>
<td>Example 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.1.2 Developmental Projects</td>
<td>Example 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.2 The Uses of Money</td>
<td>Example 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.3 Plans</td>
<td>Example 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Collections of Projects as Targets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.1 In Research Chiefs' &quot;Collective&quot; Turns 2) in Formal Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research groups</td>
<td>Example 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.2 In the Director's &quot;Collecting Turns&quot; 3) Targeted at All Research at Once</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.2.1 In Formal Meetings</td>
<td>Example 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All research in the House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.2.2 In Non-Formal Activities</td>
<td>Example 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All research in the House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.3 In Memorandums</td>
<td>Example 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The House as a Whole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 In Discussional Items in Managerial Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 Managerial Decisions and Their Consequences Evaluated (no example)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In Conversational Parts of Formal Meetings, Non-Formal Activities, E-mail and House News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 People</td>
<td>Example 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Texts and their Individual Ideas</td>
<td>Examples 10 and 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Unless specifically mentioned otherwise, examples listed in this Table are analyzed later in this chapter.
2) Formal meeting turns in which research chiefs target several projects belonging to some research group (see Chapter 3).
3) Formal meeting turns in which the Director targets all research at once. Explained in Chapter 3.

I will go study these evaluations according to the activity context in which they appear rather than on a target by target basis. Next I will go through the evaluations depicted in Table 1 activity by activity. I will start with the more common
categories and proceed to the less prevalent ones. Notice that in
terms of linguistic structure, there is little variation in the
ways in which evaluations were done in various environments.
Within relatively few linguistic forms, there exists a large
amount of variation in targets and criteria. Usually, the
managers just said that "some project is x," "x" being the
evaluative utterance.

1. Evaluations in Formal Activities

1.1 Targets in the Report Format and in the Minutes

In terms of evaluations, the richest environment in the
House consisted of formal meetings, most notably managerial group
meetings, and the minutes of these meetings. In these meetings,
the managerial group periodically went through the House's work,
and in reviewing it, they passed evaluative judgments about it.
Of course, in principle any target could have been taken up in
these meetings. However, this was not the case. Several features
served to reduce possible variation in targets. First, the
Director's turn analyzed in Chapter 3, Example 6, specifically
made plans relevant as the ground upon which the managers were
supposed to do their evaluations. Secondly, the managers' main
method of making evaluations reduced the variation of targets in
talk. The targets routinely reviewed in managerial meetings were
research (by research chiefs), other projects (by other
managers), and the budget's categories by everyone. In addition
to these targets, collections of projects were often targeted as
well. For example, "research groups" could be evaluated in the
research chiefs' collective turns. Finally, the Director, who acted as chair, got a collecting turn in which she evaluated research as a whole (these terms were introduced in Chapter 3).

1.1.1 Individual Projects or Accounts in Budgets

In some cases, managers evaluated individual projects, or attended to some individual, identifiable account in the House budget.

1.1.1.1 Projects as the Main Target in the House

The most important targets reviewed in the House were projects. The most important subtype of projects was research, reviewed in terms of individual studies, and developmental projects. I will begin with the more important kind of work, research, and continue to developmental projects.

1.1.1.1.1 Research (Mainly by Research Chiefs)

The major evaluative target in the House was research, reviewed and evaluated in terms of individual studies. There were several reasons for this focus of attention. Most projects dealt with in House plans were various kinds of studies. Researchers were routinely working on a study or two (one was working on four studies), and since more than half of workers were researchers, this meant that there was a large number of studies going on at any time. Since the managerial group reviewed every project once in a while, studies prevailed among the targets of reviews and
evaluations. Also, normative reasons may have played a part as well: as Chapter 2 showed, the law concerning the House defined research as its major type of work. Its formal importance is also evident in the way in which management gave overwhelming attention to reviewing research projects. Thus, the nature of the House's work entered into evaluative practices in this quite rough numeric way: since most formally identifiable work is done by researchers, not by other staff, research, by necessity, becomes the major target of evaluation.

Primarily, research was handled underneath the heading "projects" that were taken up by mentioning their names. Example 1 below is a typical case. This example is from the minutes rather than from talk, but the format is essentially the same in both.

Example 1. [managerial group minutes. 5/30/95, p. 1, item 4]

4. RESEARCH GROUPS
   Conditions for Housing in Everyday Life
   Projects, A National Survey of Actors Involved in
   Debt Negotiations and A Study of the Meaning of Voluntary
   Debt Settlement Negotiations, will be finished as
   planned. Home Cleaning Habits will be late, as well as
   Information Signs in Driers and Irons. Katja and Anne are
   preparing their own program for the Group. With [another
   institute], we will apply for EU funding.

10
11   The Meanings of Homes
12   The plan for this project will be specified when pia
13   Mäkelä gets back to Finland in the Fall.

Here, a string of studies is reviewed, beginning with "A National Survey of Actors Involved in Debt Negotiations" and "A Study of the Meaning of Voluntary Debt Settlement Negotiations." These studies are grouped underneath their respective research groups (mentioned in lines 2 and 9). This format is by far the most common in the minutes as well as in talk in formal meetings. There are several evaluations in these reports, as Chapters 5 and
8 will show. Interestingly, here the managerial group seems to be interested in how work progresses rather than in its quality. I will come back to this feature in Chapters 5 and 8.

1.1.1.1.2 Developmental Projects (Mainly by the Information Chief and the Data Administration Chief)

The House had other types of projects as well. These projects had more or less clear identities, and they could be, and were, handled in the same way as studies -- that is, as projects. Among these projects was a project designed to produce a housing research data base and a project designed to put this data base onto the Internet. To distinguish these projects from the category of "research/studies," I will talk about "developmental projects." This term is a gloss in that it consists of various types of projects, ranging from a data base developed by the House (called SUPERMAN in this study), which consumed the efforts of five persons, to smaller projects such as rearranging the library's newspaper and periodical reading room, or buying a copy machine for the library. However, these projects were something that had, as any other project, an opening, a working stage, and an end, and could thus be followed using the same project terminology as research or large, more time-consuming developmental projects. In this, they differ from such activities as updating software, at least in the way in which the House managers treated them.

Here are two examples of developmental projects. The first example deals with one of the publications and the library group's projects. The second example is from the "data
administration unit," which was the home of the project "(improving) office services." Again, we are dealing with "projects," but this time not with research or studies. A separate subclass is then justified for these projects. Apparently, there is no evaluative material in the first of these reports, which provides a comparative background for the other two cases.

Example 2. (detail) [managerial group minutes. 5/30/95, p. 2, item 5]
1 Developmental needs of publications
2 In the Fall, a special afternoon will be arranged for the personnel. Then wishes, costs, schedules, marketing related to publications and their production will be reviewed. Before that, researchers will be asked for examples of good research reports, and cost comparisons will be done.

Example 3. (detail) [managerial group minutes. 5/30/95, p. 2, item 6]
1 Developmental needs of administrative matters
2 A decision concerning [the software of] the accounting systems will be made soon in the Housing Office. Related to it, preparations for setting up an accounting system for usable property will be started. The group will include Ari, Mikko, and Sole. Concerning office services, it was noted that the coding process of bills has improved. The pay policy group has gathered twice. There will be an updating meeting [for the personnel] in the week of Midsummer.

There is an evaluation in Example 3 in line 5 concerning some improved aspects of office services. This evaluation shows that in the managerial group discussion as interpreted by its secretary Anita, one administrative project had improved.

1.1.1.2 The Uses of Money

Various budgetary matters were occasionally targeted in various activities, ranging from the Board to the Annual meetings, and from managerial meetings to informal groups. In the
following example, there is an evaluation in lines 1-2. The "Housing Office" is the House's parent administrative unit:

Example 4. [managerial group minutes. 5/22/95, p. 2, item 1]
1 It was noted that by May 19th, 33% of appropriation has
2 been used. [We have] stayed within the budget very well.
3 The Housing Office will be asked about unbound monies.
4 Research chiefs can think about the acquisition of
5 necessary research data and recruitment.

Behind this rather dry bureaucratic notion lies 20 minutes of talk [Ai 5/22/95 10:09-10:29] in which many things took place. My diary notes, written during the meeting with small handwriting, cover two full pages. This discussion largely consisted of how various budget categories had been realized. Each item, none of which is specifically mentioned in the minutes, could vary from a few seconds to several minutes, and could cover many kinds of activities. (I will come back to these reviews in detail in Chapter 5).

1.1.1.3 Evaluating Plans

Finally, the House managers did not only evaluate on-going work, or work that is being finished, but also plans. Obviously, plans can be reviewed, analyzed, and evaluated for certain properties just like any project. Also, plans can treated as the initial stage of a project that is about to materialize. Interestingly, in my formal meetings data, plans were evaluated in one specific environment only. The House managers evaluated not only on-going projects, but also projects in their very early stages. In this context, it was always mentioned that these projects were only in the "planning stage," which served as an excuse for not evaluating these projects in the same way as other
projects. Importantly, negative evaluations targeted at projects in this planning stage prompted defenses by other participants.

The following example displays in a lucid way how projects were treated in their early stages. In this example, Maria has been evaluating a research group in positive terms, but then goes on to mention that despite general progress in this research group, "nothing's getting finished now," (lines 2 and 3). I have removed the next phase in her report. There she notes an exception to this hearably negative characterization (one Discussion Paper was about to come out), which prompts Karita to provide additional information about the fiscal situation of this research group. After this elaboration, which I have also removed from this example, Karita reminds Maria first that the Group has only recently taken off (lines 4-6), that the prime researcher (Mira) has still been involved in other projects (lines 9-10), and that the project is still in the planning stages (lines 12-14):

Example 5. [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1, 243-266]

1 Ma ja ja (2.2/.ehkä hhhhhhhhh) mun mielest nää
   and and (2.2, perhaps hhhhhhhn) In my opinion these are

2 etenee kaikil- (mut) täältä ei nyt (.) ei oo nyt
   progressing ever- (but) nothing is (.:) isn't

3 valmistumassa sitte, (1.2)
   being finished now, (1.2) ... ((continues))

: ((10 lines removed))

4 K Mut täytyy muistaa se että?,,
   But [you] must remember that?,,

5 (0.7) tuo koko- kokonaisuus on käynnistyny vasta
   (0.7) this gro- group only took off at the

6 *viime kesän* lo#pulla ja: ja: # j-
   end of *last summer* #and a:nd# a-
   itse=asiassa
   In=fact

7 Ma (joo/mm)
   (Yea/mm)
I will not get to how Maria received Karita's turns. Suffice it to say that she went on to evaluate Mira's situation afterwards, by mentioning that Mira is currently too busy with other projects to work efficiently on her research group. Thus, Maria partly undermines a presumption implicit in Karita's reminder -- that the Group will progress well once Mira joins it full time -- while simultaneously retaining the tone set by Karita's notion of the planning stage of the Group. Thus, Karita succeeded in transforming Maria's initially too harsh evaluation in lines 2-3 by pointing out that the project is in a planning stage, which suggests that plans should not be treated as strictly as other projects. This was a general pattern in the House: projects defined to be in a planning stage were not reviewed harshly even if they seemed to have problems.

1.1.2 Collections of Projects as Targets

In a few situations, managers also evaluated collections
of projects rather than individual projects. These collections had various names, ranging from groups of single, identifiable projects to House research as a whole.

1.1.2.1 Research Groups in Research Chiefs' Collective Turns

Studies could be targeted in many ways. Primarily, they were handled underneath the heading "projects." However, sometimes they were lumped together into "research groups" that received evaluations that were partly based on individual projects, but were often done in ways that made their connection to individual projects more spurious. Another way to lump projects together into larger groups was based on the categories in the Annual plan. We have already seen an example of this classification. As Example 4 in Chapter 3 showed, the Annual plan classified projects as those that "will be finished," and as those that are "beginning and continuing."

To begin with the latter type, we can look at Example 6 below. In this example Mikko, a research chief, after having presented three studies, gets on to the next class in his list. At this point, Mikko has finished reviewing two projects he did not know much about, and gets to the next subclass. The phrase "BEginning and continuing" in line 1 is from the House plans (see Chapter 3, Example 4, line 18), and denotes a class of studies that will either begin during the new year, or continue through it. Before this class, he had gone through a class of studies called "will be finished" (see Chapter 3, Example 4, line 14).

Example 6. [A 05/30/95:1 1(2) B:2. 220-]
1 Mi "ALrkvat ja jatkuvat" Nää on tota: ="BEginning and continuing" Well: these are
There is an evaluation in Example 6, lines 8 and 9. Importantly, this instance shows that at a few specific points, research was targeted in terms of collective units rather than in terms of individual studies.

For an example of how research groups were used as a collective category, let us return to Example 1, which for the sake of convenience, i reproduced below:

**Example 1.** [managerial group minutes. 5/30/95, p. 1, item 4]

4. **RESEARCH GROUPS**

Conditions for Housing in Everyday Life

Projects, A National Survey of Units Involved in Debt Negotiations and A Study of the Meaning of Voluntary Debt Settlement Negotiations, will be finished as planned. Home Cleaning Habits will be late, as well as Information Signs in Driers and Irons. Katja and Anne are preparing their own program for the Group. With [another institute], we will apply for EU funding.

The Meanings of Homes

The plan for this project will be specified when pia Mäkelä gets back to Finland in the Fall.
In the minutes, the same procedure of lumping work together into more encompassing categories is also apparent; in Example 1, research groups are identified in lines 1, 2, and 9. In the minutes, research groups are used as collective administrative units in many kinds of evaluative situations. Therefore, the concept "research group" was used as a device for classifying projects into bundles that could be evaluated in collective terms.

1.1.2.2 Research as a Whole in the Director's "Collecting" Turns

House work was made available for evaluative inspection in yet another more generalized way, as well in one rather specific place in formal meetings. This place was the Director's commentary turn after a series of reports. After the Director had listened through two strings of reports by the two research chiefs, she could target research as a whole. Here is an excerpt of such an evaluation, which also serves to end the activity of reviewing work. In a recent study about the round of opening turns in jury deliberations, Manzo (1996: 122) maintained that the Chair, who opens the opening round, also gets the last turn. In this last turn the Chair can both give his or her opening statement, and also summarize the other jurors' views. This is a privileged position in terms of the distribution of knowledge (Manzo 1996: 122). Likewise in meetings, where the Director gets the last turn in which she is able to evaluate research as a whole. This is what takes place in Example 7 below. (Unfortunately, the preceding context of this excerpt is too long...
Earlier research on assessments in talk has maintained that assessments typically appear at topical closing points, where they both show appreciation for the preceding talk and show that the speaker aligns with it (see Goodwin and Goodwin 1987). Here,
Karita provides the closing item for the series of reports on research: she specifically gets back to the item through which she opened the string of evaluative reports (see Chapter 3, Example 6). Her summary turn may thus be doing several things; it provides a judgment that is not tied to individual studies or research groups, it serves to illustrate her position as the Chair of the meeting, and it does work towards closing down the reporting series.

Of course, there were a few other activities in which the Director could do such general evaluations. For example, Example 15 below in this chapter presents a case in which she reviews the reasons for the organizational change which was described briefly in Chapter 2. In this meeting, the heads and coordinators of each research group, the (then) two research chiefs, and the Director were to go through the first year of the change and talk about their plans for the new year. In the opening turn of the meeting, the Director described the reasons for the change in terms of the whole House, praising the quality of work in the former organization before going on to those negative features that prompted and justified the change. Here then, she targeted the whole House. Structurally, this turn is a collecting turn quite similar to Example 7, although it appears in a different environment and does different kinds of work.

1.1.2.3 The Targets of Evaluations in Memorandums

Another environment in which collectives were targeted were the memorandums written by management for the Board. In these memorandums, individual projects were used as examples, not
evaluated per se. Instead, evaluations there were mainly targeted at the House as a whole. Below is an example in which the managerial group (who wrote these memorandums) describes one of the House projects to the Board. Notice that what is evaluated is "the development work done by the Housing Research Institute" rather than some particular project. The subject of the developmental work is the Housing Research Institute rather than some particular group in it.

**Example 8.** [Memorandum for the Board 5/24/95, p. 5]

In the context of the developmental discussion of the EU\(^1\) data registers, [we] have been able to note that the development work done by the Housing Research Institute well compares with top international work in this area. Due to its limited resources, the Housing Research Institute has not been able to participate in the tender round of this developmental work. However, the Research Institute has promised to work in the support group set up to support and evaluate the development work.

1) Refers to the European Union.

It is important to note that these cases are essentially managers' collective self-evaluations. The writer is the managerial group, whose evaluations of the House these memorandums are expected to express. In writing memorandums, the managers maintain a general perspective on the House, and thus make observable the fact that they are responsible for the whole House. One way to maintain this perspective is to use the whole House as a unit. Also, the Board is supposed to look after the House as a whole, not to target individual projects, which presumption is built into the memorandums by this selection of the unit of analysis.

1.2 Evaluations in Discussional Items in Managerial Meetings
Finally, in formal activities, the House managerial team could evaluate the House in terms of still more encompassing categories. Managerial decisions and their consequences could also be evaluated by management. However, these evaluations were usually handled as discusional matters rather than as reviews. Due to the length of these conversations, it is not possible to analyze an example in detail here. There was one such discussion in the meeting of 5/30/95, where Karita wanted to hear the managerial group's opinions on the newly-installed team-based organization (see Chapter 2) [Ai 5/30/95, 10:57-11:28]. In this discussion, the managerial group members gave their opinions on various facets of the larger, on-going change. For example, Mikko opened the discussion by noting that for him, the change had not really changed anything, and that the new organization was going to be ridiculously heavy in terms of administration. For Maria, the project change had been more difficult than she had imagined. For Karita, the main problem was the formal structure of accountability: in the new organization, there could be situations in which it was impossible to pinpoint who is in charge of some project. Finally, they built a slot in which Karita could have expressed her summary evaluation about the process, based on these less encompassing managerial evaluations. After a rather skeptical discussion, she was content to note that change was on its way, and that any further evaluation about its consequences for the House should be done at some later point in time.

2. The Targets of Evaluations in Conversational Parts of Formal Meetings, in Non-formal Activities, in E-mail, and in House News
So far, the targets have been strictly "businesslike," targeted at work, variously understood. When we turn to less formal environments, this picture changes, and other targets are routinely opened for evaluation in addition to those items discussed above. In crude terms, these targets are persons, texts, and the ideas expressed in texts. These targets were evaluated occasionally in the conversational parts of formal meetings. More typically, however, these targets became available for evaluation in non-formal talk, in e-mail, and in *House News*, where research was targeted infrequently, if at all.

2.1 People

People were continuously targeted in House discourse. For example, in reports about research, it was often necessary to single out both the researcher and the project in order to identify them unequivocally. The main target of evaluation in these cases, however, was the project. Persons were mentioned in identifying functions only. For instance, Example 1 shows this pattern clearly. In it, two researchers, Katja and Anne, were mentioned, but the evaluative comment ("are preparing their own program for the group" in line 6) is targeted at their activities, not at them as persons. In talk about other projects, names were not usually necessary; in reviewing the budget, for example, the managers' interest was in the ratio of money used to the point of time in which the account has been taken. Thus, in most House activities, people were secondary matters, not targets of evaluation.
However, people could become targets of evaluations in several places in House discourse. For example, in what I called the "conversational parts of formal meetings," people could be evaluated not on purpose but in arguments designed for other purposes. The next example is a typical instance of such an evaluation. In this example, the research chief Mikko talks about a project in which some researchers attempted to digitalize videos for a computer using software designed for doing TV commercials. After a long discussion of the pros and cons of this project, he noted that one of its problems was that a good cameraperson is needed to get reliable and usable visual data. In this context, he notes that the principal researcher, Ari, seems to believe that he is qualified for this task, although Mikko apparently thinks that this is not the case (arrowed lines).

Example 9. [A 05/22/95:1 2(3) B:2, 262-272]

1 Mi ne voidaan monella #tavalla,# .hh Ja s(h)e(h) .hh they can be taken in many #ways,# .hh A

2 K nd i(h)t(h) .hh [*Joo,* *
   *Yea,*

3 Mi S(H)E on n(h)iinku jotenki sellanen aihe et siis I(H)T is s(H)ort of that-kind of topic that

4 ? ((noise))

5 Mi niin#ku:# $(hhe .hhh)$ (0.2) Em- emmä tietysti sort+of I+not of+course #well::# $(hhe .hhh)$ (0.2) I do- I don't reALLY

6 → yhtÄÄN niinKU ePÄILE #sitä et (0.2) et(.)tei# A:ri at+all sort+of doubt that that th(.)at NAME douBT at aLL #that (0.2) th(.)at# A:ri [doesn't]

7 → usko et hänel on #Lahjoja niinku tän tyyppi- (0.3) Believe that he's #TAliented enough to this sor- (0.3)

8 tÄN typpises harrastelu(s) et niinkun# (0.3) to THIS sort of pastime [but] well# (0.3)

9 (hhhahhh) EHkä se kuitenki hh edellyttää hhhh hhhh (hhhahhh) MAYbe it still hh requires hhhh hhhh
Notice Mikko's irony in this example. He is plainly critical of Ari's recent idea, and signals this in several ways. For example, he criticizes his friend Ari for a somewhat unrealistic self-concept, and labels Ari's work a "pastime" rather than "work."

Still, he softens the comment by separating himself from his comment in several ways. He starts with a laughter token (line 5), thus signalling that what is to follow is not to be taken totally seriously. Then he continues with a mentalistic form ("I don't doubt at all"), marking this opinion his own and thus displaying a somewhat weak claim to have knowledge about Ari's self-concept. He ends with a suggestive modality ("MAYbe it still hh requireshhhhhhhh," line 9), which prompts the Director Karita to step in to continue his sentence.

In some cases, managers relied on personal references more directly. For example, once the Director, who was thinking about recruiting a researcher for a forthcoming project, characterized this researcher variously as someone "who can't make up his mind about what he wants to do when he grows up" [A 1/28/95+, line 2094], as someone "who should find his own big picture" (lines 2116-2117), as someone "who's lacking ideas about what to do" (lines 2126-2128), and as someone "who's lost his ball" (lines 2137-2139; a once popular Finnish expression, denoting someone who does not know what he wants). In some other cases, people became targets of evaluations which were done using rather debasing stereotypes. Thus once, after some trouble with some administrators, all lawyers were defined as "nitpickers...
who lacks common sense" [A 05/30/95:1 1(2) A:1, 21-27]. Abusive language was also used in some other cases in the House; for example, administrators who had just caused trouble for the House in research financing were occasionally targeted with rather angry descriptions [for example, D 12/2/94, 111-119]. All these evaluations took place either in the conversational parts of formal meetings, or in other non-formal activities.

2.2 Texts and Their Ideas

Another type of target consisted of texts and the ideas expressed in these texts. Example 10 below offers a case in which one memorandum is briefly evaluated. This memorandum was written for the managerial group by a temporary researcher, and dealt with marketing the SUPERMAN data base. The evaluation (lines 7 and 8) is global in the sense that Maria, who does the evaluation, does not specify what it is in this memorandum that prompted her praise. Example 11 is a more detailed case. In this example, which is from the Board minutes, Mikko detailed a series of criticisms of a proposal for the House reorganization written by another managerial member, Jari.

Example 10. [A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 9-19]
1 A   Tuota: (.) k-khr
Well: (.) ((couch))
2 (1.9)
3 A   Täs oli ensin merkitty tää ((TERÄSMIES:)) Teräsmiehen here was first marked this [name]
The resul*ts* of the Superman marketing campaign
4 markkinointikampanjan tuloks*et* (.hhh) /Mä sillon marketing+campaign's rësults I then
were marked here first (.hhh) /In the
5 VII- VIImekš tuota mä en tiedä >oo(tte)ks< te käynty

Example 11. [board minutes 3/14/94, p. 2, item 3]

Mikko Kuusela:
- there has been no discussion of strategy in the House,
- research topics have been written down by one person only
- given the small size of the unit, the strategy paper
- stresses organizational things too much
- it is questionable whether it makes sense abandon the
- three-office research structure because the proposed six-
- team structure does not provide a clear outline of
- research activities

In the latter Example, Mikko criticizes the memo for several faults, ranging from the autocratic style in which it had been written to a major error in it. In Mikko's opinion, the House is so small that the memorandum's stress on "organization" is misplaced. Finally, there is a criticism of the clarity of the proposed new organization (see Picture 4 in Chapter 2 for a chart of the new organization). These evaluations are targeted not so much at the memorandum as such, but at individual features and arguments that can be found in it. In this sense Example 11 differs from Example 10, which passed only general judgment on another memorandum; the evaluation in Example 11 is more specific.

3. Discussion
When the above analysis is compared to the description I gave of the House in Chapter 2, a few features readily stand out. In particular, out of all possible targets that the House provides, only some became evaluated. With the main exception of people-targeted evaluations, most evaluations are targeted at work. For example, research is defined as the most important part of House work, which was reflected in evaluations, too. Similarly, many other tasks assigned to the House by Law and Statute (Chapter 2, Examples 1 and 2) were evaluated routinely by managers as well. Thus, there was an observable orientation to work in evaluations. However, the way in which these projects became evaluated was rather narrow in one specific sense. Overwhelmingly, work was treated in terms of projects, or collections of projects, rather than in terms of some other unit. By no means were projects the only things that could have been targeted in evaluations. Indeed, we saw above some other units at work as well. Among these other devices were people, individual texts, and the ideas expressed in these texts. It is also easy to imagine some further instances. For example, evaluations could have been targeted at people's behaviors, personalities, arguments, opinions [for example, A 05/22/95:1 A:2-3, 127-134], dress, sense of humor, and so forth. Still, these other possible targets entered the realm of evaluations in the House only occasionally, if ever. Thus, the focus on work was an achievement that, furthermore, had a procedural basis (For an extended analysis of how research orient to "projects" as a horizon from which their work evolves, see Lynch 1985: 53-80).

This focus on work had two kinds of consequences for
evaluations. First, in House evaluations, projects have properties that are different from, say, individual paragraphs in texts or arguments in manuscripts. Most of these details, which could be formulated as evaluable features, are not attended to in evaluation as a result of the focus on (undivided) projects. Secondly, work that is not organized in projects remained largely invisible. In fact, there were several classes of such work. First, such all-important everyday competencies as reading, writing, installing computers, and researchers' work in libraries remained invisible in managerial evaluations. Secondly, office work was taken for granted by management. In fact, the office staff's work was almost never targeted in the evaluative parts of formal meetings (Example 3 above was one of the few instances of such staff-targeted evaluations). Also, little attention was paid to computer maintenance. In fact, Petri often complained about this somewhat bitterly, and noted that much of his work was not appreciated at all [A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 365-396], perhaps because it could not be readily understood in terms of "projects," the primary unit used by members to make work visible and a topic of talk. The members' habit of thinking in terms of "projects" thus suppressed other possible ways of making "work" visible and work-upon-able, and was thus consequential in terms of how attention and evaluation were allocated in the House.

Projects have other interesting properties as well. Note that projects may be said to have an opening or an initial stage, a middle, and an end. Furthermore, projects can be said to be planned, deferred, shelved, reinitiated, invigorated, and so forth. Also, projects may be said to be proceeding well or to be late. Thus, projects in the House assume something of a thing-
like quality; in fact, they are assumed to have a life on their own. They are assumed to have consistency, continuity, and manipulability. Notice finally that since "projects" are constantly invoked and relied on by members in their on-going activity, evaluation becomes a fairly structured phenomenon -- evaluations are targeted year by year and occasion by occasion at the same targets. An important part of the members' sense of order and stability is based on their own practice of using "projects" as the main unit in making evaluations.

The reason for relying on "projects" as an evaluative unit was largely related to the methods used by management in constructing their reviewing activities. They largely used the Annual plans as their memory aids. The office did not have objectives in these papers and, for various practical reasons, members' mundane competencies were not written down in these documents either. In contrast, non-work activities constantly provided different types of targets for evaluations. For example, floorball games and the performance of various players were evaluated routinely, as a quote from a diary note detailing one typical post-game locker room talk shows. "... After the match, Jari said that the women's game is a lot better than it used to be. In particular, Mari is really good these days. 'We've lost an athlete,' said Jari." [D 9/13/94, 131-133]. These evaluations were largely targeted at the athletic abilities of various members. Occasional teasing and commentary on tough playing style aside, these evaluations were usually appreciative in tone.

Evaluative Criteria in the House
Another important aspect of evaluations is the criteria used in making evaluations. In Chapter 1, we already saw that some kind of yardstick is necessary for an evaluation to take place. In Picture 1 in Chapter 1, Kast and Rosenzweig maintained that in any control system, there must be "a means of comparing actual results to standards and evaluating differences" (Kast and Rosenzweig 1985: 510, Fig. 19.1, item (3)). However, there are several specifications of "criteria" in the literature. In the best discussion available, Dornbusch and Scott specify this concept in the following terms:

Ordinarily, evaluators... are concerned with more aspects of task performance than whether an attempt was made to carry out the task. Specifically, they are interested in assessing the effectiveness or efficiency of a given task performance. In order to make such assessments, criteria must be established. The criteria which can be employed in the evaluation of a performance are almost infinite, but in the rational case they are in large measure determined by the goal toward which the performance is directed...

Three distinguishable types of decisions must be made in establishing criteria for performance evaluation. First, the evaluator must determine which task properties should be taken into account... A second type of decision involved... is closely related to the selection of task properties and performance attributes. If more than one property is selected for a given task evaluation, a decision must be made as to the relative weight to be assigned to each in arriving at an evaluation... The determination of standards and transformation rules is the third and final aspect of the criteria-setting component of the evaluation process. (Dornbusch and Scott 1974: 137-140, italics in original, boldfaced type added).

The point in "determining standards and transformation rules" is that no performance can be deemed as "good" or "wanting" just by looking at how much or what someone has been doing (Dornbusch and Scott 1974: 139). There must be a standard to which performance is compared before some particular performance can be said to be good or wanting. According to Dornbusch and Scott, the concept of
"criteria" needs to be broken down into three components: selecting the properties to be evaluated, weighing them in some way, and setting some standards against which the value of performance can be measured along each dimension. Standards, or criteria, then, are a necessary component of the concept of evaluation, and need to be studied in their own right.

It is obvious that any performance can be evaluated using several criteria. For example, in grading papers, teachers usually think about the paper in terms of its logical properties, the coherence of its argument, the depth of its analysis, its uses of evidence, and so forth. Each of these dimensions may be given a value that may then be compared against some standard. The final grade may consist of the (sometimes weighted) average of these distinct values. Decisions about what attributes are selected for evaluation as well as decisions about standards may, but need not, be based upon the goals set for the task activities. Dornbusch and Scott talk about goal-based criteria as comprising a "rational case" of evaluation. In practice, other attributes and standards may enter the evaluation process. Dornbusch and Scott refer to those attributes that are used in forming evaluations but that are not based on the "rational" background as "non-performance" bases of evaluations.

Note, though, that this account is overbuilt in that it assumes that members who make evaluations make these distinctions explicitly. In practice, this is not always so. Most evaluations in the House, for instance, were confounded in that the criteria used in some evaluations are implicit, perhaps inferable from an evaluation, but are not made unambiguously visible in the evaluative context. The issue becomes, what are these criteria,
and when are they made specifically visible? This account also assumes that those evaluative criteria which are made public form the "real" criteria used by members. This is not necessarily so; evaluators may well base their evaluations on one set of criteria, and voice another set in public.

Below, I will present a brief classification of the main types of criteria used in the House in making evaluations. These criteria can be sorted into three broad classes: organizationally based evaluations, performance-based evaluations, and evaluations based on non-performance measures. Before analyzing these criteria, however, I will make an observation about when evaluative criteria were made explicit.

1. Explicating the Evaluative Criteria

In only a few cases in all my data does the speaker or the writer make his or her evaluative criteria explicitly available by laying down the criteria and naming them as criteria. In general, it appears that these criteria are explicated when there is a need to justify some decision. This is the case in Examples 14 and 15 below. In Example 14, we will see how economic and supervisory responsibilities, research project head's/coordinator's responsibilities, activity in graduate studies, and exceptionally productive work in some unit could be used as criteria for allocating rewards in the House. As Example 15 witnesses, the quality of research could be evoked as a possible criterion for evaluating performance. In most other cases, though, the criteria used in doing evaluations were not explicated in so many words, but had to be inferred by the
recipients (and the analyst). Examples 14 and 15 have one common feature. These evaluations justify official decisions: in Example 14 pay raises, and in Example 15 a reorganization of the House.

2. A Classification of Evaluative Criteria Used in the House

2.1 Organizational Criteria for Evaluations

Chapter 3 showed that plans are the main basis for making people accountable for their actions in the House. Earlier in this chapter, we saw that studies and other projects are the main targets of evaluations. Both features were related to a single interactional feature, the report format, which is the device overwhelmingly used in meetings to make evaluations. In terms of criteria, the report format exhibited a similar consistency. People who relied on this format based their evaluations overwhelmingly on plans and schedules and, while reviewing budgets, on projections counted from the sums expressed in budgets at the time of the meeting.

Example 12 presents a case in which "plans" are used as criteria for judging a project. Here, one project's progress is measured in terms of whether it realizes the objectives set for it in the plans. Plans specify a projected course for the project, and measures the project's success in terms of whether it digresses from that course. Example 13 gives a case of a "schedule" as an evaluative standard. In this example, a research project is reported to be "progressing according to schedule." The evaluative component consists of an announcement about the project's progress as measured against the yardstick specified in
some kind of "schedule." Schedules, in turn, were specified in the annual plans in a general fashion, and (often) in a more specific way in grant proposals.

**Example 12.** (detail) [managerial group minutes 8/22/95, p. 2, item 4].

1. The Focus Group project is progressing according to plans.

**Example 13.** (detail) [managerial group minutes 5/30/95, p. 1, item 4].

1. ... Martti Saari's project Measuring Custom Tariffs is progressing according to schedule.

**Example 4.** [managerial group minutes. 5/22/95, p. 2, item 1]

1. It was noted that by May 19th, 33% of appropriation has been used. [We have] stayed within the budget very well.
2. The Housing Office will be asked about unbound monies.
3. Research chiefs can think about the acquisition of necessary research data and recruitment.

Example 4, reproduced here, shows how budgets were used as a source of evaluative criteria. The budget, just as plans and schedules, offers a projected course for some activities in terms of money. Notice that this example is rather general. My field notes from this budgetary discussion extend to more than two pages, which could be multiplied up to ten times in detailed transcript. Thus, this interpretation does not mean that all work is doing well within the limits of the budget. In fact, my transcripts show that this is not always the case. One budget category has been used up, which was immediately noted and accounted for in the meeting [A 05/22/95:1 1(3) A:6, 1-25]. In addition to comparing money allocated to different budget accounts to how much money had been used, members made a rough count using the point of time in which they were then to estimate how much money should have been used at that point. If more was used, an account could be asked for (Chapter 5 analyzes these inferences in detail).
2.2 Performance-Based Evaluative Criteria: Positively Defined Activities and the Quality of Work

It is fairly easy to imagine that performance-based criteria other than those described above were also used in the House when making evaluations. This is the case with the following two examples. In Example 14, taken from House News, an evaluation is targeted at several people simultaneously. It tells about bonuses and pay raises, and cites a series of criteria as grounds for allocating these rewards to members. These criteria, detailed in the second paragraph of Example 14, are "economic and supervisory responsibilities, research project head's/coordination's responsibilities, activity in graduate studies, and exceptionally productive work in some unit." These criteria, in fact, were not known to workers in the House until this message came out although, of course, they are easily imaginable.

Example 14. [Housenews 10/31/95, p. 1].
1 The uses of Appropriation to be Allocated within
2 Government Agencies
3 Researcher Maria Mäkinen A20 → A21
4 Research assistant Laura Savela A13 → A14
5 Information service secretary Johanna Itälä A9 → A10
6 Research secretary Tanja Kurki A9 → A10
7
8 The Housing Research Institute's managerial team, in
9 handling the so-called Special Increases for Women and
10 Low-Pay Groups, has noted that the research institute
11 has, within the limits of its salary budget, a
12 possibility to grant small rewards as personal bonuses
13 from the monies saved from vacation bonuses. Decisions
14 about Special Increases for Women and Low-Pay Groups are
15 permanent and, according to the proposal done by the
16 unions, it was decided that they are directed to the
17 lowest wage groups in each group. Monies saved from
18 vacation bonuses are one-time-only bonuses, and it was
19 decided that it is the Director's responsibility to allot
them, according to the general principles agreed upon in the managerial group. In 1995, unused vacation bonuses that can be used as personal rewards added up to (including employer-paid social benefits) 112,800.25 marks.

Using the grounds agreed upon in the managerial group (economic and supervisory responsibilities, research project head's/coordinator's responsibilities, activity in graduate studies, and exceptionally productive work in some unit), I have decided to pay one-time-only additional personal bonuses to the following colleagues: Iris Virta, Ari Kuisma, Janika Luoto, Laura Isotalo, Joanna Koski, and Ira Tuomi.

Karita Jokela

1) In Finnish, "virastokohtaisen järjestelyvaran käyttö." These monies are in the Government's annual budget, but can be used in its agencies without a need to consult higher authorities, which is not the case with most monies in the budget.
2) Meant to be targeted at those groups whose salary is lagging behind the general trends, at various levels of training and other competence.

Notice that this evaluation takes place in a text that announces a decision which has been based on an evaluation. Also, although this evaluation is the Director's, the criteria she used in assessing who is worth bonuses were fixed by the managerial group, not by her. Furthermore, due to the structure of the message (which is composed of two items in the minutes), we can not attribute any particular criteria used in evaluating specific persons. The analysis remains at a general level, but manages to make observable what is regarded as good work by the managerial team.

Example 15 gives an instance of another evaluation in which the evaluative criteria are made explicit. This excerpt is from an informal meeting in which the heads and coordinators of House research groups reviewed the first year of the change, and described their plans for the following year. More exactly, this excerpt is from Karita's (the Director) long opening turn (see
also Boden 1994: 94–95, 145). She praises research for its high quality in terms of "academic criteria" (lines 11 to 13). Here the criteria is openly expressed, and anchored to the evaluation study done by Mari Santala a couple of years before (see Chapter 2 for more detail). Mari Santala has a Ph.D., and has been a professor at a locally prestigious college. Her assessment of House research could thus be cited as an authoritative source of academic perception.

Example 15. [A 1/24/95, 256-276]

(0.8)

1 2 K

Mut /VARsin pitkälle ilmeisesti se tilanne, but pretty far+to apparently it situatuation
But /APParently that situation just about

3 (nyt) juuri sillon puoltoista vuotetta now just then 1½ years
one and a half year- years ago

4 sitten ku >Mari sitä< analyysia teki niin, ago when [name] that analysis did then
when >Mari was doing that< analysis,

5 (0.2) niin oli se että,h .hhh #ö::# et et,
(0.2) was that that,h .hhh e:: that that,

#eö::# *(joka)* näky sit siinä meiän esi-
#e::# *(which)* was seen in the fee-

7 esittämässä n,ö:: esittämässä, (0.2) niinkun
feedback n,e:: feedback, (0.2) given by us

8 pAlautteessa että: (1.2) et tää tietynlainen
that: (1.2) that this sort of

9 malli,h (0.4) oli johtanu semmoseen (0.7)
model,h (0.4) häd led to a sort of (0.7)

10 → kyläläkin .hh #ö::,#h tuota:,hh (.)
in fact .hh #e::,#h well:,hh (.)

11 → lAAdukkaaseen tutkimukseen jos sitä
research in gOOd quality if It

12 → ajateltiin, (0.2) #ö::,# (. ) >myöski niinku<
was thought of, (0.2) #e::,# (. ) >also in terms of<

13 → akateemisin #kriteerein,# (0.3) .hhh mutta että:,
In this example, there is a contrast structure. In one sense, the former organizational model was deemed good. It had led to high quality research. In another sense, however, the former model was not very successful. It had led to difficulties in arranging (managerial) support for research and in finding direction for research. Thus, the positive evaluation of research does not stand alone, but is a preface in a larger unit that leads Karita to a description of the difficulties that prompted the organizational change in the first place, and justifies it now.

2.3 Non-Performance Based Evaluative Criteria

To find out whether managers use criteria other than those based on performance in evaluating work, Dornbusch and Scott (1975) asked the following question of their respondents in what they called the "Five organizations study": "Are there other things aside from the way you perform in general as a (position) that have an important effect upon the organizational rewards and penalties you receive?" They summarized the results obtained from their open-ended responses as follows:

Personality and human relations skills were the influences most frequently mentioned; these were cited
by eighty-eight respondents mentioned as affecting organizational sanctions. Forty-four respondents mentioned "attitude," with football players and team leaders highest on that non-performance basis for evaluation. Age, seniority, appearance, and outside contacts were other categories given occasionally. It is worth noting that race, nationality, or religion were hardly mentioned by our 224 respondents. (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 187).

Dornbusch and Scott do not claim that these American results are universal. However, another study, done in a Nigerian hospital, showed that although ethnic differences (that is, tribal status) were more important in Nigeria, this was an exception. In terms of other non-performance bases, their American results were essentially replicated in Nigeria (Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 188).

Whether non-performance bases vary across cultures, however, is a secondary matter here; what is more important is to realize that such bases may be used in doing evaluations. Next, I will focus on these "non-performance" criteria.

2.3.1 Individuals' Actions, Values, Attitudes, and Personalities

We saw earlier in this chapter that people and their behaviors were evaluated occasionally. It is rather obvious that evaluations targeted at people open up new types of evaluative criteria for the House members. For example, while projects cannot (sensibly) be said to have "attitudes," persons may definitely be evaluated in terms of their attitudes. To get at the criteria used in evaluating people, I went through evaluations targeted at people specifically. The criteria that were used in these evaluations can be classified into four types: actions, values, attitudes, and personalities. In utilizing these
criteria, managers assume that workers display certain qualities, and that these qualities have different values for the House.

In Example 16, one researcher's speech is reported as a response to a report. Previously, Mikko had said that a project done by a researcher "has a life of its own" in an apparently neutral tone. The Director had then asked about the timing of the press conference in which the results of this project were to be announced. She then offered a possible date for the press conference by saying that it should be "before midsummer" (i.e., June 21). This loose time frame prompted Anita (who is responsible for press contacts) to tell a story about a conversation with Johanna, the researcher in charge of this project. This report contains at least two evaluative items, the first one in lines 2 to 9 and the second one in lines 12 to 18.

Example 16. [A 05/30/95:1 1(2) B:2, 373-394]

1 A ...tolta (2.4) JOhannalta ni (1.0) mäst tuleeko sulle ...(2.4) JOhanna (1.0) Then I [asked] whether your [study]

2 will come out at the end of June (I me*an*) (1.2) [will]

3 valmis*ta* (0.3) @ö::ei::? tää?!, vuoden kesäku-@ it] Be finis*hed* (0.3) @a::no:t? thIs?!, year Jun-@

4 ens vuoden loppu- ens vuoden kesäkuun next year's end next year's Jüne

5 at the end of June next ye-

6 Mi *(lop*puun)* by+th+end

7 ye

6 Mi *(mhh)*

7 K (Höpö röppö)

8 (That's trash)

8 A SIIS VUODE YHEKSÄNKiT KUUS KESÄKuun loppuun THAT IS it should (end) BY THE END OF

9 pitää (loppu var-). hhh /Mäst=että kAi\ sieltä nyt JÜNENINETY SIX .hhh /I [said] then sUrely\ something
In lines 2 to 9, Anita reports Johanna's announcement about her publications schedule, which is held to be scandalous by the speaker, and by the Director who joins the speaker's evaluation in line 7. The problem, then, is related to the researcher's intended schedule; what is wrong is the researcher's intention to defer publishing her study for a year. There is yet another evaluative element targeted at the researcher in lines 12 to 18, where Anita reports the researcher's explanation for the postponement of the study. Notice how Anita uses the research's
An analogous, but slightly different criteria used to evaluate people was based on individuals' more stable attributes. Such attributes as carelessness could become criteria against which individuals were evaluated (Example 17). Similarly, skills could form the basis on which people were evaluated (Example 18). Evidence for the existence of these attributes could be derived from talk and behavior (Example 17), as well as from more abstract qualities (Example 18).

Example 17. [D 9/15/94, 38-45]
1 Anita came in to the cafeteria to eat. She had a dinner
2 which she warmed up in the micro wave oven. Jari told her
3 that he had been at a fair yesterday and seen a
4 publishing house that had a good offer for seminar
5 papers. Anita asked the price. Jari shouted in the
6 doorway while walking away that "something like 10,000 or
7 50,000." Anita was left wondering about this with Karita.
8 "The difference is huge... you really should investigate
9 first".

Example 18. [D 3/24/95, 172-187]
1 Next Jari told about Matti. Matti had been a quiet guy
2 before he was hired by the House... He had had bad grades
3 in school, high school in particular had been really
4 difficult for him. At university too, he had been a
5 silent person, and remained silent when working in the
6 Bank of Finland'. Now, however, as Matti has increasingly
7 gotten more responsibility, he has become more courageous
8 step by step. As a result of that change, his skills
9 really begin to become valuable. In Jari's opinion, Matti
10 is a skilled researcher, who not only knows his
11 statistics, but can also apply them to the real world (a
12 problem in academy, Jari says), and is able to conduct
13 high-class experimental work', if that's what's needed.

In Examples 17 and 18, recipients do not show how they
understood Anita's comment about Jari and Jari's story about Matti. Some features do stand out, however. Notice that in Example 17, Anita does not just disapprove of Jari's suggestion, but points out that "you really should investigate first" (lines 5 and 6). This description tells the hearer what Anita thinks is proper for people in this situation. Since Jari does not act according to this precept, there is something contemptuous in the way he is behaving. It is not just what he has done, but also a more persistent feature which may be implied here, his carelessness with money. In Example 18, Matti's personality change is given as a reason why his skills have become more valuable to the House (lines 4 to 6). A person who is open and dares to use his skills to help others, for obvious reasons, is a valuable asset at the workplace. Jari's logic shows how personality may be associated with a person's value for some organization. Several researchers have argued that "proper personality" is an important asset at work (see Edwards 1979: 149-151; Dornbusch and Scott 1975: 188). An important reason for this appreciation of personality, of course, is apparent in Jari's story of Matti. What is especially appreciated by Jari in Matti is his change of character (or personality), which presupposes the idea that characters or personalities may be evaluated, and people held accountable for them.

It is worth noting that in these evaluations, several criteria are clustered together. For instance, in Example 17 where Anita's primary source of anger was Jari's not knowing the price, she quickly went on to generalize her criticism in terms of Jari's more stable attribute, carelessness. In Example 16, Anita's description of what Johanna had said to her is similarly
generalized in terms of how these words display more stable attributes, an attitude towards some central values of research (for these values, see Merton 1973: 267-278; for relevant discussion, see Mulkay 1980: 111-125 and Gieryn 1995: 398-400). These two instances of criticism contrast with Example 18, which maintains a focus on Matti's personality all through the exchange. As such, these generalizations resemble gossipers' habit of talking not just "about the extraordinary or offensive behavior of another person but also about the person himself, about his character and what is typical of him" (Bergmann 1993: 121, italics removed). This typifying tendency in part gives talk its evaluative character. It justifies the sentiments that are made observable through these descriptions.

2.3.2 The Interesting Quality of Work

When other targets, such as texts or House News were evaluated, members could evoke criteria that were not based on any of the previous categories. One prevalent way to show appreciation towards some target was to point out its "interesting" quality. In Example 19, the Director writes about House News from an administrative point of view. At the same time, she congratulates the publications staff and House News more generally. The evaluative expression is in lines 6 and 7. Here the criteria for Karita's evaluation is the continuously interesting quality of the news bulletin. An interesting thing is worth attention and time. Thus by pointing out that something is interesting, the speaker (or the writer, as in Example 19) suggests that others might profit from paying attention to this
thing as well.

Example 19. [E 11/10/94 17:36]
1 From: 1) KARITA JOKELA
2 To: EVERYONE
3 Subject: X400
4 Date: 10. October 1994 17:36
5
6 New fascinatingly interesting HOUSE NEWS appears on everybody's desk at regular intervals. THANKS AGAIN TO THE EDITORIAL STAFF. I'd also like to remind us all: let us all write [letters] to the editor regardless of our work - or official duties
7 1. official news (committees, memberships, greetings from meetings and congresses, which also go for travel reports in the House etc.) and
8 2. more informal musings as;;;
9 karita

1) Text in address fields in English in original (lines 1-4).

Another variant of this device was based on quoting or paraphrasing other people's opinions. Instead of declaring his own interest in some target (as in Example 19), the speaker could make an evaluation by pointing out that someone else had been interested in the House, its projects, or its work. Thus, in Example 20, Jari tells about his conference trip that had taken place a few weeks earlier. He had been at a conference in Toronto, Canada+, and had received good feedback from the audience. In the previous paragraph, he had classified papers into four classes, and here places his own presentation with those papers that took "a new look at a familiar phenomenon."

Example 20. [Housenews 8/22/95, p. 5]
1 My own presentation about the unsolved problems in housing research and in so-called household ecology belonged in the latter group for most members of the audience. On the basis of the audience's reactions and invitations to give talks (among other places, in Houston+ and Rio de Janeiro+), I guess I succeeded quite well in my task.

Here, it is apparent that Jari's presentation has been
successful; consequently, his work has been good. Notice, though, that he did not evaluate his own work directly. Instead, he made his success apparent by showing that his audience had expressed explicit interest in his work. Here, the criteria that made talk evaluative was based on interest displayed by other people, not by the speaker. We shall see later in Chapters 7 and 9 that this device was used quite often in evaluations in non-formal activities.

**Targets and Criteria in Projects Brought to Meetings "For Discussion"**

As I mentioned earlier in this chapter, some projects were brought to meetings "for discussion" rather than for review. The treatment of these projects was in many ways different from "ordinary" projects. The most important difference was that in these cases, the discussion was often based on a written memorandum, and the project was targeted in talk not just at the level of the project, but also in more detail. The following example provides an instance of such a case. It deals with a project designed around a computer connected to a video-recorder and a television screen. The system could be used to analyze visual data using a Windows-based program. The House had gotten the system from the importer for a pilot project for two weeks. Jari and Sauli, who was the methodologist working on the computer staff, conducted a brief pilot during these two weeks, after which they gave a brief demonstration to House members. Next they wrote two papers about the system for *House News* [House News 5/17/95, 4-7; House News 5/17/95, 8-10], Sauli's being more
methodologically oriented, and Jari's being oriented to the possible usability of the system in the House. Jari's paper, titled "Imprisoned by the Terminator" (referring to a well-known movie character), was largely critical of the system, while Sauli's paper was largely based on the idea that social scientists have not properly analyzed video data before. These two papers were used as the background memo in the managerial group, which was supposed to discuss the project. The discussion took more than 800 lines of transcript. Therefore, I will only paraphrase it here.

In this discussion, Karita first asked for "questions" from other recipients. The research chief Mikko initially prefaced his response by noting that he has many questions about the project [A 05/22/95:1 2(3) B:2, 95-99]. Then he mentioned that his "questions" are somehow similar to those he had in an earlier discussion about the Focus Group Project, which was handled just before entering into the discussion of the video machine project. Since he had criticized the Focus Group Project for various ills, his opening already signals to the others that he will be critical. In the ensuing discussion Mikko, indeed, had several other "questions" about the project. Among other points he made, or provoked by him, were doubts concerning for whom video image processing is done, and in what form its results could be reported (later in the same transcript, lines 129-143). He was also worried about the costs of hiring good camerapersons for projects, and criticized Sauli's paper, which was, in his opinion, too general to be useful for assessing the project. Petri and Anita added difficulties such as the costs of producing good video data (lines 222-270), the problem of finding suitable
training for using the system (lines 328-331), hardware costs (lines 420-437 and 629-643) and software costs (lines 732-762), problems in finding qualified personnel for the project (lines 450-452 and 471-481), the inflexibility related to the technology (the system tended to crash if overloaded, which made its simultaneous use for many projects difficult (lines 484-500), and fast software development, which will bring down prices within one year (lines 715-731). Thus, although this discussion was targeted at one developmental project only, multiple evaluations appeared in this discussion, and multiple criteria were used in assessing the project. In this sense, this review is much more detailed than any other case handled in this chapter; this project is treated differently from the examples analyzed so far in a number of ways.

The primary analytic message of this case is that when "projects" are used as the primary unit by managers, an underlying consistency of the ways in which work is properly made observable and manageable is assumed and maintained. By contrast, when "developmental projects" are discussed, this coordinated way of seeing is partly broken down, resulting in talk in which several aspects of these projects may be focused upon within a larger unit called the "developmental project." This talk, still, is targeted at identifiable "projects," and it is treated as such by members. For example, the video machine project is treated as just another project on the agenda, in the minutes, in the annual plan and in *House News* stories. However, there is no logical reason why ordinary projects should not have been similarly examined in such detail.

Multiple targets opened up for review in which multiple
criteria were used mainly in two environments. First, as already mentioned, multiple criteria were used in discussions about "developmental projects." Projects of this kind often prompted long discussions. In these discussions, several aspects of the project were routinely focused on. Not surprisingly, when several aspects of some project were talked about, several evaluations could also be done, and multiple criteria could, and were, used to assess the project. Secondly, in those few cases in which the report format broke down, a similar kind of opening up of the routine descriptive practice based on "projects" took place (see Chapter 3 for an analysis of "conversational environments in formal meetings").

Conclusions

This chapter has shown that various activities are evaluated in the House, but that for the most part, House managers mainly focus on research and other large projects. Out of the whole range of possible targets, only a few are evaluated; in this regard, the House's evaluative practices may justifiably be described as being "selective." This selectivity has a practical procedural basis. In formal activities, evaluations took place in the report format or in the reporting context, which overwhelmingly guided the managers to focus on projects and other types of work as formally defined. Elsewhere, where the report format was not at work, a more varied set of targets became available for evaluative attention. Outside the report format, other targets become available as well. For example, people were evaluated occasionally outside the report format.
Several complications in this pattern were also outlined in this chapter.

Selectivity, then, appears to be the main finding of this chapter. Why is there such selectivity? The main reason seems to be related to the methods used by managers to make evaluations. When they did evaluations using the report format, they overwhelmingly focused on research and other kinds of projects, and maintained performance-based criteria. When the report format is used, evaluations are rather in a made businesslike frame. In other environments where this device was not exclusively relied on, a more varied set of targets could become evaluated. Consequently, there was less criteria consistency as well.

This chapter has also shown that various criteria were used in making evaluations. The most common criteria were based on plans, schedules, and budgets; these were overwhelmingly relied on when evaluations were made within the report format. Again, when other targets were evaluated, other criteria appeared in evaluations. For example, when people were evaluated, they were treated in terms of various personality categories, and in terms of what they had displayed for some member about their intentions and plans.

The managers' "gaze," then, renders some aspects of the House "'thinkable' and, as a result, able to be acted upon, [and] also... potentially governable," as Townley (1993: 224) puts it. However, the managerial "gaze" is targeted fairly narrowly in the House mainly because most evaluations take place in several routine administrative procedures. Here we have seen how this administrative procedural basis is evident both in the ways in
which targets become available for evaluation, and in the
criteria used in evaluating these targets. There is no such
procedural basis in non-formal activities and in e-mail and House
News. This fact is evident in the wider selection of both targets
and criteria.
Notes for Chapter 4.

1. This expression is interesting in one particular sense. To say that "I have some questions" I suspect often act as disguises for "reservations" for academically trained people. The speaker shows not primarily her ignorance in doing such utterance. Rather, I believe, the form in academic discourse shows that the maker of the question wants some points to be explained before she sees the project's justification. Obviously, the speaker also reserves a right to make several questions concerning the project as the same time.
Chapter 5: Evaluations in Formal Activities

So far, we have seen that House activities largely came under systematic scrutiny in formal activities. Now it is time to turn to a more detailed examination of evaluations in these activities. In this and the following chapter, I will delve deeper into how evaluations are made in interaction in formal meetings, and in other formal activities. These two chapters, then, look at evaluations in one specific type of environment, formal activities, especially formal meetings. The reason for concentrating on formal meetings is threefold. First, most evaluations in the House take place in formal meetings. Second, interaction in formal meetings is different from that in conversation or many other speech-exchange systems (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974: 45-47). Third, this turn-taking system is "procedurally consequential" for evaluation in several ways (see Schegloff 1992). Accordingly, these activities deserve specific attention.

In order to simplify the structure of this chapter, I have not studied evaluative devices as they appear in various places in formal meetings. Thus, this analysis covers the devices used in the report format, in the reporting context, and in the chair's turns in informal activities (these concepts were introduced in Chapter 3), as well as other types of less important formal activities. Chapter 6 analyzes how these evaluations are received. In this chapter, I study only those evaluations that are specifically offered as evaluations. I will concentrate on these "focal" evaluations, and will not study the evaluations appearing in "subsidiary positions" in the report format. Subsidiary evaluations are instances of evaluation in which an evaluation supports another on-going activity such as an argument, rather than being made and treated as an evaluation. As they follow a different interactional dynamic from focal evaluations, these evaluations are not studied here.
An Ethnographic Note about the "Manageriality" of Action in Formal Activities

I will begin with a few comments about how the "managerial" character of the meetings analyzed in Chapters 5 and 6 is accomplished. Of course, sometimes the whole activity may be managerial. In formal meetings in particular, there are only managers present in normal cases. If someone is missing, someone will look for him or her [Ai 5/30/95, p.1]. Indeed, often membership is an accountable matter: the meeting will not start unless everyone is present, or legitimate reasons for absence are noted (see Boden 1994: 90-92). Similarly, the meeting will not start if there are outsiders nearby, unless they are granted specific permission to participate. Thus, in some general sense, the very procedures used in constructing a meeting and collecting members to that meeting constitute the occasion as managerial, and makes action in the meeting managerial by default.

However, this observation does not answer the question of how manageriality is accomplished in these meetings or, more specifically, how it is that action in formal activities is such that it is observably accomplishing manageriality. To get at this issue, we may look at what different members did in these meetings. Interestingly, there are several activities that are performed only, or at least mainly, by the Director, Karita. In fact, she is the only person who was constantly active in the meetings studied in Chapters 5 and 6. Not only does she chair the meetings, but she also constantly tells what she knows about the project being talked about by some other chief, confers on herself primary recipient status, using continuers and acknowledgement tokens during reports, and participating in jokes and other forms of humor throughout the meeting. Also, she collaborates in making evaluations, occasionally giving reports when Mikko signals that he does not know enough about the target [A 05/30/95:1 1(2) B:2, 30-153, 156-203], and taking up things reported earlier from a new angle (see Chapter 6, Example 8, lines 9 to 11). Thus, Karita's influence on these meetings is wide, multi-faceted, and almost constant. Notice too that her "managerial style," as a common organizational folk concept goes, is fairly complex. While some managers may be "formal," some "output-oriented," some "resource-oriented," some "person-oriented," some "socially oriented," and some others politically oriented," Karita's style can hardly be described using any single concept. Although the discussions analyzed in Chapters 5 and 6 on
the whole are oriented to organizational matters in the very details of interaction, this organizational framework is held up when interaction consists of reports followed by other reports. In other formal activities, a more diverse set of activities takes place, and while other managers' activities become more varied, so do Karita's. As a result, her "style" can be characterized not just as active, but also as complex in its multi-faceted constitution. To talk about "styles" is to gloss over the fact that her "style" was located in the specific, local circumstances of talk and practical action at the House.

Of course, there is no single reason for Karita's being that active. Minimally, a designated chair in some meeting only has to open the meeting, move the meeting from one agenda item to another while allowing other members to muddle uninterruptedly through their tasks, and close the meeting. Thus, all that is needed to make a meeting publicly and witnessably a "meeting" is a group of managers who make reports, and someone who chairs the meeting by opening and closing it, and by moving the meeting from one agenda item to the next. It is perfectly possible to visualize a manager who maintains only this minimal organization in the meeting. Karita certainly is not a minimalist in her way of participating in meetings; instead, she dominates most activities in them, participating in most on-going activities. We may conjecture that her relentless activity may have a background in the way in which she participated in House affairs. As I explained in Chapter 2, Karita spent much time in the House, and participated in most of its activities. As I also argued in Chapter 2, a good deal of the managerial group interaction revolved around her. In general then, she was the House's best-informed member, and thus well equipped to participate in almost any kind of talk in the House by, say, correcting and elaborating on items she heard in talk (comp. Watson 1994: 214, 210-211, and the literature he cites). In interactional terms, she was the person who was constantly put into the position of a "knowing recipient" (Goodwin 1981: 156-159; Lerner 1992: 261-252). No wonder, then, that her constant activity and detailed knowledge of House affairs had not gone unnoticed by other members, who characterized her as a very strong manager and leader [for example, I 5/5/95, p. 5].
Explicit and Implicit Evaluations

Whenever we are faced with an evaluation, we are facing a member's practice. Whether something is evaluative depends on how this something is done and heard rather than on some constant structure. The mechanism that makes us hear something as evaluative is rather simple as such. To put this process into admittedly mechanical but still clarifying terms, it consists of a speaker selecting an object and characterizing it in an evaluative fashion, and a hearer making sense of this selection procedure. The speaker selects the object and characterizes it in such a way that the hearer, in doing his backtracking operation, learns that the speaker has not just brought an object to talk, but has also somehow evaluated it. As such, the occurrence of an evaluation depends on members' procedures just as understanding more generally (see Garfinkel 1967: 30). Evaluation is inescapably a member's practical accomplishment.

When we get beyond this notion, we get to more informative trains of thought. There may be large differences in how items are done to be recognized as evaluations, and how they are observed by the recipients as evaluations. At one extreme, there are more "packaged" cases in which some of the more conventionalized features of our culture come to match the speaker's and the hearer's procedures, and to guarantee that they come to conjointly accomplish an evaluation. When, in a simple case, a speaker points out a book and says that "this book is good!," the hearer can consult the meaning of the word "good," the form of the utterance, and her contextually particular knowledge. When combined, these procedures may cause her to hear that the speaker has made an evaluation. These procedures are rather "guided" in that the hearer does not have to rely solely on the contextual particulars in her sense-making efforts; she is aided by her conventional semantic and syntactic competences as well. These conventional semantic and syntactic features serve as local pragmatic resources in coordinating interaction for both parties.

In more complex cases, members may have to rely on different kinds of inferential procedures and consult various types of knowledge to come to conclude that an evaluation has been made, and to make sense of it. These evaluations achieve their intelligibility through contextual particulars only, not through some formal semantic and syntactic properties of the utterance. As we shall see in this chapter, understanding these evaluations requires access
to the House's planning and accounting processes, or good previous knowledge of the House's on-going developments.

Preliminarily then, we have to distinguish two classes of evaluations according to the procedures involved in accomplishing evaluations. For want of a better term, I will call the first class "explicit evaluations," and the second "implicit evaluations." Of course, if someone would be forced to explicate how it is that he hears some utterance in an evaluative manner, he would end up with the difficulties experienced by Garfinkel's students, whom he asked to explicate some perfectly commonplace utterances in ordinary conversation (Garfinkel 1967: 24-31). In brief, such explication would be an endless task; all expressions are indexical in the final analysis (see Garfinkel 1967: 4-7; Garfinkel ad Sacks 1970 [1990]). In practice, people rely on a presumption that others co-operate in constituting the everyday as non-problematic, and rely on common procedures and presuppositions to sustain these procedures (see Garfinkel 1963 [1990]).

Finally, it ought to be noted that in a few cases, no evaluative utterances were voiced, even though evaluations were hearably being done. Thus, once Petri told other managers about the project "to improve the SUPERMAN database." After naming the project he immediately noted that Windows 95 had not come out yet. The new update of SUPERMAN was to be based on Windows 95, which he did not mention in so many words. However, this single item of information, combined with the understanding of SUPERMAN's relation to Win95, was enough to show that the SUPERMAN project was not on schedule. This item simultaneously provided an explanation of this problem and conveniently got him off the hook.

**Implicit Evaluations in Formal Activities**

I argued in Chapter 3 that plans in particular may be used as structural devices for specifying what members are expected to do. To speak in more exact terms, plans project actions for members, and are simultaneously used as interpretive devices in assessing whether action has taken place according to these specifications. Action in line with plans is seen to be reasonable and intelligible, while action that is not becomes accountable as somehow aberrant, and may receive a "secondarily elaborative" treatment (Heritage 1989: 115-120). Thus, as structural devices, plans and other
managerial decrees have the same properties as any other procedure used by members to make sense of action. They "provide for the intelligibility of perceivedly normal conduct and for the visibility of conduct which deviates from this" (Heritage 1987: 240).

In the House, implicit evaluations in formal activities were based on four kinds of procedures. First, project evaluations could be done against plans while budgets, secondly, were reviewed against a simple rule that was grounded on printouts from the accounting system. Thirdly, budgets could also be reviewed simply by comparing the use of money at some point in time to the previous year's use. In these evaluations, several organizational technologies could be involved in the production of an evaluation. Fourthly, most evaluations were based on a telling of details about the current stage of some project. This procedure is not based on any specific organizational technology. We will see that in most cases, evaluations were performed in such a way that no problems were formulated in them. Still, a concern with accountability could be heard to be at work throughout the work performed by managers.

1. Implicit Evaluations Grounded in House Plans and Accounting Systems

In Chapter 3, I argued that one differentia of managerial evaluation is its occasional reliance on certain rather mundane organizational technologies. I argued that the most important of these technologies is the annual plan (or the "action plan," or "the plan of operations," the terminology varies from one workplace to the next). These instruments are constituted in the House's administrative and managerial processes, and they are assumed to somehow set the course of action for items specified in them for some foreseeable future. It follows that any piece of work mentioned in them can be measured and evaluated against them.

It is important to see that these technologies do not guide evaluation and thus possible further managerial actions automatically. Instead, to get them to bear effectively on work, they have to be used in evaluating work. Furthermore, to make them relevant in interaction, they have to be occasioned in it, and be mutually oriented to by participants. In the House, evaluations could be said to have an observable material basis in plans and reports from the accounting system. In this section, we will see how these
instruments were used in evaluating work.

1.1 Evaluations Based on Plans

Previously, in Chapter 3, I argued on theoretical grounds that plans and other managerial guidelines are routinely available for members as grounds for assessing work. I proposed that plans in particular specify an intersubjectively shared basis for evaluating work; they specify how a project is supposed to progress. If some project is progressing, it is on a "perceivedly normal" track. If this project is not on track, its deviation becomes noticeable and accountable. Indeed, when projects were not on this normal course, it was noted by members, and a search for reasons for this perceived aberration from normality was routinely initiated (see Heritage 1987). These theoretical concerns must now be analyzed in more detail to see what kind of evidence there is about such orientation to plans in managerial action in the House.

In a few cases, plans are explicitly referred to as procedures upon which evaluations are based. In the following example, Maria refers to plans in making an evaluation. Note that the contractual nature of plans becomes apparent in the very first words of her report. It appears that she is treating plans as a set of promises (lines 3 to 7). Then she proceeds to mention that one project aside, every other project is doing fine. The project that is not being finished is then specifically examined as a potentially troublesome case. I will come back to what Maria does after she has done her evaluation (arrowed) immediately after presenting her report and the ensuing interaction.

Example 1. [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1--; B:1, 35-58]

1 Ma ...voit sanoa (.). hhh (Täst) kodin hallinnasta (.).
2 mä nyt (.hhh) pohjustin sitä katsomalla tätä
I just (.hhh) grounded it by looking at our
3 meiän suunnitelmaa ja (näitä) yksittäisiä hankkeita
plan and (these) single projects [to find out] where
4 mis mennään ja h (.hhh) ja mun mielest niinko, (.)
we are going and h (.hhh) and in my opinion kinda, (.)
5 se mitä on sanottu valmistuvaks tänä vuonna,
what's been said to be finished this year,
6 (1.0) tänä vuon=nii (.). #e:#=näyttää, (0.8) näyttää
(1.0) this year (.). #e:#=it looks, (0.8) looks like
Here are six [pieces of] hair, (.).

“will be finished”, (.9) and well [there's] only

that seemingly won't, (.7) won't stay on schedule

and it is Marketta's, (.9) work, (.2) but. (.2)

Marketta's, (.9) continu- continuance study concerning

[these] (.) info signs,=But on the other hand

Marketta has had this development work, of the

further further+study but that [name]

these signs related

and there's only

one that see

ningly won't, (.7) won't stay on schedule

of the

Marketta's, (.) continuance study concerning

further study but that [name]

these signs related
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Marketta has had this development work, of the

kinds of od+js t

sorts of h (.2) odd jobs to which (. )
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In lines 2 to 4, Maria frames the way in which she has come to her evaluations. She first tells them that prior to the meeting, she has gone through work formally under her managerial powers, and has compared it to the plans, which are thus explicitly introduced as grounds for the forthcoming evaluation in this excerpt. Then she proceeds to an evaluation that targets all work underneath the plan’s category "will be finished" (line 5). This procedure produces her first collective evaluation, "what's been said to be finished this year... only one that seemingly won't, won't stay on schedule" in lines 5 to 9. Notice though that by saying "only one," Maria makes it clear that other projects are proceeding as they are said to proceed in the plans. Notice also that this evaluation is placed into an utterance that locates the items to come in one class of projects, those that "will be finished" -- since only one project has not stayed on schedule, the problem is minor and unique among this group of projects. Positioned this way, the (research) group gets a positive account at the outset, while the only project in trouble gets highlighted.

Then, in lines 8 to 12, she gets to an evaluation of Marketta’s ill-fortunate project. First she specifies the sense in which there is a problem in this project, which is that it has not stayed on schedule (line 9). Then she identifies the troubled case by naming the researcher who is responsible for this project, Marketta (lines 10 and 11). Next she proceeds to an explanation of the reasons that explain the problem. In lines 12 to 16, Maria gives an account of why this particular project is going to be late. The reasons for Marketta’s being late are other assignments, "the developmental work of the study panel" and "other odd jobs" that have taken her time. Although her project is overdue, she cannot be held responsible for the current situation because her "being late" is effectively accounted for. Since there are good organizational reasons for her being late, her action is given a "secondary elaborative" treatment (see Heritage 1989: 115-120) by Maria, Mikko and Karita that show that it was not her fault that she is late. Accordingly, she cannot be held accountable for this specific delay.

This example shows that in the final analysis what is at stake is accountability rather than plans (or schedules) as such. Plans are treated as
yardsticks against which action is analyzed. A worker is suspected of breaching a norm if she does not act according to plans. If his work does not proceed according to plans, his actions are analyzed to see why this is the case. If the managerial group finds solid reasons accounting for the alleged breach, (to borrow a legal term) an acquittal may be given, and the person under scrutiny will be forgiven (for Marketta, such acquittal is in lines 25 to 30). Obviously, this does not have to be the case. Managers' analysis may lead to the conclusion that the target is for some reason responsible for this trouble (see Example 10, Chapter 6). If that is the case, additional concerns may be raised. For example, the managerial group may venture into talking about how to get the project back onto the "normal" track. Thus, although work is scrutinized overwhelmingly in "neutral" terms, this is so only with projects that proceed according to plans or that, in Garfinkel's early terms, proceed in a "perceivedly normal" fashion (Garfinkel 1963 [1990]: 198; see Heritage 1987: 235). Still, behind all this apparent neutrality, responsibility and accountability are at stake.

Given this analysis, it is apparent that much more may be involved in the following case than would meet the eye, should we only pay attention to its apparent neutrality. In the next example, which immediately follows Marketta's case, Maria is reviewing two projects. In the course of doing her report, she mentions that these particular projects "proceed as planned."

**Example 2.** [A 5/30/95, 58-63]

1. Ma Ymmärrettävä ja tota?, (1.8) eli meilhän on mhhhh understandable and well so we — we have Understandable and well?, (1.8) then we have mhhhh

2. valmistunu noit korkotukia ja (0.4) tää velkaneuvonta be+ready those interest+support and this debt+informing finished these interest loans and (0.4) this debt settlement

3. ja vapaaehtosjärjestelmät eli eli Marian ja (0.3) and voluntary+systems — So So Maria's and and voluntary settlement systems [studies] that is Maria's

4. → ton (. ) Ira's projects advance in+planned+manner and and (0.3) Ira's projects proceed as planned and

5. käsikirjoituksiä on (tu lolla) *tässä* (0.9) manuscripts are (coming) *here* T[0.9]

6. tässä kesäkuulla vielä? this *June?*

Note that this evaluation is done in two ways after the identification
component. First, Maria notices that these projects "proceed as planned." This item makes visible that these two projects are well within the frame laid down in the plans. Since progress on these two projects corresponds well to that promised in the plans, accountability issues are not raised in a visible manner. Secondly, there is a notice about manuscripts in line 5 ("manuscripts are (coming) *here* (0.9) this June?"). This time there is no need for an account, since there is scarcely anything in the project's course that would warrant such discussion. Still, the background for making such judgments is there, although in the form of a neutral reference to plans rather than in terms of explicit analyses of accountability. Since no problems are made specifically visible, hearers may infer that the project is doing fine.

To end this section on plans, some of their further properties may also be referred to. First, it is important to note that "plans" are both specific and general. They are generic in that basically anyone equipped with the concept of "plan" (that is, almost everyone) can make sense of these evaluations and raise accountability issues. To make sense of a comparison between a plan and an activity does not require detailed knowledge of the activity under investigation. However, plans are also specific in that plans are real objects at the workplace. Members with specific knowledge of these plans get a detailed understanding of some project, if they relate what they hear in talk to this knowledge. Obviously, managers occasionally do utilize such specific structurally-grounded knowledge in making sense of talk. However, it is outside the scope of this study to examine whether and how they utilize that knowledge, or how that knowledge is distributed.

The second thing of interest is that this simple procedure is an efficient way to browse through much activity through the lens of accountability. A simple series of comparisons of projects with plans locates problematic cases efficiently, and creates slots for accounting for them, if such accounts are called for. These seemingly simple comparisons get to the very heart of managers' work in several senses. They constitute an on-going investigation of activities, a search for "deviant cases," and they create the
possibility of studying the reasons for performance, making changes in its background conditions, and justifying remedial action. With these thoughts, we can proceed to the next major implicit device that was used in formal meetings to make evaluations.

1.2 Evaluations Based on Balance Sheets and The Linearity Assumption

Another organizational ground upon which an evaluation could be built was routinely used in budgetary discussions. This device consists of a simple rule used by members to find out whether the House, some of its departments, or some of its projects have stayed within budget. Again, we notice that accountability issues are deeply interwoven into this procedure for making the use of money visible at the workplace.

Background information for this type of analysis was provided by the House accounting system (Figure 1). The first column shows how much money had been budgeted in each category and how much money had been transferred from the previous year, the second and third how much had been used so far and how much had been reserved for the whole year, and the fourth how much was still unused in that category. The final column reported the percentage used so far. This account system consisted of approximately 50 accounts and thus covered the House extensively in fiscal terms. This sheet was the only formal "display" (Lynch 1985) used in evaluations in the House.

![Figure 1. The Accounting Sheet Used by Management](Doc. 5/19/95, 3)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>+transfer</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th>Reserved</th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>Use-%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT AND DEVEL.</td>
<td>833310</td>
<td>512510</td>
<td>429200</td>
<td>-108400</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUGHT SERVICES</td>
<td>218000</td>
<td>108000</td>
<td>114000</td>
<td>-4000</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH SERVICES</td>
<td>124000</td>
<td>33000</td>
<td>42500</td>
<td>48500</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE</td>
<td>633000</td>
<td>408000</td>
<td>378300</td>
<td>-135300</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT AND DATA ADMINIST.</td>
<td>3220500</td>
<td>1467000</td>
<td>1719400</td>
<td>34100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL COMBINED</td>
<td>5241000</td>
<td>2420000</td>
<td>2590700</td>
<td>230300</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) These figures are fictional.

These standardized figures could occasion interactional episodes using the following simple linear calculation as a rule for determining when money was
used inappropriately. This rule is specified in three steps below:

**The Linearity Rule:**

Step 1 Count 
\[ a = (x/12) \times 100, \]  
where x is the ordinal number of month  
(thus, January is "1" and May "5");

Step 2 Count 
\[ b = \frac{\text{money used so far from some budget category}}{\text{money budgeted for the whole year for this category}} \times 100. \]

The rule: The results from equations (1) and (2) should match or be roughly equal, that is, \( a/b \approx 1 \), not much over 1 or close to 0. If they are not, then a deviation from "perceivedly normal" course (of spending) is taking place, and the matter becomes accountable.

Using this kind of rule, the managers could make sense of the current situation, and find out quickly whether some account was in danger of being exceeded. If that was the case, the reasons for that state of affairs were discussed. All that is needed to understand this device is the budgeted amount of money in some category, how much has been used in that category, and knowledge of the date of the fiscal report.

I will give only one example of a discussion of the budget where it became necessary to explain the way money had been used. This example is the very first item in a May managerial group budget discussion. Petri's report begins in lines 10 and 11, where he notes first that the report is brand new. Then comes the crucial moment: he refers to the figure in the report distributed to the managerial group. In line 37 he says that this figure is 62%, even though it is only May 19th, and the figure should be around 40%. Next he says that there is no need to worry about percentages in the report (lines 11 and 12), and immediately explains the reason for this claim. By the end of line 13, he has provided himself with a slot in which he can elaborate on this rather unusual beginning, and in line 13 he gets to this explanation. There are all kinds of wages, both permanent and temporary workers' wages in the report, which have been counted to the report for the whole year (Karita confirms this explanation in lines 19 and 20).

After this explanation, Petri goes ahead to tell the real situation from line 24 onwards. According to him, the real situation is that the House has used 33% of its appropriation (line 33), which is "the right, the right situation," not sixty-two percent, as the report falsely says (line 37). Then Petri gets to a more detailed overview, detailing the use of money for various budget categories, consisting of such categories as "research,"
"management and development," and "information service" (lines 42 to 43). At the end of this more detailed overview, he recapitulates that only 33% of money available for the House for all its functions has been used so far (line 44).

Example 3. [A 05/22/95:1 1(3) A: budget discussion, 217-272]
1 K Ja aloitetaan tästä määrärahojen käytöstä ja
   budjetin tietoja.
2 And let's begin from the use of money and
   käsittely.
3 Petri lähti tulostetun tulosta.,
   name printed a report,
   (1.4)
4 (k-hr) ((clears throat))
5 K ja tässä määraa rojen käytöstä ja
   budjetin tietoja.
6 Petri lähti tulostetun tulosta,
   printed a report,
6
7
8 K
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21 P (El-i) siin on koko vuos otettu sit< Eli
(S-o) there is the whole year in< So
* ( ) ( )*

22 A Joo,

23 K Yes,

24 P tota:, h (. ) itse asiassa me olemme, hhhhhhh#em#
well In fact we have
that:, h (. ) in fact by the end
25 (. ) toukokuussa, (1.0) n:= loppupuoleen
May by the end of
(. ) of (1.0) n:= May we have, hhhhhhh#em#
26 ?
27 P käytä
used
28 K YHeksän teentoistopäivän=
BY Nine tee n t h of May=
* (mh)*
29 ?
30 P =käyttä ne<
eed<
31 K Siin (on),< ->PAkat il-meisesti otettu
There (<have presumably been taken
32 jouluon (laskelman)
already into this (she)
33 P kolme prosenttia
three percent of
34 meidän määraahoistamon,
our appropriation,
35 (1.7)
36 P >Se on niinku< se oikea tilanne,#
>That is< the right situation,#
37 eikä, h (0.2) eikä kuuskytka*ks prosenttia mikä
not, h (0.2) not sixty-tw*o* percent that
38 on tässä sivulla kolme,#
is here on page three,#
39 (2.3)
40 P "Kaikki yhteensä", hhhhhhh Siellä, (. ) ne menee
"All combined", hhhhhhh In there, (. ) they go like
41 siten että tutkimustoiminta on käytetty
that that for research activities it has been used thirty
42 kolkytkolme, (0.5) ö:: tietopalvelu k'sk't/kahdeksan,
three, (0.5) e:: for information service tw'n't/eight,
43 (1.4) johto ja kehittäminen on kolkytseit*tsämän
(1.4) management and development is thirty-se*ven
44 ja,* (1.2) *ja kaikki yhteensä kolkyt#(kolme),#*
and,#* (1.2) *and all combined thirty#(three),#*
Two things are worth noticing in this example. First, there is the way in which the evaluation is made. This is not directly a plan-based evaluation, but based on projected budget figures at the end of May. There is evidently an assumption of a linear use of money underlying Petri's report as well as underlying his assumed preemptive account. This assumption is rather simple: approximately one third of the money should have been spent by May 19th. If more was spent, an explanation was appropriate. Such a rule was not specified in the plans; still, such a rule seems to be shared by all members, who used this simple rule throughout budget discussions. For instance, in lines 19-20 and 31-32 Karita confirms Petri's calculation without questioning its validity. Also, in more specific budget review discussions, deviations from the expected pattern caused more specific searches for problems. In one case, for example, 160% of the budgeted amount had already been used although only about 40% should have been used according to the linearity rule. After reporting this, Karita rushed to find the reasons for this excessive use of money. The search was only completed when she realized that an unplanned publication had been financed from that (small) budget category [A 05/22/95:1 1(3) A:3-5]. It also shows one way in which people at work make the use of money visible at the workplace.

Secondly, this example shows that the budget is an accountable matter from the very beginning. Indeed, Petri offers an explanation even before he reports about how money has been used in the House. I would like to suggest that this preemptive strike was related to the linearity assumption just discussed. In most cases where there was a departure from this linearity assumption, an explanation was volunteered. Typically, the Director explained discrepancies from this rule by showing that problems in the figures resulted
from changes in the category system used for accounting, or from some mistake. In contrast, "normal" budget behavior did not call for an account. Thus, the very structure of the assumption may project asking for explanation, should the report figure deviate from the estimate drawn on the basis of the assumption. To rely still on Heritage's terminology (1989: 115-120), we may point out that these "secondarily elaborative" explanations "normalize" the discussion which might otherwise have ended up with an alarming observation of the budget having gone astray. Thus in Example 3, Petri shows that the "62%" figure is an artifact of the accounting system rather than the result of some real problem. When he then gives the right figure, there are no two competing versions of reality at work. Instead, just one version is shown to be right, and the other an artifact.

1.3 Discussion

In several evaluations, some organizational technology is used in the very constitution of the evaluation. In Examples 1, 4 and 7, for example, there are explicit references to the annual plan that stated when each project was supposed to be finished. Thus, in Example 1 there was a sentence in the plans that specified when projects managed by Maria were to be finished. The plan thus specified the schedule for these projects. Similarly, in budget reviews, there were comparative figures produced by the accounting system. These figures essentially analyzed the uses of money in terms of a simple rule, consisting of expressing the amount of money used so far in terms of the percentage of money used from that account to how much money there is in that category for the whole year. Thus, these evaluations were grounded on organizational technologies that were made relevant in interaction in various ways, and that could be subject to many kinds of study by members.

However, it should be noted at this point that only a limited number of formal organizational technologies were involved in the production of evaluations in the House. Basically, the House managers only used two types of "technologies" in their evaluative interaction, namely House plans and the simple balance sheet given in Figure 1 above. These technologies were rather simple even when compared to the heuristic balance sheets designed to back up decision-making in the firm analyzed by Anderson et al. (1989: 117-120, also
Furthermore, if we compare these "technologies" to the complex technical environment at work in the line control room in the London Underground (Heath and Luff 1997), or work in natural science laboratories (Garfinkel et al. 1981; Lynch 1985), we find that managers' evaluative work had a fairly limited "technological" basis in the House. Talk about managerial "technologies" is metaphorical at best. Similarly, a comparison of the House with the procedures upon which the work of primary care physicians is based (Peräkylä 1999) shows that the work of the House managers is largely conceptual and based on their situated knowledge of the workplace. There are no X-rays or blood tests, nor are touch and listening usable "technologies" in House work. The specificity of managerial evaluation arises from the concepts and categories used in evaluating, not from some technological background that would form a practical foundation for making evaluations in the House.

Interestingly enough, it was only through the balance sheets analyzed in subsection 1.2 that non-work activities and office work were evaluated. Notice that these abstract summary figures provide very little detailed access to these events. Management's evaluative view over these activities thus remained rather indeterminate. This indeterminate attention contrasts starkly with the more detailed attention given to projects and research groups. Projects and research groups were in fact evaluated using both balance sheet information and information based on plans. (We shall soon see that other evaluative devices were used to evaluate projects and research groups as well). In all cases, the crucial thing noticed by management was first whether there was a discrepancy between expectations and actual performance in some project or other target and secondly, whether this discrepancy could be accounted for somehow.

2. Previous Situations and The Course of a Normal Project as Intersubjective Grounds for Evaluations

In contrast to the evaluations described above, some organizational evaluations are not grounded in organizational information production and summarizing procedures. Rather, some evaluations are based on methods that are shared by people in interaction only intersubjectively. In some cases, members could evaluate some item by comparing it to some previous comparable situation.
This previous situation was remembered, not given in some balance sheet or in the plans. In other cases, members could evaluate projects by telling what stage the project was in at the moment, and by comparing this stage to the course of an "average" project.

2.1 Comparisons with a Previous State of Affairs

In budget reviews, evaluations were occasionally done through a comparison of the current figures to last year's figures in the same category. Last year's figures for each budget category at a comparable point in time could be given in the financial reports distributed to the managerial group, who could then simply compare the amount of money used this year to last year's figures. Occasionally, members simply remembered last year's figures. If the current figure far surpassed the previous year's figure, the reasons for that situation were routinely elaborated [for example, A 05/22/95:1 1(3) A:3-5, 2-45; A 05/22/95:1 1(3) A:6, 1-49]. These figures were not supplied by the accounting system, but were based on members' memory.

2.2 The Course of a Normal Project as a Measure Against Which to Evaluate Projects

In evaluating research, managers often analyzed the status of some project using an assumed "normal course" as a ground for assessing how it was doing. The assumption here is that projects may be formulated to have a "normal course." These evaluations do not presume the existence of some material or structural device such as plans or the accounting system. Rather, this device works on the assumption that some project can be situated on the imaginary line a "normal" project usually takes. This line consisted of the following kinds of steps. I will present a few examples of some of these types below.

In many evaluations, such implicit comparison of some particular project to a "normal," or an "average" project was the only device used by managers in reporting on work. Such comparison allows hearers to make inferences about some project's current state and, towards the end of the project at least, allows them to estimate how much time is needed before the project will be finished. This comparison also allows them to specify the
The project's current state which, again, can be compared to members' understandings concerning a "normal" project's course that is assumed to proceed not just in certain normal stages, but also at a certain speed. Unless some project is specifically marked as doing badly, hearers can infer that it is doing as expected -- i.e., it is on a perceivedly normal track. Through this construct, then, the issue of accountability may, but need not, be formulated explicitly.

**Picture 1. How the Stage of a Study is Made Visible**

A project about to begin

↓

The project that "continues" or is "underway."

References to some detail that tells the current stage of the project *(Example 5)*

↓

References to manuscripts *(Examples 2 and 4)*

↓

The manuscript is going to press or to the publications staff *(Example 4)*

↓

The project is about to be finished *(Example 7)*

This device is generic in that to make sense of it, people do not need to know the details of some particular project. Making sense of this procedure presupposes some understanding of a typical project's stages which, in the case of research, is measured in months and years rather than in weeks or days. To make visible how some project is doing, it is enough to tell the stage the project is currently in or where it is heading. Independent knowledge of the project is not needed by members to make sense of this device in a coordinated fashion. Thus, no explicit comparison of the current project to some other project is needed; recipients are well equipped to make inferences about the project's future from a tiny amount of knowledge concerning the project.

With these preliminary reflections, we may get to the data. In the next case, an announcement about a forthcoming manuscript is the only item that gives recipients knowledge about how the project is doing. This time Maria refers to a manuscript that is about to go to the publications staff whose job it is to put the final touches on manuscripts before they go to the press. The message to the hearer is clear: this project is about to be finished. I will come back to this example after presenting the data.
Example 4. [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1, 182-190]

1 Ma Siit tääll on tään, (. ) näätten elintarvikkeitten (. )
Then here are these, (. ) concerning the consumption (. ) of

2 kulutuksest oli Pia ja Lauran hankkeet ja (. )
these food stuffs [there are] Pia's and Laura's projects and

3 Pialta on tulossa nyt, (1.2) nyt tulee Anitan
(1.2) Pia's got one coming soon, (1.2) Anita will

4 puolelle?,, (1.1) käsikirjoitus (joka lähtee)
soon get a (1.1) manuscript?,, (which is going to)

5 A Me saadaan sulle
We'll get it to you

6 Ma [paimoon)
the press

7 A -se tiis-taina*
on Tues-day*

8 Ma Joo
Yes

9 (1.4)

In line 2, Maria refers to Pia's and Laura's projects in the past tense, which may show that these projects are already finished. If heard this way, her turn is factually wrong; Pia's project is coming out, while she later says that Irma's project is only about to begin. Thus, here the choice of the past tense refers again to the annual plan which she uses as a memory aid, and which lumps these two projects together. In interaction, however, she deals with these two projects separately.

In a few cases, an evaluative tone was elicited by a reference to the project's likely future course. This course was usually painted in positive colors. In the next example, Mikko deals with a project that was being done by a seasoned researcher, who had been gathering data for about a year already and was about to begin analyzing it. Notice that here the detail showing the present status of Jari's project is currently is produced collaboratively by Karita and Jari. Karita adds the item about the data after Jari had ended his previous turn with a short pause. Jari's turn in line 2 is already evaluative. Then there is a contrast marker "but" (line 2) and an interrupted utterance that may already project some additional component that is not that positive. Next, there is a brief pause, which at this point may be treated as a sign of trouble in making the evaluation, or of finding the right words. Karita comes in to help at this point. Through mentioning Jari's "data," she ties Jari's project to one typical project's "stage of life." After Karita's comment about
the data, Mikko confirms this piece of knowledge at the beginning of his next turn, and thus ties his talk to Karita's talk. At the end of line 5, managers know that Jari has got his data, and is somewhere in the middle of his project.

Example 5. [A 05/30/95:1 1(2) B:2, 211-219]
1 Mi /
/Noh /Ja- Jar- Jär
in tää on (.). on (.).
/Now /Ja- Jär- Jär i's it is (.). Is (.).
2 tulossa mut et sehän on nyt h
coming but that it is now h
3 (0.4)
4 K A i /neisto kerät
data's been ty,h
5 Mi /Se o:/ /Ni se on< aineisto #ke-
It i: Yea it is< the da
tty,h
gathered,h
6 ke#rättynä ja kyllä siitä tutkimus #tulee#
gathered and yes from+it research comes
gathered and it's gonna become #a study yet#
7 K *joo* *yea*
8 (1.2)
9 K Nii joo=
Oh yea=

The second part of the evaluation (in line 6) is also important here. In this second part, Mikko says that Jari's project is "gonna become #a study yet#." Notice that this item is delightfully ambiguous. On one hand, it may project a positive future for Jari's project, and thus may be doing a positive evaluation. Although she had first completed Mikko's utterance in line 4 after Mikko's short pause, Karita, after a longer pause, goes along with Mikko's evaluation in line 9, after which Mikko immediately starts another report. Karita does not do anything during Mikko's fairly long pause in line 7, although there was an opportunity for her to do so. Instead, in line 8, she says "Oh yea," which seems to mark that now she understands and accepts Mikko's trusting assessment of Jari's project. On the other hand, however, Mikko's item may display reservation as well. This item may also be heard in a defensive way. That is, it can be heard to display that Mikko's analysis of Jari's work is hopeful despite his doubts and difficulties about it. If heard this way, this formulation may be taken to suggest that Mikko has doubts about the project, but it may also suggest that for Mikko, the project is going to work out fine, regardless of his unspecified doubts about its progress. Note6
In the preceding example, we saw that comparisons of particular projects with a "normal" project's course can house items that may display pessimism about the project in talk. The following case shows in more detail how this device may be fashioned to show that some project is not doing well. Indeed, several items indicate a disapproving position towards the project throughout this example. Erika is a permanent researcher in the House. Maria does several things in this report which I will analyze after we are familiar with the data.

Example 6. [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1, 63-76]

1 Ma tässä kesäkuulla vielä? (0.9) Ja samoin sitte this June? (0.9) And in the same way then

2 Erika on omassa työssään tästä (tosta) siivouksesta in her own work about this cleaning Erika has

3 ni, (. ) ni jät täny yhden sortin hyvin karkeaa, eh, (. ) has given one sort of very rough,

4 ? HHHHH

5 Ma (0.7) karkeaa käskirjoitusta, (hionu) sitä (0.7) rough manuscript, [she's been] polishing it for

6 luetavaksi Kyl siin, siinä menee kyl aikaa for+reading yes there there goes time

7 ? *((kola hdus, a slam))

8 ? *(mh)

9 Ma *#vielä sen Erikãn kans# että se* (0.8)

*#vielä sen Erikãn kans# että se* (0.8)

10 → Vanhana hankkeena ni jo sois että se ois SÌnce it's an old project I'd already like to see

11 → valmis *(mutta)* that it'd be finished *(but)*

12 (1.2) *((epävarma ajoitus, timing uncertain))

13 Ma mut ehkä se siitä nyt sit sy- alkusyksy*stä,h* (0.3)

but perhaps it will (be finished) (0.3) in Fa-

14 (valmistuu)

15 (1.1)

early Fa*ll,h*

There is an identification in lines 2 and 3. Since this example takes place immediately after a case in which it was said that two projects were proceeding as planned, Erika's project is depicted in a positive manner up to the middle of line 3 because of the way in which Maria begins her report about Erika. When
Maria opens her report about Erika with "in the same way then," she builds into talk a presupposition that Erika's project is also proceeding "as planned." Erika's project is also assessed in a string of reports begun by Maria by noting that all projects, save one, are on schedule. Since the troubled project (Marketta's) had already been dealt with, an additional ground is given for recipients to see Erika's project in unproblematic terms.

This footing soon changes. The manuscript offered by Erika is first depicted as "very rough" in lines 3 and 5. Although a manuscript can usually be taken as a signal that a project will likely be finished soon, Maria's description shows that having a manuscript does not necessarily project a quick finish for this project. Secondly, in lines 6 and 9, she spells out an implication that was implicit in the description of the manuscript as "very rough." In these lines, she says that this project is still going to take a long time. Furthermore, it is not just Erika's time that will be consumed, but other people's time as well. Thirdly, Maria shows that in her mind, the project should have been finished by now (lines 10 and 11), especially because it is an old project already (line 10). By saying where the project should be, she shows that its present state is somehow wanting (compare this to Bergmann 1993: 124-125). After this item, she goes on to give a "bright side" of the report, which shows that for her, talk about Erika's work is not warranted anymore, and thus she is ready to move on to the next item. After a pause of 1.1 seconds in line 15, in which no recipient takes the turn, she opens up a new report (for how optimistic projections serve to close troubles talk, see Jefferson and Lee 1980a: Appendix, pp. 2-5; Jefferson and Lee 1980b: 38-39; and Jefferson 1988: 431-433). Note7

Thus, Maria installs several items into her report that show that the project is not as it should be. These items could serve as "bait" that provide opportunities for other participants to show willingness to talk about Erika's difficulties. These comparisons of individual projects to an assumed "normal" project may thus be used to do negative evaluations just as they may be used to do positive ones. Erika's case displays two ways in which such negativity may be built into this device. First, projects may come of age in the sense that they should be finished in due time. If a long-awaited project is still unfinished, there is something wrong with it, no matter how well it is proceeding at present. To be treated as "perceivedly normal," projects thus
ought to be finished in some definite amount of time. Secondly, even projects in the manuscript stage are not necessarily treated in a positive manner. Manuscripts take a varying amount of time and work to get finished. Some manuscripts indicate that the project will be finished quickly and reliably; others do not. To be "perceivedly normal," a manuscript must not be accompanied by descriptions that show that this manuscript is somehow abnormal. These features suggest that no matter how "neutral" comparisons between real projects and a "normal" project might seem at first sight, what is at stake is accountability. These comparisons can be heard to communicate "perceivedly normal" work for these managers if there are no items that hearably call forth contrary interpretations. These comparisons, however, place projects on a scale that is more "accurate" than plans, which may in part explain their prevalence in the current data. Plans only indicate whether some project is proceeding as planned or not; these comparisons provide more accurate information about the status of the current project.

We do not have to dwell long on the final case, which shows that these comparisons are used by members to evaluate non-research projects as well as research. Here Petri, the computer chief, reports about a House product. Since we are dealing with another software product here, I will retain my practice and call it "SHOE," after a comic strip character, a (bird) journalist who keeps having trouble with his computer. SHOE is designed to assist housebuyers in calculating the costs of their mortgage loans. Its main customers are housing authorities in some non-governmental institutions and municipalities. Petri had been in charge of the development of SHOE 5.0, which has encountered some unexpected incompatibility problems, partly due to changes in the operating system (Windows) and the spreadsheet upon which it was built (Excel).

Example 7. [A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 2-14]  
1 (0.3)  
2 K .mt Petri, (.). tiesthallintoyksikö .pt Petri, (.). The data management unit  
3 (1.3)  
4 P No joo no mä käyn (.). pikasesti "tän" (0.4) listan, Well okay I'll go through (.) "this" (0.4) list quickly  
5 (0.2) Siin on se Vaakun, (0.7) tussä, (1.9) thru (0.2) There is Shoe, (0.7) Here, (1.9)
Again, there is more than one evaluative item. The first one is in line 6, where Petri says that "(it) proceeds (with trouble)". This evaluation already forecasts problems, but does not detail them exactly. The second one is also in lines 6 and 7, where Petri notes that the annual plan promises that SHOE 5.0 will come out. By the end of line 7, his turn implies that the project will come out as promised in the annual plan, but that there are some as yet unspecified problems. Finally, the third evaluation, saying that SHOE "is... ready," is in line 8. This item positions the project as being at the very end of its life course. It does not project further work. However, there are items that add shades to this picture. The first such item was the description of "problems" embedded in the first evaluation. Secondly, Petri does not just say that SHOE is finished. Instead, he says that it has been "concluded," that it is ready (line 8). Third, there are qualifications in line 8 "(We have decided now that it is ready)". Finally, when Petri does not receive comments from others (line 9), he explains what the "problems" mentioned earlier mean (lines 10 to 12). This explanation also accounts for why it has been "concluded" that the project is finished: there are problems, but because they cannot be solved, and the markets are waiting, some shortcomings have to be accepted. Thus, projects other than research can be assessed using a stage-based comparative device. Also, people may use this device to inform others
about projects they are personally held accountable for.

Comparisons of some identifiable project to an assumed "normal" project are routinely used in the House to show how some project is doing. Normally, this device just flags the current stage of some project. This device may also be used to flag less positive assessments, if some items that prompt negative inferences are embedded in it. I have suggested above that unless this device is specifically used so that its items hearably call forth another interpretation, projects evaluated using comparisons of single projects to normal projects are hearable as "perceivedly normal."

All evaluations analyzed so far, then, routinely formulate work and other targets as accountable. In the absence of some specific accounting item, projects assessed using these devices fall within the limits of "normalcy." Thus, in evaluative interaction in the House, most evaluations maintain, with various devices, an assumption that work proceeds without difficulties. However, when workers' behavior departs from the expected pattern, then questions about accountability may become an issue, and a search for reasons for this departure arises. Interestingly, in contrast to the multitude of "presuppositions, knowledge elements, inferences and contextual features" used by people in everyday life as "resources to maintain a consistent sense of the central events of the exchanges" (Heritage 1987: 238), evaluations based on the stage of a work represent a narrowing down of possible methods: they are overwhelmingly organizational in character. The very devices used by managers represent a small selection of possible devices that could be used in maintaining the sense of work as normal at the workplace (compare to Heritage 1989: 239-240).

Notice that unlike evaluations based on plans, evaluations based on comparisons of real projects to "normal" projects are maintained in interaction in a completely collaborative fashion. The assumed course of a "normal" project acts as a presuppositional ground for making sense of evaluative items in interaction. Still, neither device necessarily presupposes detailed knowledge of the project nor of the plans. By implication, they also give the hearer an opportunity to infer how much time the evaluated project will be expected to take in the future.
Explicit Evaluations in Formal Activities

Above, we have seen how evaluations were done using implicit evaluative devices in formal activities. However, this is not the whole story. The assessment segment (see Goodwin and Goodwin 1987, 1992) may be used in various positions and in various tasks in formal activities. In Example 8, Maria is evaluating a research group ("Conditions for Sustainable Housing," in line 2) that consists of several projects. She moves from the identification of the group to single projects through a stepwise procedure. First she notes that a research programme for the group is under preparation, and then begins to transfer to single projects. She moves from the group to single projects by first noting that single projects are progressing "at good speed" (lines 6 and 7). At this point (which is the first possible point in which the speakership could change), Karita comes in and Maria gives up her report for a moment, to resume it later after Karita has initiated a brief elaboration concerning the financing of this research group.

Example 8. [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1, 229-235]

1 (2.9)

2 Ma  Sit kestäväs asumiskulttuurissa ni siit

Then in Conditions for Sustainable Housing

3 on se tutkimus(ch)elma valmisteilla (1.0)

the research (pr)ogramme is in preparation (1.0)

4 ?

k- KHr:

((clears throat))

5 Ma  valmisteilla ja yksittäisissä hankkeissa

in preparation and in single projects

6  →  mennään, (0.3) mennään mun mielest hyvä

it's going, (0.3) it's going on at good

7  →  vauhtia

speed

8 K  e()<

think a()<

9 Ma  e()<

think a()<

10  (1.8)

11 K  Energiatutkimus(raho )

Energy research (mon)ies)

12 Ma  

13 Kati Koivu ja (0.2) ja yhdessä turkulaisten kanssa
Notice how Karita comes in with her additional piece of information about financing right after Maria has ended her utterance. Her choice of the point of entry into the report shows that, for her, Maria's turn-in-progress was about to be completed somewhere around that point. However, this was not the case for Maria who, after Karita had provided her item and a clarification of what she meant, resumed her earlier report, though with a slight twist. Notice how in line 9, Maria had already tried to continue her turn, but had cut short her turn and had given way to Karita for completing her turn instead. After Karita's announcement of financing, and her clarification about the source of monies (in line 11), she first briefly shows that now she understands what Karita is talking about (“Oh yea”), and then goes on to a report of the study which had received a decision on financing (Kati Koivu's project in lines 12 to 14). After this perturbation, she gets back to the collective evaluation of the research group, which consisted of a general positive evaluation about progress (lines 15 and 16), and then a somewhat more shady tone shown in her noting that no studies are coming out from this research group yet (lines 16 and 17). Note 8

Interestingly, other possible though even more clearly evaluative forms, such as "fantastic," "great," or "lovely," were not used in the House, which partly accounts for the neutral, non-enthusiastic style of making evaluations in the House's formal activities. This neutral style is perhaps typical of workplace (or bureaucratic) discourse more generally. However, without comparative data, I can only note this possibility. More intriguingly, I could not find a single case of criticism done using explicit devices in my formal meetings data. There were cases of criticism, but in each case, criticism was accompanied with a set of reservations, qualifications, accounts, and so forth (I will come back to the significance of these features in Chapter 9).
Example 9 exhibits another explicit evaluation. This evaluation is from the Chair's "collecting" turn (see Chapter 4). It takes place right after Maria and Mikko had finished their two consecutive strings of reports. When Karita enters in line 1 in Example 9, all House research had just been reviewed. In this Example, Karita says that when she "technically compares" objectives in plans to on-going projects, her conclusion is that "we've adhered pretty well (. . .) to [our] plans," thus showing that in her opinion, research has done fine on the whole (lines 5 and 6). She then elaborates this statement by noting that progress has been "almost more abundant" than projected in plans. At the end of this collecting turn, she finally upgrades the whole statement by opening up a premise embedded in it: House plans are usually ambitious. Because of this state of affairs, the recipient can infer that "staying in plans" contains a positive evaluation. Performance is better than "normal." (In line 15, Karita gets to a project she thinks Mikko had forgotten to mention, but is corrected almost immediately by Mikko, Maria, and Anita). Note9

Example 9. [A 05/30/95:1 1(2) B:2, 622-636]
1 K
[8] [mthhh nii juu eli\] [eli
[pthhh Oh yeah so\]
2 jos jos nyt ihan vaan niinku\#n\# teknisesti
if [I] now just sort\#\# technically
3 vertaa toimintasuunnitelman ta\'votteita* ja sitte
compare the action plan\'s objectives* to
4 menossa olevia hankkeita *#nlin niin johtop\#tyt\#s
on-going projects* #then then the conclusion
5 on\#* varmaan se et\#t\#.hhh varsin hyvin ollaan
is\#* surely that that .hhhh we\'ve adhered pretty
6 pysytyy h (.) suunnitelmissa ja: ja tuot\#a\#: well (.) to [our] plans and and wel#1:\#: 7 tarjohtah .hhhh edistyminen (. .) (vaikka) sek\#a
the supply\#h .hhhh progress (. .) ( ) both
8 aikataulullisesti et\#t\# sis\#ll\#\#llisesti ja
schedule\#wise and content\#wise and
9 *my\#\s niinku\#* teemo\#jen osalta nin *on (. .)
*also sort of* theme\#wise* *has (. .) [been]
10 melkein runsaampaa vaikka tuoki on\#* (1.8)
almost more abundant\#even though* (1.8)
11 *#yleens\# meill\# ollu aina: kunnianhimoinen
*#we have usually had a quite ambitious
12 toi toimintasuunnitelma\#*
action plan\#*
Thus, after two strings of reports, there is a slot in which the director can look at all research in the House and evaluate it at once. It is in this slot that the "whole" of House work is visible for members, and can be looked upon from a generalized perspective. An important qualification to this statement is that the way in which work was made visible using "projects" as targets was rather selective, as we have seen in this and the preceding chapter. Still, it is in these slots that House managers get closest to a generalized viewpoint of House work. Note 10

Indeed, in Example 9, the Director not just evaluates all research at once, but also presents her evaluation as a conclusion rather than as an independent evaluation. This format ties her words to prior talk -- the grounds for the conclusion must be looked at in previous talk. This form is also rationalistic, and somewhat humble in that it suggests that given these data, her positive judgment is warranted: no matter who would be doing the inference, his judgment would be the same, given the state of affairs as depicted in Maria's and Mikko's preceding reviews. She also returns to the plans issue with which she opened discussion under item 2 on the agenda (see Table 2 in Chapter 3), thus displaying the structural and reflexive ground for her inference. Here she also closes an evaluative sequence consisting of two series of reports, and which she had earlier initiated (see Example 6 in Chapter 3). This turn, then, does multiple things, evaluation being just one of them.

The typology above covers the most important evaluative devices used in the House. However, note that evaluations can be made in other kinds of informal meeting environments as well. For example, informal meetings usually open with the Chair's opening turn that sets the agenda for the meeting. Within these opening turns, there may be evaluations in various tasks [A 1/24/95, 257-287]. In addition, while formal meetings are not usually opened before all important members are present (see Boden 1994: 90-91), the membership issue is not that critical in informal meetings. Informal meetings may be opened even
though someone is missing. Accordingly, some participants may arrive when the meeting is well underway, which prompts brief apologetic sequences that are sometimes followed by summaries of what went on before in the meeting. These summaries are brief synoptic utterances that may incorporate evaluations in the midst of more descriptive component parts. These evaluations may be done using both explicit [for example, A 1/24/95, 659-664] and implicit devices [for example, A 1/24/95, 1237-1287].

**Conclusions and Discussion**

This chapter has looked at how evaluations are done in formal meetings. As we have seen, most evaluations are implicit rather than explicit. Secondly, we have seen that evaluations are largely done in the report format, although a few evaluations appear in other environments as well. Managerial group discussions do classify work in terms of how well it is proceeding. If work is found to be adequate, it is reported in terms of plans, schedules, the stage of the study or, in the case of budgets, using the linearity rule or a comparison with some previous state of affairs. No further discussions usually arise if the project is perceivedly doing well. By contrast, if some piece of work is found somehow wanting (or particularly praiseworthy), accountability is made specifically visible. In absence of such discussions of responsibility, evaluations can be heard to be neutral. Most often, managers target single projects. However, in some specific places they may target more encompassing units as well. The Director, for example, at least in managerial meetings, "owns" those slots in which the whole of House research is assessed. Thus, evaluation is an activity that is done at multiple, loosely related levels. Managerial evaluations make House work visible and evaluable at multiple levels in various environments.

Still, it is mainly through the report format that members make work available for inspection, for review, and for seeing whether corrective action is needed. Overwhelmingly, it is at the end of the report format that the managers make evaluations that show how they valuate action in relation to some criteria deemed to be important in the House. Most evaluations in the House classify work into "good" and "bad" through subtle, largely implicit means. Possible subsequent managerial actions partly depend on this judgment; these
subsequent actions may range from waiting to see what happens to efficient negative sanctions (indeed, people had been fired from the House, I 10/30/94, 511-553; D 3/11/94, 92-110]). When every project is reviewed and evaluated in this way, managers learn where their action is needed, and are able to target their action to these targets. In this sense, writers such as Edwards (1979), Kast and Rosenzweig (1985), and Dornbusch and Scott (1975) seem to be correct: evaluations do indeed form an integral part in the practices of scanning work and helping managers to recognize deviations from the expected course of action. As Chapter 9 will show, these sense-making procedures, however, do not necessarily lead to managerial action. Rather, they are a precondition for remedial action, and relevant only if the managerial group finds out that managerial action or sanctions are warranted and justified. Thus, evaluation can best be seen as a complex collaborative interpretive activity that may, but need not, lead to social control at the workplace. All in all, it contributes to maintaining formal systems and making them a lived reality for its managers.

Finally, evaluations in the report format were done relying on "projects" as a target oriented to by members during the report format. Members used this target as a unit to make work visible and something that can be worked upon by management. Speakers and recipients alike maintained it to a great extent during the activities under scrutiny here. When held up, this unit "suppressed" other potential targets, and directed managers' attention to "serious" targets that can be found in House plans and other official documents. Perhaps due to this device, rationality and generality were maintained in these discussions which seldom went into much detail. It is worth noticing that when whole projects are used as units, several assumptions are simultaneously made. Projects are assumed to have an independent, tangible, and manipulable existence in addition to being observable, reportable, and reviewable. It is as though they are considered to have a factual status, and an independent existence that can be described with a rather limited set of attributes. In part due to this assumption mutually held up in interaction, projects appear for these managers as an objective and unquestioned order of affairs (see Zimmerman and Pollner 1970 [1990]: 95). Consequently, work appears for them as something that can be administered and managed. Interaction in managerial meetings is based on that same formally privileged form of perceiving the House that can be found in its formal documents.
Notes for Chapter 5.

1. A note about some positions in which some evaluative terms appear is needed before these analyses. Obviously, the simplest way to do an evaluation is to use the paradigmatic evaluative words "good" or "bad," either alone or in conjunction with some other elements. However, in the House many instances of words such as "good" did not perform evaluative work. An obvious case of such usage of, say, the word "good" is at the end of a meeting, where people in the House routinely used this word as a closing item [for example, A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 666-698] (compare to Schegloff and Sacks 1973; Boden 1994: 102-106).

2. Put here the long footnote concerning "subsidiary evaluations."

3. I will come back to recipient action in this case the next Chapter, so I will skip analyzing Mikko's and Karita's action here. It is sufficient to note that the recipients eagerly align with the reason for Marketta's work being overdue. - Interestingly, the secretary lumped Marketta's project with another project bound to be late, and noted that these projects will be late without the account given by Maria for why Marketta will be late.

4. It may be worth observing that Maria manages her string of reports in an elaborate manner by opening it with Marketta's case. Because she positions the only troubled case in the beginning, Maria is able to signal immediately that all other work in her group has gone well. Because she begins her string of reports with the troubled case, she is going to end her series with five positive cases. The trouble case will not be the last in her string of reports, and thus it will not loom prominently in recipients' minds when she ends. Nothing else, this organization minimizes the interactional significance of Marketta's project efficiently for several minutes in advance. She also built the item that projected an overwhelmingly non-problematic string of reports into her talk just before she ventured into Marketta's case. Due to this preparation, she is able to show that only one project is in trouble. Although it is placed into a prominent place in interaction, it is not alarming because her hearers already know that other projects are doing fine.

5. Why are there two evaluative items? Perhaps a strongly positive case is a wise policy after a somewhat negative case (Marketta). One way to do such positive case is to give two items that allow recipients see that the project is doing fine at all counts. Unlike in Example 3, there is no discussion that implies responsibility in any way.

6. How about why Mikko installs this item to talk now? One possible answer lies in the sequential context. Karita's note about data in line 4 introduces a slight side sequence to Mikko's report which is still non-finished at the end of line 2. After briefly paying notice to Karita's addition, Mikko is then in a position to get back to his previous track. Another possible answer may lie in Karita's earlier comment about data, which may signal suspicion, since it was given after Mikko had boldly announced that there is nothing special about projects marked as "beginning and continuing" in the yearly plan. When he, right after this announcement, began a more detailed review from Jari's project, Karita's "the data's been gathered" in line 4 may be seen to point out that Jari's project is not doing that fine. It may be that Mikko's turn removes this possible doubt from talk -- at least this is what Karita's "Oh yea=" in line 9 seems to indicate.

7. In fact, this project finally came out in Spring 1996.

8. What is this evaluation doing here? We can give the following conjecture. Notice that it took place in a Chief's "collective turn" (see Chapter 4) in which not one but several projects were evaluated before entering into reports about single projects. It appears that Maria uses this device mainly for a preparatory device for a more longer coherent report, which consists of telling how each project within this "group" is doing in terms of publication plans. Given this positive collective characterization, she may then present each
single evaluation in a light that is less positive without giving an idea that the group consists of failures only. This explicit device leaves little doubt about the character of Maria's general assessment. An implicit device would not have done that work as neatly.

9. Notice also that Karita's word order differs from the normal course analyzed in existing conversation analytic literature. The Finnish language has a relatively free word order, which plays down the importance of this feature. Still, her word order underline the importance of the price by placing it into a more prominent place. Also, recipients do not have to track down his forthcoming assessment term by conjecturing it from his previous talk; it is available at the outset.

10. See Lynch (1985: 56, 64, and pages between these two) for a discussion of how and how much work is really visible for various members in a research laboratory.
Chapter 6: The Local Organization of Evaluative Interaction in Formal Activities

Chapter 5 mapped in detail the ways in which evaluations are made in formal activities in general, and in formal meetings in particular. Chapter 3 showed that evaluative interaction in formal meetings essentially consists of a repeated string of reports made by various chiefs. In terms of a simple formula, interaction consists of Karita's agenda-transferring turn, followed by Maria's reports1...n, Mikko's reports1...n, Anita's reports1...n, and Petri's reports1...n. In addition, there could be collective turns within each string of reports, and Karita could do collecting turns at the end of the whole series. When this form of interaction is at work, interaction in formal meetings is thoroughly evaluative. Every other element in interaction is designed to support evaluative action. This form is called "the skeletal form of the meeting" in this study.

This chapter shows that this organization is a situated achievement. As we have already seen, this simple recursive local organization takes place in meetings fairly rarely; there are plenty of departures from this pattern all through these meetings. In particular, in many cases, recipients do not just listen to the speaker, but take part in talk through a variety of procedures. This chapter looks at these recipient actions, and provides a catalogue of them as far as they are relevant to the
understanding of the reflexively accomplished local organization of evaluation in formal activities. The importance of studying recipient action, furthermore, is also based on the fact that it is ultimately recipient action that decides what comes out of any particular evaluation. Recipients work out some possibilities in on-going interaction, and leave others dormant, to speak metaphorically. Those possibilities that are oriented to by recipients, in turn, become the basis for further action. How an evaluation is treated by the recipients crucially affects its fate both within this same interaction and, perhaps, its long-term consequences as well (see Linde 1997: 156), as Example 1 in the Preface, taken from Bosk (1979), showed. This evaluation led to a decision about whether one resident would be kept in a specialization program in a teaching hospital. If the managerial team's collective opinion gets collaboratively displayed and formed during evaluative episodes, then their importance may be considerable.

Table 1 provides a summary of recipient actions in the current data, which shows that the pattern of recipient actions related to evaluations is fairly complex, and that evaluations were received in a variety of ways.

The Table shows that recipients did several things in formal meetings. First, sometimes recipients stayed quiet and let the speaker go on without interruption. This form of recipient action maintained the skeletal form of the meeting. Secondly, there were several departures from this "withdrawn footing" as it is called here. These recipient actions can be classified into informationally-oriented recipient actions, acknowledgement tokens and continuers, evaluative recipient activities,
recipient-driven actions, and into collaborative evaluations. Obviously, there are various kinds of "evaluative" recipient actions. For example, in some instances, recipients treat the evaluation in clearly agreeing or adversary terms, which may become consequential for subsequent interaction. The notion of "recipient-driven evaluations" captures those situations in which recipients end up becoming the de facto report givers. The notion of collaborative evaluations, on the other hand, captures those situations in which the speaker had included such items between the identification and the evaluation that some recipient can "guess" the evaluation, and proceed to voice it instead of the speaker. These evaluations will be analyzed as instances of "collaborated evaluations."

Table 1. Recipient Actions in Formal Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintaining the Skeletal Form of Meetings</td>
<td>Example 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 The Withdrawn Recipient Footing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Departures from the Skeletal Form of Meetings</td>
<td>Examples 2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Informationally Oriented Recipient Actions</td>
<td>Example 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Acknowledgement Tokens and Continuers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Evaluative Recipient Action</td>
<td>Examples 6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 Aligning with the Evaluation</td>
<td>Examples 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2 Adversarial Recipient Action</td>
<td>Example 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Recipient-Driven Evaluations</td>
<td>Example 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Collaborative Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Maintaining the Skeletal Form of Meetings by Withdrawn Recipient Footing

Occasionally, regardless of whether the preceding evaluation was positive, negative, implicit, or explicit, no recipient action whatsoever could be found in my tapes.
course, this does not mean that the recipients did not do anything during the course of the evaluation. Still, there were cases in which the recipients did not react to any specific item given by the speakers. In the following Example, for instance, Maria does a whole report in lines 2 to 7, and passes to the next one in line 9 without any apparent orientation to her interlocutors. "Museovirasto" in line 3 refers to the National Board of Antiquities.

Example 1. [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1, 89-98]

1    → (2.2)

2 Ma  Ja sitten on tän, (. ) tän tyypisätä, # (0.8)
And then there is this, ( . ) sort of, # (0.8)

3 yhteistyöhanketta tonne Museoviraston suuntaan mikä
cooperative project with Museovirasto which

4 oli näis Karitan paperissakin mainittu tää, # (0.2)
was mentioned in these papers by Karita, # (0.2)

5 E:U=rahoitus (0.2) tähtäimessa yhdessä Museoviraston
E:U=funding (0.2) being aimed at together with

6 kanssa (1.0) Mut se on hyvin alkutekijöissään
but it is very beginning+parts

7 se .hhh se yhteistyö (0.9) siihen suuntaan*
It cooperation to+that+direction

direction* is in (0.9) an embryonic .hhh stage

8 → (1.2)

9 Ma  No (sit) Asumisen muutoksista nin:*:*:* Jotenki
Well (then) about Changes in Housing well:*:*:* Somehow

10 siit on koko ajan< (0.8) täl kirjattuki< Se
it's been all the time< (0.8) been written down< It

11 on (0.7) se on alkava hanke ja se
is (0.7) it is a project that's beginning and it'll be

12 täsmentyy ja (. ) oikeastaan mulla ei (. ) sen enempää
specified and ( . ) I haven't really got ( . ) any

13 siihen (1.2) siihen o vieläkä=s:anottavaks: eli:, (. )
more to say (1.2) about that yet so:, ( . )
Note how recipients refrain from speaking not only during the report, but also during the evaluation and after the report. It is important to note that this reception stance was not without its consequences for the recipients. By withholding action, they were letting the speaker pass with whatever she was doing. By staying silent, the recipients also withheld any cues about how they related to the speaker and to what she was doing. Earlier treatments of recipients "refraining" from participation in formal activities are given by Boden (1994: 143) and Manzo, who suggests that "the often long duration of the opening statements is permitted by the next speaker's refraining from speaking until the current speaker has completed her or his turn." Manzo continues, "In fact none of the other jurors speaks in these opening statements," and concludes by drawing an analogy: "Speakers in formal meetings do not receive the same type of response as do interlocutors in casual conversation, but resemble speechmakers addressing a silent 'audience'" (Manzo 1996: 116). In its basic constitution, formal meetings share some properties outlined by Boden and Manzo.

Notice the skillful use of pauses in this excerpt. There are two pauses, both positioned right between two reports. The first pause is in line 1, and lasts 2.2 seconds. The second pause, which lasts 1.8 seconds, is in line 8. These pauses appear to do several things. Most obviously, they give time to Maria to look at her (possible) notes and check where she is at the moment, and find out where to go next. Less obviously, through these pauses, the speaker also gives room for possible recipient actions, be these comments, questions, agreement tokens or
disagreement tokens. When this room is not used, the speaker learns that others, who could have done something during the pause but did not, do not have anything to add to the report or questions for her. Through an analysis of these pauses, she learns that she can proceed to the next report. Finally, remember that in ordinary conversation, pauses are taken as a disaffiliative item in an assessment context (see Pomerantz 1984: 70). Here, members do not seem to treat pauses that way; rather, pauses seem to signal unproblematic recipiency. The lack of continuers and other recipient activity during the report format is similarly a sign to the speaker that she can go on. Notice in particular the two rather long pauses within her report in lines 6 and 7 (1.0, and 0.9 seconds respectively): the report format is a collaborative achievement from the ground up.

This form of recipient activity does far more than it would seem to do at first. In essence, it allows the speaker to go on from one report to another without interruption. In Chapter 3, I argued that there is a basic -- to speak metaphorically -- "skeletal" form that meetings may take, and that this skeletal form consists of reports following each other until one speaker's area of work has been gone through. Now we can specify one interactional condition for this form. A meeting takes this basic skeletal form only when recipients maintain their withdrawn footing. If they give up this footing, and do more consequential actions during or after the speaker's reports, this basic skeletal form collapses into conversational exchanges, which were also analyzed in Chapter 3 (see also Chapter 7). Thus, the basic skeletal form in which review discussions (and meetings more generally) take place results from members' collaborated action
or, perhaps better, non-action. Furthermore, this footing made the whole organizational structure visible in the managerial group interaction as it is laid down in such formal documents as the Working Order and, in more specific detail, the Annual Plans. For example, when Maria proceeded smoothly from one report to the next, she also went through her subordinates' work without impediment. When, as in Mikko's case, others took more initiative, breaking the withdrawn footing, there was a constantly evolving local social organization at work in interaction. This local social organization could differ a great deal from the "default" organization in which each chief was supposed to report about work under his or her responsibilities. Thus, this footing made interaction "formal" in several ways at once.

This footing is rather rare. In the House, it took place mainly when Maria was reporting, probably for several reasons. She was reporting about research, which is largely individual rather than collaborative work. Someone cannot report about research unless she is intimately knowledgeable about what is going on in the various studies in progress. When a knowledgeable person reports about research, it is news for others. Contrast research with work with computers. Initiatives and complaints about computers and software arise from most members at the workplace. What goes on in some other study is far less visible for others. Also, she was an experienced chief who knew the report format much better than Mikko, who was a new member of the managerial team during my field work. Since he had only been a research chief for three months, Mikko often transferred his reports to Karita, and displayed in several situations that he
did not know much about the work he was reporting about. Finally, unlike Mikko, Maria was reputed to be a disciplined administrator who took administrative forms seriously. This perception is grounded in some features of reality as experienced by members. For example, she did not make jokes, or use vernacular in reporting, and did not call forth recipient action using such items as laughter tokens when she was doing her reports. However, this is not the place to try to single out why her string of reports was mostly received quietly. It is more important to note that a meeting only occasionally proceeded along the basic "skeletal" form outlined above. Usually, interaction in meetings took more varied forms.

However, in several cases, we can point out more specific interactional reasons for withdrawn recipient footing. In particular, speakers could lead recipients away from evaluations by producing further talk after an evaluation. This additional talk could "bury" the possible relevance of an evaluative item for recipients by providing a new item to which they had to orient. These actions could take various forms. Thus, in lines 9 to 13 of Example 1, Maria reports about one research project by telling that "it is a project that's beginning and it'll be specified [later]", and then continues that she does not have anything more to say about this project yet. Next she went on to tell about one researcher who was supposed to come back from Germany in the summer, and start to work on that project then. Here, the evaluative item, a description of the project's stage, was buried by Maria's further talk.

Similarly, Petri could also bury an evaluation in his accounts. For example, once he complained that he had had too
much other work to be able to install a sampling program onto the Focus Group Project's data base [A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 98-107]. In still another case, one project, installing a data security system, had already been done, but someone had tried to break into the system from within the House. Petri suspected that the hacker was Martti, a mathematically-oriented student trainee, which led to laughter [A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 116-159]. In contrast to Petri's defensive accounts Anita, on the other hand, tended to report at length about her activities rather than give brief reports about the current state of some project.

Thus, speakers could direct the managerial group's attention away from the evaluation in several ways and, due to these additional items, were often able to continue from one report to another without interruption.

2. Accomplishing Departures from the Skeletal Form of Meetings

The rest of this chapter will show how the House managers accomplished departures from this basic skeletal form, and what forms interaction took as a consequence of these departures.

2.1 Informationally Oriented Recipient Actions

In Chapter 2, I showed that management had varying responsibilities at the workplace. Their responsibilities were available in their meeting talk not just in terms of evaluations, but also in other ways. One way in which their position in workplace activities was available in talk was in the way they
oriented to informational issues in talk. Much essential House activity was based on the rather solitary work of researchers. Many of the most important decisions and actions that explained progress or non-progress in research were known to the researcher primarily, and occasionally to his or her chief. By contrast, work in, say, the information service was essentially done in large, rather expensive projects, and decisions about them were made in meetings in which Karita, Anita, and Petri were normally present. In general, then, knowledge about on-going work in that area was distributed to several members of the managerial team, while knowledge about research was much less widely available to them.

Earlier researcher in conversation analysis has paid some attention to some important interactional consequences of how knowledge is distributed between members (see Labov and Fenshel 1977; Tainio 1993: 156-157). For example, Pomerantz (1980) has noted that people who are seeking to know something which they do not know at present may try to elicit information from a knowing person by displaying that they have "limited access" to knowledge -- that they know something about the target, but not much. Not knowing something may provide a warrant for an unknown recipient's attempt to elicit a piece of information from a knowing recipient. Not so with "knowing recipients," who are people who have access to the events or targets talked about apart from what has been said. In a lecture originally delivered in 1971, Sacks noted that the way in which various participants of some conversation have access to the events described may greatly affect the way in which conversation proceeds. In essence, when several people have independent access
to the events described, they face the problem of who is going to talk and how other "knowing recipients" align to the speaker's talk. One typically troublesome situation is when spouses tell about things they have done together. Several kinds of problems are easy to visualize in this situation. For example, when one of them tells about something they both have witnessed, another may find this version boring, incorrect, biased, or problematic in some other way. Sacks suggests that one way in which the listening spouse handles this situation is by monitoring the story for its correctness (Sacks 1994, II: 443). "Knowing recipients" typically do such monitoring and repair trouble, for example, in the event structuring, delivery problems, failures to elaborate the story, and in the story's facts (Lerner 1992: 261-266; see also Goodwin 1981: 156-159). They may also use their "right" to speak on their own behalf (Lerner 1992: 265-266).

In the House, the problem of who speaks, of course, was partly solved by allocating reporting duties to specific managers. The "listening" problem, however, remained. Interestingly, the managerial team's solution to this problem was by and large the same as is routinely used by spouses and other "knowing recipients" in ordinary conversation: most recipient activities positioned after evaluations were informationally oriented in character. By this, I mean actions that oriented to preceding talk in terms that elaborated it in terms of its informational quality rather than in evaluative terms. Recipients could, for example, add information to preceding talk in their subsequent turns. They could also prompt more information from the speaker by asking questions. These actions treat the report format as a unit designed to provide information rather than as
an evaluative turn. Again, these "informationally oriented" actions could be placed after positive as well as negative, and explicit as well as implicit, evaluations.

Thus, in Example 2 Anita's comment about the manuscript in lines 5 and 7 is elicited by Maria's prior action. She had mentioned Anita's name in line 3 with an upward question intonation, and held a pause next, which Anita could take as a sign of a forthcoming query. When Maria then mentioned the word "manuscript," Anita finally knew what she was talking about specifically, and could take her turn as a request for verification (see Lerner 1992: 260). Though positioned after an evaluation, however, Anita's action is not oriented to the evaluation. Rather, it adds information to talk. Example 3 represents a case in which Karita ventures into expanding Anita's account of one project (lines 27 to 31). I have removed a side sequence from this example in which Karita further specifies the project Anita is dealing with here, and Mikko asks what project Anita is talking about. Example 4 is different from the first two examples in that in this case Anita, after hearing Mikko's evaluation of one project, asks what it is that this project deals with (line 5), thus eliciting a more specific description of the project. She displays her ignorance rather than monitors the report's correctness. Still, her action operates in an informational frame; it does not build on Mikko's evaluation nor does it lead to additional evaluations by Mikko. Instead, it leads to an informational turn by Mikko (and later, Karita). Evaluations are in lines 3 and 4 in Example 2, in lines 6 and 24-26 in Example 3, and in lines 3 and 4 in Example 4. Line 4 in Example 4 represents a typical way to initiate repairs when a
prior turn has had some repairable element (see Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks 1977).

Example 2. [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1, 182-190]

1 Ma Sit tää on tää, (.) näitten elintarvikkeitten (.).
Then here are these, (. ) concerning the consumption (. ) of

2 kulutuksest oli Pian ja Lauran hankkeet ja (.).
these food stuffs [there are] Pia's and Laura's projects and

3 Pialta on tulossa nyt, (1.2) nyt tulee Anitan (.).
Pia's got one coming soon, (1.2) Anita will

4 puolelle?,, (1.1) käsikirjot\nsoon get a (1.1) manuscript pt?,, (which is going to)

5 A
Me saadan sulle
We'll get it to you

6 Ma
[the press]

7 A

8 Ma

9 (1.4)

Example 3. [A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 413-458]

1 (0.7)

2 A No joo tää ol#i:# tää oli tota <sitten> se et
Well okay this was well <then> it was

3 sit >/täs on vuosikirjo\jen ja vastaavien
then >/here's the preparation sta\ge of the year

4 valmisteluvaihe< .hhh Tutkimus e::m tää
books and similar< [things] .hhh This e::m year book

5 vuosikirja on:: sikäli:m,h (. ) #ö yu# melko
of research is:: In a sense:m,h (. ) #e eh# pretty

6 pitkällä et nyt (. ) nyt siit on tota
far and now (.) and now there will be well

7 (0.7) [(.) tämmönen niinku kokonaisuuus-
(0.7) [(.) this sort of entire-

8 ((()mt tai paperipino pöydälle))
((.pt or a stack of paper hits the table))

9 A ensimmäinen kokonaisuuus käydään huomenna (sitä)
first whole we will go through tomorrow that
The first entire part will be gone through tomorrow

10 Irenen kanssa lävitse ja sit me käydään sen
with Irene through and then after that [we'll] go

11 jälkeen# Karitan kans tää lävitse eliikä .hhh
through it with Karita so that .hhh

12 K ye
   joo
   yea

13 A tutkimuksen osalta se on melko lailla< siin on nyt
regarding research it is pretty much< these registers

14 nään rekisterit (ja )
are there now (and) |

15 (: ((9 lines removed))

16 A on ollu puhetta .hhh tutkijoiden kanssa et katotaan
[there] has been talk about-.hhh with researchers that we'll

17 (sitää) sisältö lävitse ja mietitään sitää- katotaan
look at (its) content through and think about- we'll

18 sitä et mikä siel on relevanttia mikä siel on
look at what is relevant in there and what is [to be]

19 putsaamista ja siin on tota- siin on tätä ja
cleaned in there and there is well- there is this and

20 K joo
   yea

21 A siin on myös sitä ryhmittämiskysymystä mutta,h
there is also this question of grouping but,h

22 .hhh se saadaan nyt tässä vaiheessa sit ennen ku
.hhh [we'll] get it in this stage before [we]

23 jatketaan sitä o- siltä osin niin .hhh et se on
continue with it part well .hhh so it is going

24 siinä,- siinä mielessä pikkusen
in that,- In that sense on a bit

25 K joo ja
   Yea and (/I thi-)

26 A s l o w e r schedule
   hitaammalla aikataululla
   ja ja vuosikirjasta vielä
   and and about the year book

28 → toteaisin näistä kahdesta että että ne on osa
I would yet like to say about these two that they are a part of the development of Superman because we'll also evaluate when we'll see sorta by ourselves what is also evaluate when we'll see sorta by ourselves what is also evaluate when we'll see sorta by ourselves what is also evaluate when we'll see sorta by ourselves what is

Teräsmiehen kehittämistä koska niissä arvioidaan part of the development of Superman because we'll

myös ku me ku niinku itse nähdään mitä on also evaluate when we'll see sorta by ourselves what is

Teräsmiehessä, (et) mikä on sen sisältö .hhh in Superman, ( ) what is it's content .hhh

Teräsmiehessä, (et) mikä on sen sisältö .hhh in Superman, ( ) what is it's content .hhh

Example 4. [A 05/30/95:1 1(2) B:2, 535-546]

1 Mi /*Ja sit, (0.2) siit tulee viel tällanen erillinen /*And then, (0.2) there'll be yet a sort of separate

2 pamphlet and then [there]'s there's this project by Martti pamphlet and then [there]'s there's this project by Martti

3 joka h (0.2) must #etenee nyt tällä hetkel ihan which h (0.2) I think is progressing at this moment

4 ihan ( )>* pretty ( )>*

5 A → *Mikä tää Martin,*

*What is this Martti's,*

6 (1.5)

7 Mi s::E::: (. ) s:e: s:e: on s::: HHh seo se on i::EH::: (. ) i:t: i:t: is th:: HHh it's it is

8 A *(( ) ) ( ) )* ( )

8 Mi se on tää rajasuojan mittaaminen it deals with measures of trade protection on in these...

9 A joo, yea,
information-oriented frame. In Example 4, Anita adds a piece of information to talk. In Example 2, she asks a question designed to elicit more information about Martti's project. Her question maintains the referent, but is not evaluative, nor does it take a position on Mikko's evaluation. In Example 3, Karita maintains the referent too, but adds an item that shows how hearers are supposed to relate to the project in question. Although she reframes the way in which the project is to be treated by hearers, she does not evaluate the project, nor elaborate on Anita's evaluative "slower schedule" (line 26).

As these examples show, several actions are possible within an informationally-oriented frame, ranging from adding brief pieces of information (Example 2) to longer informational turns (Example 3), to questions designed to elicit more information about projects from the speaker (Example 4). Through these actions, recipients do several things. For instance, they display a different amount of knowledge and, occasionally, their analysis of the target to the speaker and to other participants. For example, in Example 2, Anita displays rather detailed knowledge about one project, while in Example 4, her question shows that she does not even have elementary knowledge about the project (but she is interested in knowing more about it). In Example 3, Karita does not just display intimate knowledge of the project, but she also shows an elaborate, independent analysis that is related to how the project should be seen to be connected to the House's other on-going projects. The differential distribution of knowledge in the House can be clearly seen in both this constant updating and in the collaborative checking of the accuracy of reports and making sure that many relevant
aspects are covered in them (see Boden 1994: esp. 130-137, 151-152). Since these acts are informational rather than evaluative, I will not spend more time on them here. An interested reader is referred to Boden, who has studied some of the ways in which members in organizations seek and elicit information from each other (Boden 1994: 110-129).

2.2 Continuers and Acknowledgement Tokens as Recipient Actions

The most minimal recipient activities in ordinary Finnish conversation consists of such responses as "joo," "niin," and "mm" (translated as "yea," "yea," "and "uhm" here. - See Tainio 1993: 154). When a recipient does one or another of these particles, his action becomes observable for other participants, who proceed to do their own analysis of his action, and may even display their analysis in subsequent interaction. Thus, according to Sorjonen, "joo" marks prior talk as uncompleted and offers a claim of understanding of that prior talk, while it does not necessarily assume a recipient's prior direct knowledge of the issue being talked about (Sorjonen 1997: 380). On the other hand, "nii(n)" marks prior talk as yet-to-be-completed and invites the coparticipant to continue. With a terminal intonation ("nii."), the latter particle claims recognition of what the coparticipant is talking about, while with a straight intonation ("nii(n)"), it is hearable as agreeing with such prior talk that assumed that the recipient does not have prior knowledge of what the speaker is talking about (Sorjonen 1997: 380).

Of course, most acknowledgement tokens and continuers in formal activities took place in non-evaluative environments. Most
often, these actions were evoked by some prior action that prompted and justified them. For instance, in Example 2, Maria's prior turn could be heard to be indirectly invoking a confirmation from Anita that Pia's manuscript was already being processed by the publications staff. After Anita's confirmative in lines 5 and 7, Maria's "yea" ["joo"] in line 8 shows that she has registered and understood Anita's comment. Most continuers and acknowledgement tokens were done either by Karita, or by the speaker who had made an information-eliciting prior move (this was the case in Example 4), and received a piece of information. Then the information-seeker usually took an active recipient position through these minimal actions that displayed recipiency while simultaneously letting the speaker go on. Most of these tokens took place in information-oriented sequences of talk.

However, acknowledgement tokens and recipient actions occasionally take place in evaluative contexts as well. Below is an example in which Mikko is transferring to a new heading in his series of reports. This heading groups together studies that are "beginning and continuing" (line 1). Mikko opens his report with a collective characterization of these projects in lines 4, and in lines 8 and 9. Then, in line 14, he continues to mention that another group of projects, consisting of projects that were not planned, is coming out. Right after Mikko's first evaluation in lines 8 and 9, Karita gives a brief token that shows not just that she has been listening to Mikko, but also that she is more or less in line with Mikko. Mikko has just completed his report, and has thus constructed a place in which other recipients could do something. In line 10 Karita, however, does not take a turn, but performs a more minimal action instead. Since she does not
take the next turn, her action aligns her with Mikko, and lets Mikko continue his turn.

Example 5. [A 05/30/95:1 1(2) B:2, 220-236]

1 Mi ="AL kavat ja jatkuvat" Nää on tota:
    ="BE ginning and continuing" Well: these are

2 K  (Sä jatkat kesä<)  (You'll continue<)

3  (3.2)

4 Mi #e:: ei:: (. ) ei:: ei ei# ei näistäkään niinkun
    #n:: no:: (. ) no:: _no_ no# these either do not sorta

5  (3.4)

6 Mi *Nii,*
    *Yäa,*

7  (1.1)

8 Mi .hh No osa alkaa ja osa jatkuu os#a osa# itse
    .hh Well some will begin and some go on some some in

9 asiassa (myös) valmistuu
    fact will (be) finished [soon]

10 K

11  (2.9)

12 Mi Ja to#ta:,#
    And well:,#

13  (2.2)

14 Mi @Ei musta näihin mitään< @ Sit niinkun (. ) no (0.2)
    @I don't think there's anything< @ Then sorta (. ) well

15 Mi tän tän tän (. ) #tän # siis niinkun niinkun näiden
    this this this this then sort+of short of these
    this this this (. ) #this# well sort of sort of in

16 lisäks on tulos kaikkee ninkun,
    in+addition is coming every+fort+of sort+of
    addition to these all kinds of things are coming,

17 K

18 Mi (.hhhhhhhh) kaikkee eks#raa# sitte
    (.hhhhhhhh) all kinds of _extra_ then

19 K  *joo*
Note that there are two more "backchannelling" items by Karita in this example. One of these "backchannelling" items, "uhm" ["mm"] in line 17, does not treat preceding talk in evaluative terms. Mikko's report is still unfinished and in-the-making. Therefore, this item shows that Karita is listening and waiting for more analysis. This action serves as a "go ahead" signal, or as a "continuer" (for this term, see Schegloff 1982: 81; see also Mandelbaum 1993: 253; these are from American English. - See Gardner 1997 for an Australian English specification).

In line 19, Karita's "yea" ["*jo*""] may be heard to align her with Mikko's evaluation, if Mikko's announcement concerning the fact that more than planned work is coming out soon ("everything extra" in line 18) can be heard as an evaluation. Notice, though, that here Mikko is in the process of evaluating research in terms of sets of projects rather than single, identifiable projects. Thus, it is possible that Mikko's turn is still uncompleted and that Karita's turn is hearable as a continuier. However, Mikko ends his turn with an announcement about "extra work," and holds a pause of 1.4 seconds. Karita interprets this pause to mean that he thinks his turn is complete. Her analysis becomes apparent when she continues talking in line 21 by naming one of these "extra" projects, thus providing a warrant for Mikko to put some flesh upon his otherwise meager announcement. Thus, Karita's "yea" in line 19 may be taken both as a receipt token, designed to align her with
Mikko, and as a continuer, or a "go ahead" signal.

It should be noted that the recipient who participates with these means gives out only a minimal amount of information about his own analysis of the target, or about his analysis of the evaluation. Instead of doing something that is analyzable in terms of the turn's content, the meaning of such minimal response needs to be inferred from its placement, and from the subtle features of its vocal delivery. Consequently, these miniscule actions may do several things in talk. First, they may display recipiency and may serve as continuers. Secondly, they may also put forth a claim of understanding, depending on their positioning in on-going talk. Thirdly, they may align their speaker with the evaluation-in-the-making by displaying recipiency and understanding when these evaluations are in the process of being made.

Usually, these particles are in places in which the speaker is just about to finish producing an evaluation, but has not quite done it. These actions do not usually produce marked changes in the speaker's course; speakers do not usually treat these actions as something that require notice. Notice finally that these actions are rare. It is as if members in formal meetings either withdraw from action, or do more consequential actions such as "informationally oriented" actions rather than use the "normal" everyday set of devices to receive evaluations.

2.3 Evaluative Recipient Activities

Together, the modes of recipient action analyzed above account for most cases of recipient action in formal meetings.
They kept the meeting largely a formal phenomenon that could occasionally get into an informational frame. This is where the interactional significance of these recipient actions lies. However, this is not the case with some other recipient actions. They display for members and for analysts alike that the recipients' understanding and analysis of what is going on is evaluative, and they may occasion extensive sequences of action that can be seen to be building directly on the speaker's prior evaluation. A typology of these recipient actions was already presented in Table 1. Instead of repeating myself, I will next analyze these actions.

2.3.1 Joining the Evaluative Mode Through Another Evaluation

If recipients join the evaluative mode, another kind of local social organization may be constituted and made visible in talk for a brief moment. It was noted earlier (in Chapter 5) that evaluations create the opportunity for members to coordinate their action in a concurrent fashion. If we follow this line a bit further, we may note that in making evaluations, the speaker not just introduces information to talk, but also takes a position towards the object being evaluated. Evaluation in this sense is an action that creates a slot in which other members may take sides with or against the speaker (for the notion of "position," see Boden 1994). In conversation, alignment with the evaluator is usually a "preferred" activity (see Pomerantz 1984; Schegloff 1988).

However, recipients may select from a large set of actions to align with the speaker in such slots. Continuers and
acknowledgement tokens, already dealt with above, are at one extreme. They may be heard to align the recipient with the speaker, but they display so little of the recipient's understanding that analyzing them properly requires a close sequential analysis. There are other actions, too, the most important being reception by another evaluation. In contrast to acknowledgement tokens, second evaluations not only display the recipient's stance towards the prior evaluation, thus locating it in the evolving local social organization; they also make the recipient's stance open and possibly consequential for subsequent interaction. Furthermore, the original speaker is put into a different position depending on the action given to him in response to his original evaluation. After continuers and acknowledgement tokens, he knows that others are listening and, depending on the positioning of these items, may learn more about how his recipients are taking his talk. In consequence, he may have to defend himself, or he may find out that his position is stronger than he initially thought as a result of an alignment by another member, by a subset of others, or by everyone who is present. Thus, the question of recipient action is crucial in understanding the local social organization of evaluative talk.

As Examples 6 and 7 will show, recipients could align with both positive and negative evaluations. In Example 6, the Director's turn is received by the speaker, Anita, with an aligning action. Previously, Anita had described SUPERMAN's recent link to the Internet. She had just finished her story by noting that SUPERMAN was programmed using the same programming language that had been used by the EU central bureaucracy in Brussels. Therefore, the House was in a good position for developing the
data bases further in the near future. She had then added that since Finland was a brand new EU member at that time, there were no Finnish-speaking information scientists in Brussels yet, which was also an advantage for the House. Then Karita begins to close the report with the following summary turn, which is given here before a more extensive analysis. Notice that Karita is ending Anita's long report, and is in this sense already aligning with her in lines 4 to 9. In line 10, Anita aligns herself with Karita who has just worked out the positive implications of her preceding report.

Example 6. [A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 2171-2181]

1 K  No ni, eli eli
     O:kay, so so

2 A  tse on kyllä yks yks
     It is really one one

3     väylä, (.) läh tee,
     way, (.) to start,

4 K  Eli muistiossa joka jo-
     So in the memorandum which was

5     johtokunnalle jaettiin ni tästä, (.) lyhyet
     distributed to B- the Board concerning this, (.) short

6     maininnat mitä (sinne), (1.2) tietoverkoista
     mentions that were (there), (1.2) about info networks

7     taikka taikka tie- tutkimusrekisteristä
     or about about the info- research register

8     (ja) mu(i)sta puhu#ttu Ni eivät siis ollleet
     (and) oth(e)rs [that were] sa#id So they were not

9     ylisano#ja päin#va s to i n ?
     exaggerations on the con#trary?

10 A  → E:i, ei ne o l i ihan: ookoo,
     okay,

11     N:o, no they were just

12     (0.3)

12     ((K. jatkaa seuraavaan esityslistan kohtaan/K. gets to
     the next item in the agenda))
In this Example, in which Karita concludes the Internet discussion, Anita aligns with this evaluation with her turn in line 10. By following her turn until the end of line 10, we learn about her opinion in relation to Karita's prior turn. In essence, we learn about some item written in a memorandum given to the Board. In that memorandum, a collective positive opinion concerning the House "research registers" (i.e. the SUPERMAN data base) was delivered. Also, an official tone was produced in Karita's turn. Not just anything is written to an audience such as the Board with its eminent members (for instance, at that time it was headed by a member of the Supreme Court who happened to have an interest in housing), and a measure of command over House affairs. For a brief moment, Anita and Karita act in unison, display their agreement on how the Internet project should be treated in evaluative terms, and ratify a positive opinion about it. A collaborative display of a shared opinion is upheld for a brief moment.\textsuperscript{Note3}

Explicit aligning actions exemplified by Anita's action in Example 6, line 10, were rare in the House. Most alignments were done using more complicated actions. These actions may occasion sequences during which participants take turns along the lines of conversation's turn taking system (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974) rather than some institutionally grounded scheme. For instance, in the next example, there is an action that displays recipient alignment with an item that has just taken place in talk. In the first few lines of this excerpt, Petri described one project named "the data and document administration, of the Housing Research /Institute," (lines 2 to
His evaluation of the project is brief and succinct: the project is still in pieces, just like before (lines 6 and 8). Karita joins this rather discouraging evaluation with a format-tying item "before" (Goodwin 1990: 179) and a jocular and commiserative "oh no:::" (line 9). A more detailed analysis follows the data.

Example 7. [A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 159-171]

1
(1.1)

2 P Ja sit(0.2)ten. (.) >Asumistutkimuksen
and Ethen hoUsing research
And the(0.2)n: (.) >To the data and document

3 omien tutkimusaineistojen ja asiakirjojen
own research+data and documents
administration, of the Housing research

4 /hallintaan,
administration
/Institute,

5 (.)

6 P Yhtä levällään #\ku.#
just+as in+pieces than
Just as much in pieces #\as.#

7 (0.8)

8 P HHennenki
HHbefore

9 K → Ennenkin voi että.=
Before oh that
Before: oh no::=

10 P =Tä mä on /semmonen murheenkryyni josta on
=Th is is /a source of trouble that has been

11 K m::m?,
uh:m?,

12 P puhuttu kai kohta kolme\ *vuot#ta (ja siinä), *#
talked about [I] guess for three\ *yea#rs (and there), #

13 (2.0)

14 P Joka nyt /ei sit pelkästään, (.) ihan mun:,
It is /not just merely, (.) just my:, 

Eikä hallinno- hallinto ei näitä tartte
and admin- the administration doesn't need these

Sanoo /mi(ten hyvä)
Says /ho(w well)

mut toisaalta hallinnolla on myöskin niinku,
but on The other hand the administration has also,

sanoisinko johdolla tietymlaisia
should I say The management has certain kinds of

velvotteita ja #säädöksiä miten asioitten
obligations and #regulations about how things

pitäis olla kunnossa #mutta?,,< .hhh /EHKÄ SE
should be to be fine #but?,,< .hhh /MAYBE IT

ON NIIN että tässä syksyllä taas
IS SO that we'll pull ourselves together#

ryhdistäydytän ja #ruvetaan sit
in the \fall again and #begin to look

>(Keväällä)<
>(In spring)<

(tutkijoitten kanssa yhteistyössä kattoo,
at that, in c ooperation with the researc)hers,

((kahvik./coffee cup noise))

/Sys:symmällä ku on enemmän
/in the fall when there's more

ai\#kaa::,#

ai\#me::,#

(0.2) ((ehkä jonkun .mt, perhaps .pt by someone))

$Just näin, (.) Hyvä Mikko, (.) Tän totesit
$Just like that, (.) Goood- Mikko, (.) You said

->( )()()( )(<

hyvin #vii-saasti.#
#very #wisely.#

Tää on Sliippi
this is [name]
This is the name of a
Although Petri's "Just as much in pieces as before" shows that this project is not doing well, and has not done well for a long time, this formulation, however, treats this apparent lack of progress in less than totally serious terms. Notice that "just as much in pieces as before," of course, may be a serious formulation. However, it may also be taken as a non-serious formulation which may suggest that for Petri, the apparent lack of progress in this project is to be taken in a relaxed manner in the first instance. If something has been "in pieces" before, there have probably been good reasons for that state of affairs.\footnote{This footing is ratified by his recipients. Karita's mock seriousness in giving her explanation for why the project should be taken seriously maintains an outwardly serious frame although she simultaneously shows that she is not taking the "obligations of management" too seriously. She makes this non-seriousness apparent with a less than totally serious description of her intentions in noting that "/MAYBE IT IS SO that we'll pull ourselves together# in the \_fall again and #begin to look at that, in\_cooperation with the researchers," in lines 21 to 25. There is something funny about being disorganized and weak-willed in a serious meeting environment when talk is about "obligations" that are supposedly serious things. Also, the idea of deferring a}
project to next fall with the qualification "maybe" in line 21 shows that this project is not exactly high on her list of priorities.

Karita's descriptions are interpreted in a humorous manner by Mikko, who makes a joke in lines 27 and 28. This item, perhaps a standing joke in the House, was immediately received in humorous terms by Karita, who notes jokingly that this is a wise idea. Petri joins in with laughter in line 33, after which Mikko explains the joke behind his almost proverbial "/In the fall when there's more time:" this expression comes from a song by "Sleepy Sleepers," a Finnish rock group of the late seventies, known for its spurious playing skills, and usually highly regressive and vulgar lyrics. Karita goes along with the joke in lines 36 and 37. Mikko's two turns, which formulates the humor found in the previous turns, thus form the platform for Karita and Petri to further ratify the humorous tone of the prior episode. Here, then, humor transforms the potentially serious implications of a lapse in work into a joke. Since several members of the managerial team, including the Director, show that they treat this lapse in non-serious terms, talk does not assume a more decisive character.

2.3.2 Adversarial Actions

In the previous examples, recipients went along with the evaluation in the preceding turn. Obviously, they did not have to go along with the evaluation. Indeed, recipients could, and did, occasionally take a different tack after hearing an evaluation. I will talk about these actions as "adversary actions." These turns
are not necessarily confrontational in the same way as in children's (Maynard 1985, 1986), or in adolescents' talk (M. Goodwin 1990: 141-189), where many actions are specifically designed to be confrontational and elicit dispute. Rather, we are overwhelmingly dealing with what Hutchby (1996: 32-34) calls "mitigated" oppositional turns. In contrast to "aggravated" turns, mitigated oppositional turns are done with those mitigating items that have been described by Pomerantz (1984).

Of course, these actions create various possibilities for further action. Sociologists and social psychologists have repeatedly shown that a person's judgment is highly sensitive to whether others are perceivably unanimously against him, or whether there is perceived disagreement in the group (see Asch 1955; Eder and Enke 1991). For example, Eder and Enke have argued in a study of how gossip is initiated among teenagers that "once a challenge occurs in a gossip episode, different forms of talk can follow, from establishing a new expressed viewpoint to setting up a framework for additional disagreement or exchange of opinions. Challenges removed the constraint to provide only supportive statements" (Eder and Enke 1991: 504). This keen observation shows that recipient actions do make a difference. Sequentially, they open up new possibilities for ensuing action. In terms of local social organization, they open up new kinds of trajectories for subsequent conversation. Adversary actions appear in two kinds of situations in the meetings analyzed in this chapter:

1. First, they may appear after criticisms. In these cases, recipients may counter the criticizing element in prior evaluation and thus in various ways "neutralize" the negative implications that might follow from such an
2. Secondly, and more specifically, when the speaker has been criticizing a project that is another participant's responsibility, the "responsible" person who is being thrown into a negative light may defend himself from the negative implications of the evaluation by going against the evaluation (Example 9).

In contrast to aligning recipient actions, adversary actions thus seem to take place in a few specifiable environments. In the House data, adversary actions are prompted by prior criticisms, especially in situations in which the blamed person is among the listeners and thus in a position to defend herself. Note5

There are various kinds of adversary actions. Often, they appear to be qualifications or informings rather than those clearly oppositional moves described by Maynard (1985, 1986) and by M. Goodwin (1990). In the following case, in which Maria is reporting about one research group, Karita, after hearing Maria's partly negatively implicit evaluation of one project in lines 2 and 3, proceeds to remind her about one important quality of the project. It has just been started, and cannot therefore be judged in terms of publications (see lines 14 to 24). There is a brief side sequence initiated by Maria's mentioning Uma's discussion paper which is about to come out, and might thus be treated as an exception to the more general evaluation in lines 2 and 3. Karita and Maria together note (lines 3 to 13) that it is an exception; it had been in preparation for a long time even before the research group evaluated here was formed.

Example 8. [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1, 243-266]

1 Ma ...ja ja (2.2/ehkä hhhhhhhh) mun mielest nää ...and and (2.2/or hhhhhhhh) in my~opinion~these are

2 etenee kaikil~ (mut) täältä ei nyt (~.) ei oo nyt progressing ever~~(but) nothing is (~.) isn't
3 valmistumassa sitte, (1.2) et se Uman, (0.2)
being finished now, (1.2) so that (0.2) discussion
4 keskustelu aloitte, h (0.8) *missä se nyt oli*
#pap#er, h by Uma, (0.8) *where was it now*
5 (0.2) [se] on painossa
(it)'s in press
6 K Joo ei o val-
Yea it's not read-
- joka on vähän niinku
- w- which is a bit sort of
7 A
8 K eri: eri=
-diff:- diff:-=
9 Ma =Se on toisen sorttinen niin on
=It is of another kind yea it is
10 K ei r i lähtökohdisita
(lähetty)
(written) from another
starting point
11 Ma ->Se on vähä
->Is is a bit
12 K liikke e #1 l e#
- initia #1 l y#
13 Ma niinku niitä taus-to ja<nii o-
like a backgro un d paper< yea it i(s)-
14 K Mut täytyy muistaa se että
But [you] must remember that?,
15 → (0.7) tuo koko- kokonaisuus on käynnistyny vasta
(0.7) this group only took off at the
16 → *viime kesän* lo#pulla ja: ja:# j-
itse=asiassa
end of *last summer* # and a:nd# a-
-In=fact
17 Ma (joo/mm)
(yea/mm)
18 K → Miraki on: (.). pää*sääntösesti ollu ihan* muissa,
Mira too has (.). ma*inly been stuck* on totally,
19 → (.). hankkeissa #kiinni et niin-kun#
(.) different projects # so that#
20 Ma Niin no
Oh well
21 Ma Mirra on
Mira has
Notice how Maria confirms Karita's qualification about the specific nature of Uma's work at the end of lines 9 and 13. Later she follows Karita's adversary reactions with a continuer in line 17 and tries to open a turn in lines 20 and 21. In this Example, Karita confronted Maria's negative evaluation by pointing out its wrong premise. This action also warranted Karita's action -- in competent and responsible managerial discourse, errors have to be detected and corrected before rushing to conclusions.

Occasionally, opposition takes more confrontational forms. In particular, recipients may not just contest the position taken by the prior speaker, but also make their disagreement apparent "in terms of agents responsible for stating those positions" (Hutchby 1996: 34; see also M. Goodwin 1990: 149). For example, if a prior evaluation has put somebody into an awkward position, that person may try to get away from this position in many ways. In the next example, Petri has just ended his string of reports. At this point, Karita takes the initiative and identifies one project that, in her opinion, Petri has forgotten. She goes on to identify the project, target her talk to Petri specifically, and evaluate the project with a rather exceptional format, an expletive in line 11 (prior to that, she has used a milder description in lines 4 and 8). In her opinion, the project is doing badly. Petri is the person who is responsible for this project. Thus, Karita is presenting him with
a tough challenge. Petri responds to Karita's evaluation by trying to turn the episode into a joke by noting that the "the year is only half over," in line 13. This item is evasive, and the almost laughing tone used by Petri suggests that he is joking. By treating Karita's prior evaluation that way, Petri suggests that non-progress in this project is not a serious thing. However, he receives a serious response that turns the episode into a brief blaming session before Mikko, in his turn, finds Karita's serious explanation laughable (Karita's lines are 19 to 24, Mikko starts to laugh in line 26).

Example 9. [A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 385-418]

1 K Siin on yks joka: olis, (. ) #ö:# this
   There is one w[h]ich would be, (. ) #e:# this

2 tutkimusaineistojen hallinta, h .hh ARkistojen
   management of research data, h .hh the management of

3 hallinta, Petri ei oo myös#kään# (0.2) #ö:#
   ARChives, Petri is not either# (0.2) #e:#

4 Asia kirjojen hallinta ei oo myös käään
   the management of documents is not either

5 ((kolahdus; noise))

6 P Niin
   Yea

7 K #(kunnossa).# Ne on ne KAKS jotka on
   #(alright).# They are the TWO that are

8 P "ne on nää ( )
   they are these ( )

9 P *Joo,*
   *Yea,*

10 (.)

11 K .nhhhh tÄYsin, *#y:::::* persee( ),
   .nhhhh tÓTally, *#e:::::* going down the tub(es),

12 Mi kr- R::hhh ((couch))

13 P Mut vu- vuosi on vasta puoles välissä,
   But th- the year is only half over,
Vuosi on vast puolesvälisäsä*

The year is only in half*

Mut siis niin ku

But then again

Joo

Ne on SEMmosia asioita jotka jotka:

They are the KINDs of things that:

jotka on niinku#u:m:e:# kun ne saadaan KERRan

that are sort of: f:e:# when you get them fixed for

Joo,

Yea,

kuntoon nii niissää ei ol sitte

ONCE then there's no trouble at

Joo,

Yea,

(vähä #hä:#lyn) päivää (k#u saadaan se)<

aII i:n them (when you get it)<

Nii,

Yea,

ÄHÄ HÄ HÄH

HH=.HHH

HEH (.HHH HHH .HHH HHH .HH H H .HH

NIIAN TOIVO (N Y V A N) -

[WELL] GET [Y OU] JUST K EEP H OPING

Nii just<

Yea just<

$/SAA DAAN (. ) VOI JUMALAUta\ Hei heh .hh hh$

$/WELL GET (. ) OH GODDAM\ Hey heh .hh hh$

(nyrkki pöytään/hits the table with a fist))

Niin

Yea

(Järjestelmästä)
(The system)
Petri's evasive response may have been prompted by Karita's exceptionally strong negative description about the state of the project. Whatever the reason for a playful receipt by Petri, this time Karita treats his receipt seriously. Petri seems to have mistaken Karita's serious action for a non-serious one (see Schegloff 1987: 206-208). The fact still remains that this report is serious, and it is done by a person other than the chief who is supposed to do it, according to the typical order of the string of reports. From Petri's point of view, the local social organization that arose around Karita's evaluation was at first rather hostile. With Karita's instructional explanation, the episode turned into a more rational instructional frame. When Karita's instructional turn was taken up by Mikko, who was quick to mock her opinion, the locus of conversation shifted away from Petri's difficulties. Petri was let off the hook.

2.4 Recipient-Driven Evaluations

In one case, recipient action had more wide-reaching effects. Though only weakly related to the preceding evaluation, this action represents an unusually effective departure from the typical set of recipient positions in meetings. Instead of treating herself as a "mere" recipient of an on-going report, Anita shows in this case that recipients may perform acts that depart drastically from the previous speaker's trajectory, and may become the indexical background from which both the speakers and other recipients act in the subsequent environment. Here the
primary trajectory around which participants align themselves is the one proposed by the recipient, not the one put forth by the speaker.

When recipients have independent, fresh, and relevant knowledge that warrants a drastic departure from the meeting's order, they may do large, non-projected actions, as the following example shows. In Example 10, Anita tells a story about the researcher Johanna's plans. Administratively, Johanna's work is Mikko's responsibility, and so he is supposed to give a report about how she is doing. However, here the primary reporter becomes Anita, who tells what she knows about Johanna's plans. To put Anita's story in simplified terms, she first tells that Johanna plans to defer publication for more than a year (lines 17 to 19), and second, that her reasons for not publishing anything fast are related to some political schemes designed to make her data better (lines 24 to 32). Anita's own opinion about Johanna's schedule is displayed in lines 22 to 23, and her opinion about Johanna's attempt to justify the postponement is in lines 31 to 35.

Example 10. [A 05/30/95:1 1(2) B:2, 360-413]

1 Mi .hh No INT:eg#raatio,#
     .hh Well INT:eg#ration,#

2 (1.2)

3 Mi .hh Hintaseuranta (1.2) elää omaa elää#määnsä.#
     .hh The follow-up of prices (1.2) has a life of its o#wn.#

4 (.) (Kyl se)
   (.) (It will)

5 (0.7)

6 K (.mt) Seuraava (kirjotus/tiedotus) oli (.) ennen
   (.pt) The next (press conference) is (.) before

7 Mi S itä s itä #T E H d ä ä n#
It is it is #B E I n g done#

8 K
Juhan nus(ta) Mīdsu mm(e)r

9 Mi
<m> m> < u h m>

10 (0.6)

11 A
Mā muuten kysy(in) mā juttelin eilen aamulla ku
By the way I asked yesterday morning I talked when

12 mā justiinsi- (. ) seura- ( . ) selvittäkseni näitä
I was just- ( . ) follow- ( . ) trying to clear these

13 (0.4) aikatau*$luja*$ .hhh *Nin tota kysyin (0.8)
(0.4) _sche du*$sless*$ .hhh *Well then I asked (0.8)

14 tolta (2.4) Johannalta ni (1.0) māst tuleeko sulle
(2.4) _Johanna (1.0) Then I [asked] whether your [study]

15 nyt sit kesäkuun lopulta (tar*kotan*) (1.2)
will come out at the end of June (I me*an*) (1.2) [will

16 valmis*ta* (0.3) @ö::ei::? tämän? , vuoden kesäku-@
it] be finis*hed* (0.3) @ä:no:t? this? , year Jun-@

17 ens vuoden loppu- ens vuoden kesäkuun
next year's end next year's June
at the end of June next ye-

18 *(lop
puun)*
by+th+end
year

19 Mi
*(mhh)*

20 K
(Höpö)
(That's
trash)

21 A
-SIIS VUODE YHEKSÄNKYT KUUS KESÄKuun loppuun
then year ninety siX Jūne by+the+end
THAT IS it should (end) BY THE END OF

22 pitää (loppu var-) .hhh /Mäst=että kAi\ sieltä nyt
JUNE NINETY SIx .hhh /I [said] Then SSurely\ something

23 jotain /MEILlek:i pitää MEIänni julkasus#arjassa
must come out /FOR U:s in OUR publica#tion

24 tulla# .hhh Sit se rupes mulle selittää et#tä#
series# .hhh Then she began to explain to me th#at#

25 tota .hh @Nin niin@ että ku marraskuussa tehdään
well .hh @Yeah yeah@ it's in October when thē
26 seuranta ja nythän on ongelma ku, .hhh next follow-up is done and there's a problem now, .hhh
27 ku >viime vuonna< oli vihannekset 'cause >last year< vegetables were so cheap then
28 ja .hhh ja tota: ja nyt tulee sitte taas kalliimpi and .hhh and well: and it's again going to get more
29 ja .hhh ja total: ja nyt $KHH he he he$
30 ja .hhh ja tota: ja nyt tulee sitte taas kalliimpi and .hhh and well: and it's again going to get more
31 ja siin ei tuukkaan sitte alenevaa sitte >Mä sanoin expensive and it won't come downwards >I said that
32 että ei kai me (iän) tutkimus o sitä et sun pitää surely ou(r) research can't mean that you have to get
33 tulla sen mukanen (siitä se pitänyt)# .hhhhh out according to that (That she didn't like)# .hhhhh
34 ja siin ei tuukkaan sitte alenevaa sitte >Mä sanoin expensive and it won't come downwards >I said that
35 että ei kai me (iän) tutkimus o sitä et sun pitää surely ou(r) research can't mean that you have to get
36 Mutta tuo#ta# ei hän nyt #tiedä sitte tuleeko,# But we'll# she #does not know when [it'll come out],#
37 K uh huh
38 ? m
39 A Tämmösen *vastauksen (mä sain)* This sort of *answer (I got)*
40 (1.3)
41 K .hh #Joo#
42 (2.0)
43 A Mutta mä en tiä onks teillä muil#la# (. ) *(jotakin But I don't know whether you have# (.) *(some
44 tietoo)* other information)*
45 Mi K - HRR:: ((clears throat))
46 K .hh No MEI1 on tuota (. ) meil on varmaan .hh Well WE've well (. ) we surely have
47 Mi? (hm:::)
Here, Anita is doing a rather dramatic action, if we think in terms of its sequential and organizational implications. It is almost as if she had prepared her turn before the meeting; this turn was certainly not on the agenda. Still, it builds on previous action in that it is being targeted at the project and the researcher whom Mikko and Karita talked about earlier. Also, her item specifies the schedule of the press conference, which was already touched upon by Karita in line 6. Thus, in terms of content, this turn is sensitive to prior items in lines 1 to 9. In terms of its consequences, it represents a new trajectory in talk, and thus still another instance of how evaluations can be made in formal meetings. The original evaluation was not negative, but Anita's story is both in terms of its content, in terms of how it was done, and in terms of the action planned by Karita and Mikko after hearing her story.

Notice that the supposed speaker, Mikko, and the
Director Karita both align themselves with Anita's story and to the flagrant violations of proper scientific behavior displayed by Johanna to Anita. These two managers display their attitude both during the story (lines 20, 28, and 30) and after hearing its completion. Karita picks up the organizational implications of Johanna's aims in lines 46 to 54. This example shows that recipient action may have grave sequential consequences. Furthermore, in this example, the local social organization of the managerial group evolves around Anita's turn. Consequently, it shows that recipient turns may have large consequences for how local social organization gets constituted in meetings.

2.5 Evaluations Prompted by Non-Evaluative Mid-Positioned Items: Collaborative Evaluations

In a place like the House, in which members have known each other for a long time, have been working together for years, and know the House quite well regardless of their official position (see Chapter 3), an additional possibility must be taken into account in regard to evaluations. These people may not work just on the what others have said, but also on what they think others are just about to say. Such situations are particularly possible in cases in which a speaker has already produced some talk, and has said things that provide material that recipients can use in such guesswork. Are there instances in which a recipient makes an evaluation on the basis of her conjecture about the speaker's possibly forthcoming evaluation and thus becomes a co-producer of an evaluation?

In browsing through the formal data, I found a few
instances of such "collaborative evaluations," as I shall call them. One of these evaluations is in Example 11. In line 3 of this example, Anita reports about a project called "Library and the reading room." After identifying the project, she tells what has been done so far in this project. The project essentially consists of moving part of the library collection to the House's basement. The first part of the project has gone well, a basement ("downstairs," line 5) has been arranged for the move but, as Anita notes, the project now needs more people (lines 7 and 8). When she enters the concluding part after a short pause at the end of line 8, Karita comes in, and fills in the description of the project's current state in lines 11 and 14. According to Karita, the project had been "tapered off" lately. Anita agrees, and weakens Karita's description with a euphemistic "it has (now) (0.2) been in a bit of a standstill" in line 15 before entering into the demand of getting more people for the project.

Example 11. [A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 1062-1079]
1 A   <Ja tota:>
     <And then:>
2   (0.8) ((sormien napsuttelua taustalla, Mikko))
     ((Mikko snaps his fingers in the background))
3 A   Kirjasto ja lehtisali on on <tuota:> (0.8)
     The Library and the reading room it is <well:> (0.8)
4   siinä vaiheessa että tota on nyt tota
   in a situation in which well the downstairs=
5   alakertaa=khrm,h (. ) alakertaa järjestetty mutta
="((couch) ),h (. ) the downstairs has been arranged but
6   <tota: > .hhhhhhhh se on nyt:=ö:: siel on Tanja
   <we:ll> .hhhhhhhh it is no:w=eh:: Tanja is There
7   nyt ollu pitkällä mut nyt täytys sit saada kyllä
   pretty far now but now [we] should really get
8   täätä toista ryhmää siihen mu#kaan, # (. ) #elikka
   this other group in#to #it,# (. ) #that is
Notice how Anita continues her report after line 5. She did not stop at line 5 after noting that the downstairs has been arranged, which displays that her report will still continue. When she gives the "but <we:ll> .hhhhhhh it is no:w=eh:: Tanja is there " in this context (line 6), her hesitations and word searches may also be taken to show that the forthcoming items are somehow problematic. Then she notes that the project has been progressing (lines 6 and 7), but notes in line 7 that "another group" should be gotten in. Again, there is the disjunctive "but"
that shows that progress is conditional upon something, which turns out to be "another group's" coming in to help Tanja, which she then explicates in lines 8 to 13. Again, there are word searches and a hesitation, which may be taken to reiterate the impression that something distressing has been going on in this project. At this point, Karita picks up Anita's line, goes on to describe the project's current slow progress ("=Yea it has.(*now*)... tapered off="), and thus displays her own understanding of the project's current state. Anita joins her evaluative item with "=Yea, (.) it has (now) (0.2) been in a bit of a standstill" in line 15 before going on with her story.

The important point in this evaluation is that Anita, who is the speaker and the chief responsible for this project and, by default, responsible for reporting about it, does not do the evaluation, but only joins with an evaluation done by one of the recipients. Due to the design of the report, Karita does not know how Anita would evaluate the project at the point at which Karita passes her own evaluation of it. Still, she can guess it, and shows that she knows the ground from which Anita is currently working by opening her first reception turn with a "Joo" [translated here as "Yea"], which displays knowledge of Tanja's current situation. Also, Anita's response in line 15 shows that she manages to make an evaluation that is in its essentials shared by Anita. Karita, then, acts on a few items that are available to her in Anita's talk prior to line 11. It appears that for Karita, Anita's word searches and disjunctive structures seem to create an impression of her unwillingness to state outright that there is a problem in the project. Here, items positioned between the identificatory component and the
evaluation prompt a recipient-driven evaluation, and all the supposed reporter Anita had to do is to align with this evaluation briefly before continuing with her report.

This case, then, shows that recipients could also act before an evaluation had taken place. What I called "mid-positioned items" (items that follow the identification but are told before the evaluative item) in Chapter 3 are important here. Of course, recipients know the target after the identificatory component in the report format. After this identification, however, they do not yet know what the evaluation will be. They can only guess it. However, if there are such mid-positioned items as stories and logical constructs (see Gill and Maynard 1995; Maynard 1996: 116), these items can provide the recipient with cues about the forthcoming evaluation, and prepare them for it. In some cases, a recipient could proceed to make an evaluation by relying on such cues even before the speaker who, indeed, may not need to do an evaluation at all.\footnote{Note7}

Conclusions

In this chapter, we have seen that recipients treat evaluations in several ways, and that both the course of subsequent action and the shape the evolving local social organization in meetings depends on recipient action. Recipients often withdraw from action and this way collaborate in transferring the speaker to the next report. Sometimes, their actions are oriented to the speaker's report on informational terms. Recipients may ask questions, and check the on-going report for accuracy and correctness. In many positions,
recipients participate in talk for a brief moment with acknowledgement tokens and continuers. The first of these three orientations maintains the basic "skeletal" frame of the meeting. The second of these orientations largely accounts for its information-oriented and factual character. The third mode make interaction dense by displaying recipiency and, occasionally, by relating some of the recipients with the prior evaluation. Still, the recipient who gives them out does not display much about how she relates to the evaluation. Many evaluations get buried beneath these three types of actions and their sequential implications.

Occasionally, however, recipients observably orient to the evaluation. After some evaluations, recipients may either collaborate in making evaluations, or distance themselves from the evaluation, in which case their alignment becomes more readily visible. In addition, non-evaluative mid-positioned elements may prompt recipient inferences concerning what the speaker means, and may lead to what I have called "collaborative evaluations" -- that is, evaluations made by a recipient rather than by the speaker. By contrast, when evaluations take place in a subsidiary position, recipients follow the main on-going activity rather than acting on the basis of the evaluation. Recipient action and its implications, then, can best be characterized as multifarious. Any attempt to understand evaluation as an interactional achievement presumes an analysis of what recipients do in evaluative contexts.\textsuperscript{Note8}

Existing literature is correct in that in the midst of all their interactional work, managers are essentially busying themselves with classifying and sorting work into categories
using the set of methods described in Chapter 5. The long-term consequences of evaluations are essentially an ethnographic question that will be tackled in Chapter 9, but a few notes here may clarify the issue. Out of examples analyzed in Chapter 6, only Examples 10 and 11 appeared to have any consequences for the projects reported on by Mikko and Anita. In Example 11, Anita argued for hiring additional people to help Tanja arrange the library. However, no decision was made at this meeting; rather, Anita's report was reduced to a reminder of the need to hire additional people for this particular project. The last few lines in Example 10 show Karita's plan to get Johanna, a researcher, back on the track laid down for her in the House's own plans. If Karita and Mikko did to talk to the administrator Joki (line 48), their activity was potentially very consequential for Johanna and the House, since Joki was the most important decision-maker in the ministry in matters relating to the work Johanna planned to do, but which was not part of House plans. Notice, still, that Karita found a reasonable reason for consulting with Joki -- the House's problems in doing what was planned -- and that no sanctions beyond consulting Joki were planned against Johanna. In fact, this was largely true of social control in the House more generally -- the use of power was an option of last resort (Emerson 1981), relied on only when other remedies did not work. Due to this stance, evaluative discussions in the managerial group were reduced by and large to progress reports that kept the managerial group aware of developments in the House. These discussions were only occasionally consequential in an observable way. If this feature is not appreciated in theorizing about the significance of evaluations, we easily attribute too much
importance to them, and lose sight of more essential practical and situated facets of this phenomenon.

In Chapter 3, I pointed out that formal activities may be thoroughly evaluative (see also Agar 1985: 156). This chapter provides us with some insight into how this evaluative character is achieved by members. Indeed, we have outlined several ways in which this evaluative character is accomplished in members' concerted activities. When recipients act in the withdrawn footing, talk in the meetings is entirely evaluative in that the whole discourse consists of evaluations and the reasoning that led to them. Every element in talk is relevantly related to this evaluative purpose -- for example, identifications of targets. When recipients act in the informational footing, they elaborate this evaluative frame but do not challenge its basic evaluational background. Rather, they monitor the accuracy of talk and make sure that the managerial team does not end up acting on wrong information or premises. Due to these recipient activities, talk still remains evaluative, although this evaluative character may be implicit in two ways: both in terms of the devices used, and in terms of recipient action. Of course, talk is even more clearly evaluative when recipients take part in the evaluative frame, or display that they interpret the discourse in evaluative terms in collaborative evaluations. Thus, an evaluative frame dominates formal discourse in the House, even though talk in these meetings is not always apparently and explicitly evaluative. (A major qualification to this result is in Chapter 7, where I will look at evaluations that take place when the meeting format collapses and a conversational turn-taking system takes over).
Discussion

This chapter teaches us several things about the assumptions in the literature reviewed in Chapter 1. In particular, this chapter has shown that even in a formal environment, evaluation is a conjoint activity, a fact little appreciated in previous literature. Existing theories, of course, may assume a context, but conceptualize it in terms of a rule in which some organizational or circumstantial situation is automatically linked with this situation by some rule rather than as a reflexive ground of interaction (the best catalogue of these situations is in Dornbusch and Scott 1975, pp. 145-162; for an analysis of explaining action by rules, see Wilson 1970). Furthermore, the very activity of evaluating is in these theories assumed to be an individualistic exercise done by managers who may then communicate the results of their deliberations to workers. These theories attribute order and rationality to action, although it is just that order and rationality that should be explained rather than taken for granted. As a corollary, these theories take the methods used by members to achieve that constancy and orderliness as unproblematic. Some of these theories are better than others, if we look at the consequentiality of meeting interaction on workers and the organization at large; evaluations in meetings do not usually affect action in any automatic fashion (see, in particular, Freidson 1980). Still, when the production of action is not focused on specifically, a whole set of assumptions are built into the conceptual foundations of these theories.
Notice that although I talked about action being based on the meeting's "skeletal" form, and distinguished this type of action from action that proceeds on a turn-by-turn basis in meetings, I did not mean to imply that there is no interaction during the report format, or during those episodes in which some speaker goes from one report to another without interruption. Of course, all interaction in meetings is construed locally; indeed, this chapter has shown that the basic skeletal form of a meeting is an achievement that occurs only when recipients withdraw from action. The "skeletal" form of meetings is easily observable when the speaker goes from one report format to the next without interruption. When this "skeletal" form is at work, interaction gets constituted around the agenda which, in turn, is constituted by reference to the chiefs' organizational positions. If some chief is allowed to go unchallenged from one report to the next, other participants, in fact, collaborate in achieving the participants' formal organizational positions in interaction. Here then, managerial action is organizational not just in terms of the devices used, but also in terms of the very interactional constitution of the meeting.

However, we have also seen that different kinds of local social organization may also evolve around this "skeletal" form. Due to many departures from the skeletal form of interaction, interaction in managerial meetings only occasionally gets constituted in such skeletal fashion. "Departures" from this skeletal form range from fleeting momentary alliances, exemplified well by, say, Example 8 where Maria and Karita argued about the grounds that could be used to evaluate one "research group," to more sweeping reallocations of positions, exemplified
by Karita, who could even give reports when Mikko demonstrated that he did not know enough about a project to be able to report on it. As we have seen, when these departures take place, they are largely informational in character. When they are evaluative, an evaluative local social organization gets constituted in interaction. We have also seen that these joint evaluative episodes may take many directions, and that members could maintain divergent footings in relation to the evaluation in interaction even in the face of other members' evaluations. These momentary local social organizations, reflexively available for members who are creating them, are endogenously reorganized in on-going action. Such departures end sooner or later, and interaction again assumes the "skeletal" character. Chapter 7 looks at evaluation in non-formal activities, an environment in which there is no such obstinate "skeletal" basic constitutive structure at work in interaction. We will see that this fact can be seen in several ways in which evaluations are made.
Notes for Chapter 6.

1. Of course, since I am relying on audiotapes, not on videos, it may be that there was non-verbal action relevant to the meeting's order going on. My reasons for relying on audiotapes were financial.

2. There is one obvious exception to this. Continuers and acknowledgement tokens may prepare a turn transition by displaying that some recipient is about to start to talk. If this is the case, speakers often treat continuers in that way. - See Example 16, lines 30, 32, and 34 for such case.

   Note that recipients' acknowledgement tokens are rather minimal in these meetings. They rely on "yea" and "mm" rather than on such more explicit items as "great," "awful," and "right" that are typical receipt tokens uttered by story hearers (see Mandelbaum 1993: 253).

3. Note that Example 6 shows yet another important feature of recipient activity. This example follows a conversation that was prompted by a report format rather than the report format directly. In the terminology of this study, this evaluation took place in the Chair's summary turn, designed to summarize Anita's long multi-unit report and the conversation prompted by this report. In this position, Karita's turn was designed to close down talk on this item, and transfer talk to next matters (here, she proceeded to give the turn to Petri). Furthermore, her evaluation was apparently hearable rather than explicit. Still, it was treated by Anita as an evaluation. This example shows that when faced with the Chair's turns, members may receive turns with means similar to those found from other contexts. Correspondingly, there is no need to study recipient action separately in different contexts.

4. That this project does not show apparent progress may also be a permanent joke in the House. Later in this same meeting, when he is told about the same project Mikko notes that "/All these things are dis\arrayed,# That is [really] #fine,# with a laughing intonation [A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 653], which is preceded by a laughter sequence about the apparent non-progress in this project [A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 612-620]. This project was taken up anew by Karita, who apparently forgot that Petri had already reported about it [A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 385].

5. Interestingly, positive evaluations were not challenged in the current data, which lends further support to those analyses (most notably, to Pomerantz 1984; Jefferson 1988) that have posited that it is difficult to receive self-blaming actions or descriptions of troubles by aligning with such items, since this kind of response might be heard as being done against the first speaker. It is easier to accept aligning actions.

7. For example, A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 38-48; A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 352-359; A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 11-250.

8. Why evaluations in some positions elicit recipient activities while in some positions they do not do that? This question would take us beyond this study, but a few preliminary observations may clarify the issue somewhat. A mixture of reasons seem to account for this situation. Some of these reasons are internal to the discourse, while some are not. Outside-of-discourse reasons are often related to knowledge issues (some recipient knows something relevant to the topic). Some are related to the managerial group's organization. For example, Mikko received much more assistance by Karita and other recipients than Maria. Mikko was a new member of the managerial team, still unaware of many of its practices and histories that lay behind its discussions. Maria, a more seasoned veteran of the group, was received in what can be characterized "a listening mood" instead. Perhaps due to her experience, she could better than Mikko guess what her recipients knew and what they were interested in, and thus could provide reports in such way that others got no warrant for questions, repairs, and confirmation requests. However, at each case, it was some interactional reason that accounted for recipient action.
Chapter 7: Evaluations in Non-Formal Activities

In Chapters 5 and 6, we looked at thoroughly evaluative formal activities. This chapter looks at evaluations in various kinds of "non-formal activities," where evaluation is an incidental phenomenon. These non-formal activities, first of all, consist of talk in the cafeteria and the restaurant where talk is plainly conversational, but may still be related to work. Secondly, they consist of "informal meetings" of various kinds (see Boden 1994: 86-87). Thirdly, there are some places in the vicinity of formal activities in which conversation's turn-taking system is at work. For example, during exchanges before meetings and after them, members orient to each other's turns on a turn-by-turn basis and are free to take a turn if they get an opportunity to do so. Thus, although conversations that surround meetings and informal meetings are topically focused in that they usually orient to the meeting in one way or another (Schwartzman 1988: 75-76, 124-125; Boden 1994: 87), turn-taking in these conversations is conversational in that there is no recurrent "format" underlying interaction that members use to make sense of and to construe their actions. Finally, they consist of what were called in Chapter 3 "conversational environments in formal meetings." While evaluative interaction in formal meetings is usually organized around a series of recurrent report formats, this organization occasionally collapses, and talk may drift
quite far in a conversational direction. If this happens, new targets arise for attention, and talk is not necessarily task-oriented at all points of formal meetings.

Two words of caution are appropriate before a closer analysis. First, my technique in writing this chapter is different from the two previous ones. Instead of offering a fine-grained analysis of evaluations in non-formal activities, this chapter has a more comparative aims. That is to say, I will assume the reader is familiar with Chapters 5 and 6; the current analysis is meant to show how evaluations in non-formal activities are different from evaluations in formal activities, and how these differences are related to the different procedural basis of activity. This chapter will show that the order analyzed in Chapters 5 and 6 is accomplished using a rather peculiar set of procedures. My second word of caution is that none of the analyses here aim at giving a full account of variation in each category; there are so many different kinds of "non-formal" activities that a separate analysis of each would lengthen the analysis too much. For example, when I write about how evaluations arise in talk, I have not given examples of every type of prior environment in the current data. What I have done instead is analyze a set of examples selected to show how variable these environments are, and how this variability is observable in evaluations. This tack is justified by the argument of this chapter; it shows that non-formal evaluations differ from formal evaluations in several ways due to the fact that managers orient to evaluation in different ways in non-formal and formal activities. However, the reader should remember that I am laying down tendencies rather than giving a full account of every
conceivable variation in evaluations.

How Slots for Evaluations are Constituted in Non-Formal Activities

The first thing to note is that the slots in which evaluations appear in non-formal activities vary. These evaluations are situated within several types of more encompassing on-going sequences and activities. These activities can be put on a rough scale. At one extreme, the very methods of constructing action provide quite predictable slots for turns that could house evaluable information or items. For example, this was the case in one meeting held in late January [A 1/21/95]. This meeting was designed to review the first few months of the on-going team change (see Chapter 2). In addition to the research management, the heads and coordinators of each research group were invited. The meeting was opened by Karita with a three-minute speech about the background of the change and the reason for this particular meeting. Her turn was followed by a string of reports by research group heads (who were occasionally assisted by the coordinators), each of which was followed by a managerial turn built on the report. In this turn, based on the previous non-managerial turn, evaluations could be and were routinely made. Before the closing, there were five such pairs of reports and accompanying managerial turns. In fact, the only thing that made this meeting "non-formal" was the absence of any firm agenda and publicly held minutes.

At the other extreme, there were informal gatherings in which evaluations were products of the moment rather than a more
regular phenomenon. For example, in one work group meeting [A 2/2/95] meant to plan the layout of one forthcoming book, Anita made several evaluations as if by accident. In one case, for example, she received a phone call from a national newspaper. When she returned, she was visibly angry. She shouted out that the call should have been directed to the ministry funding the study, not the House. The problem was that although Johanna, a researcher in the House, well knew that she should have taken the call (she was responsible for the seminar the journalist was interested in), she had not told this to the switchboard. Thus, Anita, who was the information chief, kept getting calls that embarrassed her: after all, it is hard to say "I don't know" if it is your job to know. In calming down, then, she described Johanna's inconsiderate (in)action in a disparaging fashion [A 2/2/95, 850-964]. But when there was no procedure at work directing talk into recurring reports, there were hardly any evaluations.

Naturally, there are many cases that fall between these two extremes. Occasionally, for example, the larger structure of interaction merely favors evaluations, but does not project regular slots for possible evaluations. Instead, there is an "action drift," where the managers who had originally gathered for one purpose end up in a decisional or planning discussion. This was the case in one informal meeting [A 1/18/95], summoned to hear the researcher Mira's (verbal) report about her recent seminar trip and talks with members of another institute during that trip. They had been interested in initiating research cooperation with the House, which Mira mentioned at the end of her opening report. In much of the rest of the meeting, Jari and
Karita went through the House's work, project by project and researcher by researcher, and assessed whether these projects would interest the other institute. In doing that, they occasionally did evaluations. Here evaluations were embedded in a strategy in-the-making.

Notice that even in the more structured end, all these evaluations are "spontaneous," drawn up at the moment, out of circumstantial materials. They were not, nor could be, prepared in advance in the same manner as evaluations in formal meetings. Of course, they were ordered in other ways, though the order of reports and evaluations in non-formal activities was based on methods that fall outside the scope of this study. Suffice it to say that most often, the reports were ordered according to the House's organization chart, or some other form of membership analysis (see Boden 1994: 57, 62). When reviewing research groups' work, however, the usual procedure was to open with more advanced projects that served then as benchmarks for research group heads who reported later.

Several non-formal activities, then, make evaluations possible. How and when were evaluations made within these variable environments? In what I shall call "speaker-initiated evaluations," an evaluation is not built on some specific preceding action (such as a question) designed to elicit the recipient's evaluative opinion about some target. Instead, an evaluation is installed into talk by the speaker. These evaluations take place in several environments. Some of them appear to be related to the management of topics in conversation (for this notion, see Goodwin and Goodwin 1987: 38-42; Tainio 1993: 59-67; for an analysis of the folk concept "topic," see
Schegloff 1988). They prepare a longer turn, or are designed to close down a topically coherent episode (see Example 5a later in this chapter). Some evaluations, instead, have more local tasks. For example, these evaluations are done to, say, back up a claim in an on-going argument, or to add color to an on-going description, not primarily to review work in terms of the House plans or some other organizational device (see Examples 3 and 4 below).

These evaluations contrast with evaluations in which the evaluator directly builds on the immediately preceding turn. This preceding turn may have been designed to call forth evaluations, but not necessarily. For example, in Example 1 below, there is an episode in which Anselmi, a project head, has first described his plans of arranging in-house seminars open to everyone, which prompts Karita to show that this is a good idea by describing the staff's reactions to a previous seminar. Her action may show that for her, Anselmi's turn has contained evaluable material, and that his turn may have been designed to call forth a managerial evaluation of some sort. I shall call these evaluations "recipient-initiated evaluations." Occasionally, evaluations take place in a longer series of actions. A typical example is a series consisting of a question, a reply to it, and the questioner's evaluation of some item in the reply. Another typical example of this type is a series consisting of a turn that gives rise to a tease, a teasing turn, and a serious evaluating reply to the tease (see Example 2 below). These evaluations are called "evaluations in third positions."
Some Features of Non-Formal Evaluations

Given the features discussed above, it should not come as a surprise that non-formal evaluations differ from formal evaluations in many ways. Table 1 represents an analysis of all the examples analyzed later in this chapter in terms of some attributes of evaluations.

Table 1. Non-Formal Evaluative Devices by Target and by Evaluative Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explicit Evaluations: The Assessment Segment (Goodwin and Goodwin 1987)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A forthcoming book</td>
<td>The quality of the book and its articles</td>
<td>Example 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A recent study</td>
<td>The quality of the study</td>
<td>Example 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An accounting system</td>
<td>The quality of the system</td>
<td>Example 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implicit Evaluations: Evaluations Based on Telling the Opinions Expressed by Other People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 The Number of People Expressing Some Opinion as a Ground for Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anselmi’s idea of arranging a standing in-house seminar</td>
<td>Interest in the eyes of the staff</td>
<td>Example 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Membership Categorization Device (Sacks 1972a,b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengt, a researcher</td>
<td>Bengt’s personality</td>
<td>Example 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) This Table is based on an analysis of examples analyzed later in this chapter. Notice that it does not describe all variation in evaluations. For example, there are no cases of voice changes that were occasionally used by members in evaluative ways [for example, A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 1155]. This table is designed to show that non-formal evaluations vary from one case to another in many ways, not to provide a full catalogue of evaluations along all four dimensions displayed here.

Even a quick browsing of Table 1 shows that evaluations in non-formal activities are in several respects different from those in formal activities. First, while in formal activities we found that members overwhelmingly constructed their action relying on projects as the main target, now we face a much more varied set of targets. In non-formal activities, targets vary from small
decisions (the price of a copy in a new copy machine) to persons and to the House members' alleged habit of thinking in too abstract terms. The second main difference lies in evaluative criteria utilized by the evaluators. These criteria are somewhat sensitive to targets. For example, when persons are targeted, they are often evaluated in terms of their personalities, which would be plainly eccentric in the case of projects. There was no such sensitivity in formal meetings, where almost without exception evaluations were made using either organizational and performance-based criteria. Finally, evaluations differ in non-formal activities from those in formal ones. Notice in particular the absence of those "organizational devices" that dominated evaluative action in formal meetings.

Given these differences, it is easy to see how consequential the report format is for evaluations. Thus, the report format performs multiple selective work, not just on any one dimension, but on several dimensions at once. For example, the targets of evaluations were usually different kinds of projects, which excluded other targets. As Chapters 5 and 6 showed, when members mutually bring in organizational devices as the basis of their activity, they maintain just one type of structural context as the reflexive grounds of evaluative interaction. Furthermore, this target type was almost exclusively used in formal documents such as the Annual Report, and the Annual Plan. Importantly then, through their obstinate focus on projects in their formal activities, managers reproduced these formal structures, which they clearly did not do in non-formal interaction. (For further discussion and analysis of "projects" as a unit in laboratory work, see Lynch 1985: 53-69).
In non-formal activities, where we do not usually have reports, the report format cannot perform similar selective work. Managers did not work using projects as a pre-selected object to structure perception and talk. Since various targets opened up to their perception, they relied on a varied set of devices and criteria in making evaluations. Consequently, the reflexive context they bring to interaction became more variable. Instead of an organizational context, they introduced various "contexts" into talk, ranging from their ideas about proper personality traits (Example 5), or the House's (internal) social organization (Example 1). In comparison to formal activities, then, there is little constancy in evaluative interaction in non-formal activities.

**The Local Occasioning of Evaluations in Non-Formal Activities**

1. **Recipient-Driven Evaluations**

   Occasionally, evaluations appear in an environment in which some specific preceding activity may be heard to call forth this particular evaluation; the speaker may be heard to be responding to this prior element. In this sequential environment, evaluative turns formulate some item in the prior turn as evaluable. The recipient may also show that for him, the preceding turn was not "neutral," but somehow designed in a way that projected an evaluation as a response.

   In the following example, Anselmi has previously noted that the flow of information in the House should be improved in various ways because there are many kinds of information. Then he
refers to a small internal information-sharing meeting held on
the previous Friday, and continues by noting that he would like
to continue arranging them. I have given Jari's reception turn
and both Karita's and Anselmi's reactions to it in this excerpt.
I will come back to them at the end of this chapter.

Example 1. [A 1/24/95, 1118-1148]

1 A (.) jos on, (0.7) *m-* mä luulen et jos täääl
(.) if it is, (0.7) *I-* I ṭhink that if there
2 on muitakin semmosi jotain kiinnostavia
are _other kinds of _interesting
3 yhteistyöjuttuja joista jo, .hh
cooperative things that, .hh
4 joku;,*#ö:::#* arvelee et(tä,) .hhh vois
someone;,*#e:::#* thinks th(at), .hhh [there] could
5 olla yleistä kiinnostusta nin, .hhh niin
be _general _interest [to them], .hhh well
6 tota se ei oo varmaa pAHitteeks jos
then it wouldn't really be a BAD idea if
7 jonkun pienen semmosen?, (.) tiedotus,-
some kind of small?, (.) confere,-
8 sisäisen tiedotustilaisuuden
internal press conference [would] be _arranged
9 järjestäis *(niinku et) tietää mitä tapahtuu,*
so that *(everyone woUId) know whaT_ happens,*
10 K → Niin ja ne voi olla ai,- aika spontaanain ja
Yeah and they can be pr- pretty spontaneous
11 → niinku,:; huomasin että *ihmiset oli:, muutki
sort of,:; I noticed that *people were:, _other people
12 → kun tutkijat *(nii oli niinkun), (0.2)
than researchers *(eh were sort of), (0.2)
13 → ilahtuneita (siittä), (0.3) viime
delighted (abou:t), (0.3 last
14 → perjantain tilaisuudesta eli, (tuota nii)
Friday's _occasion_ so, (that eh) it was
15 → kiinnostava muille ja:, ja tuota, (0.7) ja
_interesting to _others a:nd, and well, (0.7) and
16 \rightarrow (ihmiset mielellään), .hhh myös,* (0.3) myös (people were pleased), .hhh also,* (0.3) also

17 \rightarrow niinku >tietyyl tavalla niin,< (.) ( . ) sort of >in a way sort (of),< ( . ) ( )

18 \rightarrow (myös) sitten, (0.2) h- hallinnossa niin (also) Then, ( . ) [in] a- administration and

19 *(niin),* (.) *(toimisto)(näkee tietää)* *(so),* (.) *(in the office people learn)*

20 (mitä,) (0.3) mitä (ne) ihmiset on #teke#mässä (what,) (0.3) what (these) people are #do#ing

21 kosk#a,:# (1.4) sen pitää (kuulua tärkeänä),* beca#ue:# (1.4) it must (know what is important),*

22 (1.9)

23 K Elä, >nimenomaan että >siitä ei=ois, (.) sen Än:d, >precisely that >it would not=be, (.) not

24 kummemmin isosti:, (0.2) hallinnoitu tai really in a big way, (0.2) administered or

25 organisoitu, (0.2) tämmösillä:,< (0.2) #ö:# organized, (0.2) with these sorta:,< (0.2) #e:#

26 IDEoita varmaan löytyy kaikista ryhmistä, IDEas surely exist in every group,

27 (2.3)

28 J .mtnN:: Me ollaan varmaan vähän .ptN:: We are surely ((or perhaps)) a bit

29 liian iso organisaatio siihen että too large an organization for that

30 kAIkki tietäis mitä kAIkki EVERYone would know what EVERYone else is

31 tekis jos::,=.hh (. ) jOkaisen pitäis doing if::,).hh (. ) EACH one should

32 K \begin{align*} &\text{EI::, (olis -systemaatti*)} \quad \text{No::, (it would not be systemat*)} \\
&\text{KERRan kuukaudes kERR} \quad \text{too oma ONce each month tELl ab out his own}
\end{align*}

33 J \begin{align*} &\text{( ) ( ) ( ) ( )*} \\
&\text{KHR::, ((clears throat))}
\end{align*}
Karita's reply to Anselmi has several interesting features. First
and foremost, she shows that Anselmi's idea concerning seminars is good and it has already been proven to work well. Secondly, she shows her reasons for making this evaluation, as well as the grounds for her judgment. Other people liked the idea and its first test received good grades from them; also, seminars are useful for the administrative staff, too. Through them, the administrative staff, which does not directly work with research, will hear about what is going on in research.

Karita works here on Anselmi's prior item, and thus on an established referent, but adds several new dimensions to Anselmi's turn. Her turn transforms Anselmi's focus on "information" to the consequences of Anselmi's proposed information-sharing method. These consequences are presented in a good light. Apparently, no single item in Anselmi's turn prompted this response. Still, there were several items in his turn that may have been taken to display uncertainty and tentativeness. For example, there was an epistemic marker in Anselmi's turn ("*I-* I think" in line 1). Also, he was tentative and conditional throughout his turn. There were such items as "[There] could be" general interest, and "it wouldn't really be a BAD idea if some kind of small?,, (. ) confe,- internal press conference [would] be arranged so that *(everyone would) know what happens,*" all through his turn. These items could be taken to show that he is unsure of his idea. Thus, Karita may have oriented to these items in getting evaluative; her evaluative tone may signal to Anselmi that he should carry out his plans. A final noteworthy feature of this example is that Karita's own evaluation only indirectly comes through. She voices other people's evaluations rather than her own. She does an evaluation, but it is not clear whether she
is committed to this opinion or not.

Notice that it is difficult to "predict" this evaluation. Rather, it arises out of a situation in which Karita is able to hear Anselmi's preceding item in such a way that it might have called forth an evaluative response, and acted on this interpretation. Notice, however, that recipients could act in various kinds of "second" turns. For example, in another case, not reported here for space considerations, Mikko had asked about how many copies of SUPERMAN had been sold during the marketing campaign earlier in Spring 1995. In his answer, Petri noted that "*Unfortunately approximately ten.*" His choice of word ("*Unfortunately") displayed that for him, the campaign's results had not been that good, and perhaps also that he expected that Mikko (or some other member) could interpret his sales figures in less than flattering terms [A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 1421-1462]. Thus, members could perfectly well display their evaluative understanding in such actions as answers, not just in responses to descriptions, as in Example 1.

2. Evaluations in "Third Positions"

There are also evaluations in more complex "third position" interactional environments. By "third position evaluations," I mean evaluations that take place in a series that is (minimally) three actions long, the first and the third actions performed by one speaker ("A"), and the second by another speaker ("B"). A's first action creates a slot in which B may do an activity that is then treated in an evaluative fashion by A. A typical example of such a series is a question by A, which is
answered by B. This answer may contain material that can be evaluated by A; if it does, we may have a case of an evaluation in a third position [for example, A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 1155]. Another series in which a third position evaluation may arise is when an evaluation by A is received by B with an argument designed to undermine some important premise in A's turn. A can then counter B's turn with another evaluation designed to defend her prior position [for example, A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 2154].

In the following example, an evaluation is made in a third kind of third position slot. This time an evaluation takes place in a turn that follows a tease. As Drew notes (1987: 235-242), if prior turns are somehow hearable as funny, silly, ironic, farcical, extravagant, sarcastic, impossible, or overdoing some complaint, a typical response to such turns is a tease. Teasing turns are built so that it is apparent that they are not serious. Typically, such non-seriousness is made clear with laughter tokens, or with words that are recognizably gross, extreme, or even outrageous. Teases also recurrently attribute a deviant activity or category to the person teased. In Drew's opinion, teases are therefore hostile elements in talk, and a serious response is one way to deal with these possible deviant attributions.

For space considerations, I will only look closely at one case. The House had planned to publish a book dealing with the current housing situation in Finland from a comparative perspective. A joint effort of one group of researchers, all writers were House employees. In the managerial group, it was Anita who reported about this project. After discussing which papers were ready and which were not, Anita got to the issue of
the title. It is at this point that we enter the scene in Example 2 below. One researcher, Mia, had proposed a title for the book but, for various reasons, Karita is not enthusiastic (line 6), nor is Anita (line 8; Anita's reasons become apparent later in the meeting: she thought that the proposed title was old-fashioned and probably already used by someone). In line 9 Mikko, however, agrees with the proposed title and counters Anita's and Karita's contrary opinions. Karita then takes a step back from her initial opposition in lines 12 and 13, and proposes to accept the title in lines 17 to 21 after Mikko's turn in which he specifically mentions that this title describes the book well (line 15).

I have removed a sequence in which Mikko queries the reasons for Karita's halfhearted acceptance. Instead, talk continues when Mikko tries further to argue for the proposed title. In line 24, Mikko says that the title describes the book's contents "EXACTLY". Then Maria gets in, and elaborates Mikko's description by noting that "There are old and new *in that (same one)*" (line 28). Mikko adds then still another reason for accepting the title: it is "cogent" and, therefore, "Someone, (.) someone may buy it merely because of its name" (lines 33 to 38). Thus, Mikko ends up suggesting that potential buyers are rather silly since they can be manipulated by a simple machination. To borrow Drew's expression, we may say that Mikko's opinion displays something of his wheeler/dealer character for the other participants (see Drew 1987: 244-245).

It is this final element of his argument for naming the book as Mia suggests that is overdone and exploited by Anita, who does a recognizable tease in the next turn in lines 41 to 45.
There may also be a hostile element in her tease. Her "to be
disappointed... in the contents" may be heard to suggest that the
book is not so good after all. However, there are also laughter
tokens in her reply. These tokens show that her turn should not
be taken in a totally serious fashion. It is these features that
are oriented to by various members in subsequent interaction.
Petri laughs and thus aligns with Anita's tease, while Mikko and
Karita treat her tease in a totally different fashion. I will
come back to Mikko's and Karita's action after we are familiar
with the data.

Example 2. [A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 630-705]
1   ((kasetti alkaa/turn of the cassette))

2 A  Täs on /Mia heittäny yhden ot\sikon tänne?,.hhh
Here's /Mia has thrown out one ti\tl e'here?,.hhh
3 K   m:m?,,
4 A   .hhh "Asuminen eilen tänään huomenna" mutta
        .hhh "Housing: Yesterday Today Tomorrow" but does
5     vastaako se sisällöllästää,
        it correspond to the contents,
6 K    E:i(kä)  N:i(ge)
7   \(m\;m\)
8 A    Sitä  munka mielestä,
        It doesn't in my opinion, [either]
9 Mi  /V a s t a a\han.
      /Y  it does.
10 ?   ((kolahdus/noise))
11   (0.8)
12 K  No, (.) vastaahan siinä (se nyt) ((Tallberg:))
      Well, (.) it does in a sense (that) ((Tallberg:))
13 Tallperi
      Tällberg [is there] ((a well-known old Finnish name))
14   (2.0)
There is every element in it, ((ka hvikuppi/coffee cup))

It does, (it does)

Okei. ((In English in original))

*We'll accept it,*

*It was around (*

Okay, that's clear now.*

There is the past and the current *

and some tradition *

It is a book.*

Yea and it is a cogent name.*
Joku, (.) joku saattaa ostaa sen pelkästään
Some, (.) someone may buy it merely

nimen perusteella.#
because of its name.

*(Siit) tulee vielä ( )*
*(It's) going to come ( )*

Pettyaks(h)en
T(h)o b(h)e d(h)isappont(h)ed

si(h)t(h)e s(h)is(h)/ÄL
TÖÖN VAI
t(h)o

/$HHh,$

HA HA

HEH HEH

*$hm hm*$

on hyvä.
is good.

Ei /siitä
No /it

*$sh$ hh$

hyvää juttuja.#
has good things.#

Jo o
Yes

Mutta >otetaan< /yks vaan kysymys siitä että
But >let's take< /Just one question about it

tota pannaanks tähän jota:n muu:ta vielä.#
In lines 47 and 48, Mikko does not go along with humor in Anita's tease. Instead, he "puts the record straight" in his reply (Drew 1987: 230) by making an evaluation about the good quality of the book. It is Anita's suggestion about the book's quality that he takes as the basic point in his reply. There is first a "/N:o," (line 47) that immediately and vigorously refutes the main point of Anita's tease, and also prepares a forthcoming turn by showing that Mikko has something to add to talk. After a brief pause, Mikko rushes to give an evaluation "it is go\od" in lines 48 and 49, where he shows in no uncertain terms that for him, something is good, no matter what Anita says. I deliberately used the word "something" here: notice that it is still unclear what this "something" is. It may be either the suggested title, or the contents of the book. Next Karita joins Mikko with "No /it is going to be pretty go\od.", which aligns her with Mikko, who then gets to a more specific reply, consisting of "/It it it it [really] has merely has go\o#d things." (lines 51 and 53). It is this item that makes the contents of the book rather than its name the evaluated matter. Here an evaluation strongly rejects the validity of the main point of Anita's tease. Mikko's evaluation not only shows that her judgement about the book is wrong, but also makes it clear that the opposite is true.

As such, this episode fits Drew's description of teases. Therefore, there is little need to analyze it further. Instead, it is important to note that these overdone teasing turns may be received with non-evaluative responses as well; teases by no
means project an evaluative reply. Also, it is difficult to know what kinds of actions are received with teases. Thus, these third position post-tease slots cannot be built deliberately with an eye on making an evaluation. Instead, they arise due to the complex interactional interplay of at least two people engaged in ordinary talk. These post-tease evaluations arise from immediately prior turns, and are designed as responses to these turns or as responses to their possible implications.

These observations show that managers are able to make their evaluations observable in non-formal activities. Both examples above are "unplanned" in that they arise from interactional contingencies. Both examples are also not built around a pre-distributed agenda, nor are they based on formal documents of some sort. This is a general feature of non-formal evaluations. Since there is no recurrent format, chair, agendas, there are (usually) no strict time limits for any turn, nor a clear-cut mechanism for turn allocation. These evaluations do not utilize those evaluative procedures that were used in formal activities. Instead, we are dealing with evaluations that are clearly relevant to the managers' work tasks, but that are largely non-organizational in their outline. Finally, we have seen that the fact that the procedural background of non-formal evaluations is different from the background from which formal evaluations arise is observable in several ways in evaluations.

On Recipients' Orientations to Evaluations In Non-Formal Activities
The differences between evaluations in formal and non-formal activities do not end here. There are more ways in which the different procedural background is consequential for evaluations. In the previous examples, we have seen a wide range of variation in recipient action. In general, recipient activities in non-formal activities are largely similar to those in formal activities. For instance, in Example 1, several members maintained a withdrawn footing, which cleared room for Karita to make talk evaluative for a moment. After her turn, Jari formulated a presupposition in Karita's evaluative turn. Thus, his turn re-established an argumentative and factual tone in talk. Due to these recipient footings, talk remained factual and oriented to the House's main tasks for most of the time in non-formal contexts.

1. Recipient Actions in Non-Formal Encounters

In such semi-formal contexts as large informal meetings, turns are expectably long, which makes it possible for managers and other members to "construct and provide reports, accounts and position statements" (Boden 1994: 99, also 141). These reports, accounts, and position statements (where members make their position towards some item apparent) make it possible for them to do their essential work. Should there be constant interruptions, they could not make long and detailed chains of reasoning available. These, in turn, are an essential part of their work and a precondition for success in their work.

This kind of turn-taking system has important consequences for recipient action as well. First, when such a
turn-taking system is at work, recipients' activities have to be placed at the end of these longer turns if the recipients do not interrupt the speaker before he has finished his on-going turn. Thus, in Example 1, Jari deferred his turn at the end of Karita's turn which was unmonitored in that there were no concurrent recipient activities when she was doing her turn. Secondly, since the evaluative elements may be positioned in the middle of such along turn, the evaluative device may not close these longer turns; instead, there may be tag-positioned additional units after the evaluative item. If this is the case, the next turn is routinely hearable as being related to the last component of a long, multi-unit turn, unless some specific item shows that it builds on some item embedded in the middle of the preceding turn. This is the case in Example 5a-b below. Members' orientation to the task in all types of non-formal activities is observable in that the managers maintain a businesslike attitude towards things they talk about rather than taking a more sustained, collaborative evaluative stance towards work. There are only two exceptions to this rule: acknowledgement tokens and continuers, and some cases in which evaluations are recycled after some participant has received them with a businesslike turn.

1.1 Acknowledgement Tokens and Continuers as Recipient Actions

When there is observable recipient action at all after or during evaluations, members typically receive them in non-formal environments using acknowledgement tokens and continuers (see Schegloff 1982; Sorjonen 1997; Gardner 1997). There are plenty of these devices in the next example, which comes from the
same meeting that will be dealt with in Example 5. In this example, Jari ventures into a ruminative turn in which he evaluates one study that could be used in a cooperation project, and strengthens his proposal with a series of evaluations. Jari's evaluations are "speaker-initiated" in the sense specified earlier in this chapter. Since his action is not targeted as a response to any specific preceding turn, but rather at on-going activity as a whole, his turn does not allocate response turns to any specific recipient either. His recipients assist him in the construction of a longer turn by not trying to take a turn.

**Example 3.** [A 1/18/96, 1655-1672]

1 J Joo (. ) yks m- mä< tää nyt menee vähän ohi
   Yea (. ) one I- I< well this one goes now a bit by

2 mut siis (just) tää teknologiahan on (.hh)
   but this technology is really (.hh) the

3 koko tää niinku asumispalvelu- (.)
   whole this sort+of living+service
   all this technology of the supply of housing

4 'tten niinku tarjonnan teknologia jota
   service sort+of supply technology which
   service- (.) 'ervices which

5 meiän monet ju tut arvioi, Siis
   ours many things evaluate then
   is evaluated in many things of ours, Well

6 ((taustameteliä/unidentifiable noise))

7 sitähän se /on,
   that's what it /is,

8 K Kyllä joo
   Yes yea

9 J ja ja se m- mikä on oikeestaan yllättävää, ni
   and and w- what is really surprising, then is that

10 .hh MÄria ja Ari teki tän tämmösen teknologian
   .hh Maria and Ari did a sort of paper on technology's

11 J (. ) VAIkutuksia tulevaisuuden kaupankäyntiin,
   (. ) IMPacts on trade in the future,
Several things make the reasons for selecting these minimal response tokens clearer here. First, since Jari’s evaluation is unabashedly positive, it does not call forth any discussion about its correctness or justification. Secondly, he does his evaluation using the assessment segment. As the Goodwins (1987)
have shown, this format does conveniently call for recipient acknowledgement. Through selecting this format for making his evaluation observable, Jari makes relevant some kind of recipient action. Third, since he continues talking after each evaluation and fourth, since he is making an argument in his turn, recipients cannot take a more consequential turn until he is observably finished. Instead, they make their alignment with Jari available with continuers and acknowledgement tokens that are well suited to do just this in this situation.

These minimal tokens appear to do several things here. Generally speaking, they signal the speaker that the recipients are listening to him and reveal something to him about the recipients' interpretations of his interpretations of the references in his talk. As forms of feedback, none of these tokens work against Jari. However, they are all rather minimal in that they provide only minimal access to the recipients' interpretations and opinions. As used here, the assessment segment (see Goodwin and Goodwin 1987), appears to elicit tokens that align the recipient with the speaker, but through rather minimal means that, indeed, are typical of the speakers of Finnish (Tainio 1993: Ch. 5, esp. 154 note 1; Sorjonen 1997: Ch. 8; for these tokens in American and Australian English, see Schegloff 1981 and Gardner 1997).

What these items do specifically can best be understood by looking at them in detail. Since these tokens are fairly non-specific in terms of content, they may take several meanings depending on the context in which they were uttered. In particular, the positioning of these items is all-important here. By looking at the place in which some recipient gives a continuer
or an acknowledgement token, the speaker learns about what aspect of his talk the recipient specifically relates to and how. For example, in line 14, there is an acknowledgement token, positioned immediately after an evaluation. Anna's "yea" appears to mark out that she has paid attention to Jari's evaluation, and agrees with his assessment. In line 16, by contrast, Anna's "yea" does different work: here it appears to be a "go ahead" signal or a "continuer" rather than an acknowledgement token (see Schegloff 1981; Sorjonen 1997: 380). Karita's "just so" in line 18 appears to signal understanding and agreement. Here Jari is about to complete his argument about the benefits of team work, but he is not quite finished. Laura's "mm" in line 19 is similar to Anna's acknowledgment token line 14; positioned immediately after Jari's evaluation, it aligns Laura with Jari's evaluation, displays understanding, non-problematic receipt, and minimal agreement (see Gardner 1997). Her "mmm" in line 22 is another continuer that shows non-problematic receipt (see Gardner 1997). In line 26, Laura gives an even clearer positive alignment token, "yea just," in which the latter part makes explicit the meaning inferred from the placement of the "yea" particle. In all, due to these tokens, this episode is interactionally dense while simultaneously, these tokens let Jari continue without interruption. The way these tokens work makes it possible for these members to show collectively their enthusiasm towards the project Jari is talking about while Jari talks.

This example shows clearly enough that continuers and acknowledgement tokens may do lots of things in interaction. In particular, they make the recipients' alignment towards the opinions expressed in speech available to the speaker, who thus
gets to know how local social organization is structuring around his talk and the items he expresses. The most important point in this example is the way in which several people act concurrently in unison with an underlying evaluation-in-the-making. That was not usually the case in formal meetings, where recipient tokens were placed in most cases after the evaluation, if there was a reception turn at all. Also, when the assessment segment, which conventionally calls forth concurrent recipient action (see Goodwin and Goodwin 1987), was used to do an evaluation in formal meetings, it was almost exclusively embedded in an environment in which recipients oriented to the main on-going action in this environment rather than to the evaluation as such. Thus, even if the assessment segment was used in formal meetings for evaluative purposes, recipients oriented to it differently than they did to the assessment segment done by Jari in Example 3. In Example 3, this format prompted several members, not just two, to align with Jari's evaluation. Finally, although continuers and acknowledgement tokens may do lots of different things in interaction, they have one feature in common. Continuers and acknowledgement tokens let the speaker go ahead, with some insight into how his recipients are taking his evaluation. These items are not "noticeably present" here (see Schegloff 1968: 1083; Sacks 1994, I: 293-294). Rather, they are a part of the normal parcel of actions taken by people in the House. Again, long turns which contain detailed propositions, arguments, and chains of reasoning can be accomplished in interaction.

Just before the first lines of the following example, Petri had noted that a project named "improving office services" has not exhibited any progress at all. This evaluation initiated
an exchange that began when Maria said that in her opinion, there has been clear progress in the way the system handled invoicing and updating House accounts. Petri agreed, but then Karita noted that the processing of mail had not gotten any better. At this point, Mikko gave out a hissing sound "Sis:::=" (lit. translation is "then," but "what" might perhaps serve as well), which aroused laughter by Petri and prompted Maria to tease him about his lack of experience with this system. Next Mikko asked about the diary procedure. Maria and Petri began to explain the old system to Mikko, and Anita joined them. Soon, Karita came in and noted that the current system is much simpler than the old one talked about by Maria, Petri, and Anita. In the new system, all that is needed is that a chief writes his name onto some invoice or other document, and the system automatically takes care of assigning the necessary administrative codes to it. We enter the transcript next. There Mikko first notes that in his opinion, the current system is still pretty bad (Example 4, lines 1 to 6).

Example 4. [A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 320-335]  
1 Mi  MÄ mâ  en, mâ en, (.). mâ en, (.). m,−  
I   I  don't I don't (.). I don't, (.). I,−  
    { ( )}  
2 K  
3 Mi  (.). mus,− must, must se on,  
( .). I:− In my, my opinion it is,  
    { ( )}  
4 K  
5 Mi  must se on huono se:#(i:)# järjestelmä  
I+in+my+mind it is+bad that system  
my opinion that#:t:)# system under  
jonka alle  niit laiteta−an,  
which below those are+pút  
which they are put is bad,  
6  
7 Ma?→  Niin on,  
so is  
Yes it is,
After the collapse of the report format, where Petri had done his report, and after the eventuating talk, Mikko takes a turn and does a speaker-initiated evaluation here (note that nothing in the preceding context called forth an evaluative action). His turn contains an explicitly negative evaluation which accounts for some of the features of the recipient activity in this example. Since it is explicit, his evaluation creates a slot in which others know clearly that they are offered a place to come in, as the Goodwins (1987) have argued. Since it is negative, this turn shows that there is something wrong in this system in Mikko's opinion. This evaluation, signalling trouble, may be heard to suggest that if the system had been built differently, there would be no problems at present. By implication, this turn may be taken to suggest that there had been something condemnable in previous work. If heard that way, Mikko's turn may call forth a turn in which some as yet unnamed person might be held accountable for the trouble. If that person were present, Mikko's
turn might prompt a defensive action by him. Here, it is Petri who, indeed, takes a turn which is defensive in terms of content, and thus redirects talk to other issues with a comment that shows that although the system is bad, there has already been "huge" improvement. Petri's item thus turns the tables around.

Thus, in this example, there is a collaborated evaluative episode initiated by Mikko's condemnation of the current system. First Maria aligns with Mikko with a "niin on" ["Yes it is"] in line 7, and then Karita joins both in line 8. Through these items, both show that they evaluate the system in a similar way to Mikko (see Tainio 1993: 205). Karita's explanation in lines 8 and 10 further elaborates why Mikko's evaluation is appropriate (Tainio 1993: 204-205). More importantly, in lines 11 and 13, Petri adds a contrary item that shows that although the system is in Mikko's opinion bad, its progress has been "/HUge". Karita immediately aligns with this item when it is already in progress in line 12. Thus, a complex local social organization arises around Mikko's evaluation in this environment in which Mikko is first being teased for his ignorance of the ways of the House. Then, however, his defensive evaluation provides others with a podium that is used by at least two members to almost simultaneously align themselves with him, and one member to offer a contrary opinion. Just as in Example 3, there are several persons who concurrently and collaboratively align with an evaluation, which contrasts starkly with evaluations in formal activities.

Of course, evaluations could be received in adversary ways as well. However, there was only one case in my data in which an adversary action was done explicitly [A 1/18/96, 1273-
A more typical way to deal with evaluations was with some kind of "disjunctive" action. These disjunctive responses are a far cry from, say, children's oppositional moves and the sequences that children use to initiate and maintain arguments (see Maynard 1986; Goodwin 1990: Ch. 7). In comparison to children's colorful and often ritualistic oppositional sequences, the House members' oppositional turns are usually subtle arguments that unground the preceding evaluation by pointing out one or more of its premises rather than by opposing it directly and bluntly. In Example 1, for example, Jari ungrounded Karita's enthusiastic reply to Anselmi's description of a seminar held the Friday before by pointing out that the House is too large for a continuous series of seminars (Example 1, lines 19 to 32). This organizational implication undermines the idea that Anselmi's idea could be extended to cover the whole House. Jari's turn is oppositional, but since he gives legitimate reasons for his argument, it gives the appearance of a reasoned argument rather than an oppositional move in an argument.

The organization of action in semi-formal encounters has two important consequences for how evaluative action is construed in semi-formal activities. When evaluative elements are positioned in the middle of longer turns, they usually go unnoticed by recipients who oriented to the tag-positioned item instead. When recipients took talk in new directions, evaluation largely remained a one-person action, and became an isolated utterance rather than a starting point for a longer evaluative episode. Needless to say, action as a whole could still be ordered around an underlying task that was evaluative in character. Still, at the surface level at least, talk remained
non-evaluative, and was usually information-oriented instead. In fact, longer evaluative episodes were constructed only when some speaker obstinately recycled her evaluation in talk until others went along with it.

1.2 Constructing Longer Evaluative Episodes by Recycling Evaluative Turns

In the absence of the report format (or some other similar procedure, see Atkinson and Drew 1979 for how a judge directs talk in the courtroom) that quickly establishes talk back on a businesslike track, non-formal activities allow the construction of longer evaluative episodes in talk in a manner analogous to gossip (see Bergmann 1993: 134-138 who argues that there is no internal terminating mechanism in gossip). However, this did not turn out to be the case. Instead, managerial evaluations in the House's non-formal activities were brief and talk resumed its information-oriented and factual character quickly after these brief evaluative situations. For example, in Example 1, Jari received Karita's evaluative reply to Anselmi's description with an argument that uncovered a faulty premise in her turn. Instead of maintaining the evaluative frame established by Karita, Jari's turn redirected talk to a non-evaluative argumentative track.

However, this was not always the case. Sometimes a participant would make an evaluation, and pursue evaluative talk obstinately in her subsequent turns even when other participants tried to maintain a businesslike footing. The following example took place in one meeting in January 1995. There were six
participants; invitations had been only sent to the members of one group and a few other members. The meeting was built around the report of one member, Laura, who had been in a seminar in a rural town of Kuopio for a few days. She had talked to a number of other participants who were working in another government-financed research institute in Helsinki. They had been interested in cooperation with the House.

At one point in this discussion, members are dealing with a possible recruit for a cooperative project with another local institute. This recruit is Bengt Vahtera, a free-lance researcher at that time. He had been working in the House for several brief periods, but was not on its payroll. Still, due to his House connections, he was at that time a sort of semi-member. Here he is treated as a possible recruit. Karita says that Bengt has called her and asked her to call him back (lines 5 and 7). She points out that she is willing to talk to Bengt, and asks Jari to talk to Bengt. She uses the pet name "Benkku" for Bengt, thus showing familiarity with him. In the middle of her turn, she maintains a neutral or even a positive stance towards Bengt. In line 18, however, there is a case of a possible gossip opening (Bergmann 1993; Besnier 1989). When she asks rhetorically "What he would want to do when he grows up," meaning Bengt, she is characterizing him as a somewhat immature person, lacking in determination, and thus someone who cannot really be counted on. A membership categorization (see Sacks 1972a; for a discussion of "positioned devices" see Sacks 1994, I: 585) is used here to show that Bengt is somewhat childlike.

Example 5a. [A 1/18/95, 2082-2095]
1 K =r̕ Sillon, tajas meijän ohi: taas sitte
Then, again besides us again

( )

ihän että ei välittämättä >niinku meihin< just not necessarily >sort of bound to

sidottuna mutta, (.). Mä en tiedä miten se us <but, (.). I don't know how

Benkku >mul on n-< /Vahteran Benkun, [pet name] I have [name] [pet name]
Benkku >I have n-< /a call request from

J

soittopyynnöt, Mä yritän sen (.). kanssa (saaha)
Benkku Vahtera I'll try (to set up) (.). meeting

J

*mm,*
*uhm,*

K tarpamisen että ois hyvä kuulla miten(kä,) with him so that It would be good to hear how

J

*joo,*
*yea,*

K Jari sitä sitä, (.). (evaluates) <surely [he] thinks

J

sitä et miten se ( )((ei kuulu)) about how (inaudible)

J

*mm

uhm

K ( ) *kanssa (näit tutkimus sopii sille)* *
( ) *with him (how this research fits him)*

J

*joo, joo,* .hjoo
*yea, yea,* .hyea

(0.2)

K MIitä hän haluais isona tehä, niin, (.). niin että
What he would want to do when he grows up, (.). so is

K suuntautuuko se tuohon, (että) [question] it to that
direct+he going to direct to that, (that)

J

*mm*, (.). nii,*
*uhm*, (.). yea,*
Through several features of her turn, Karita shows her doubts about Bengt, but at no point does she tell exactly whether she thinks that Bengt should be called in to help in cooperation with the second institute. First, there is the component that shows that Karita does not want to integrate Bengt into the House. She specifically opens her utterance by saying that "besides us again just not necessarily, . . . bound to us" (lines 1 to 3). Secondly, she asks Jari to talk to Bengt and to think about Bengt's recent research interests in lines 11 to 15. Thirdly, she underlines the fact that she has not contacted Bengt; instead, Bengt has been calling her, trying to arrange a meeting with her (lines 5 and 7). Fourthly, there is the membership categorization device in lines 18 and 19 that clearly shows that in Karita's opinion, Bengt is not necessarily reliable. Finally, at no point, does she say exactly whether Bengt should be called in.

Thus, there are several things that make her turn hearable as displaying reservations towards Bengt. Still, the context clearly shows that Bengt is a possible recruit. After all, the last 20 minutes of this meetings had concentrated on finding possible projects for the cooperation. When Bengt was mentioned in this context, it was clear that he was considered a candidate. Also, Karita says that she is going to call Bengt, and suggests that Jari assesses Bengt's plans. These items suggest openness towards Bengt. Notice finally that Karita ends her opening turn with a rhetorical question in lines 18 and 19, thus creating an additional possible anchoring point for the next speaker. The next speaker can either proceed to give an answer to the question of Bengt's interests or orient to the hint about his
personality.

Thus, there were two possible ways to build on Karita's opening turn. Laura took the next turn and chose to maintain a conspicuously businesslike footing. She picked up the turn right after Karita had closed her turn, and went on to tell a story about her relatively recent discussion with Bengt, in which she had told him about some data available for analysis. Then she continues to tell about a December meeting with representatives of The Family Federation of Finland'. The Family Federation had some semi-processed data about how people use appliances'. Since this institute had not processed these data into reports, they would like to have someone to do it. Because Bengt had been interested in how the people-technology relationship is studied by researchers, Laura wanted to create a contact between Bengt and the Family Federation. Jari agrees with this idea in lines 44 and 46.

Example 5b. (continues) [A 1/18/95, 2082-2095]

21 L → No siis se mitä mä Benkun kanssa pyhuin
    Well then what I talked with Benkku

22 J
    *(just)*
    *(just)*

23 L silloin: #e:# silloin syksyyn sis: tossa
    then: #e:# then in the fall- in

24 .phhh jouluuussa, (0.4) niin tavallaan
    .phhh December, (0.4) well then it was

25 oli just se #et et# et meiltä vois saaha keis#sejä,#
    just #that that# that [He] could get ca#ses,# from us

26 (1.6)

27 L eli eli niinku tavallaan (0.2) s-
    so so sort of in a way (0.2) s-

28 Väestöliiton tapaamisen jälkeen n- niinku
    after a meeting in The Family Federation t-
Väestöliitto (oli) tehnyt hirveen paljon
The Family Federation (had) produced terribly much

materialia mitä oli viety. 
material that had been taken.

puolitiehen, eli=
>way only,< so that=

=niin= 
=yea=

=eli (niiltä puuttuu) raportit
=so reports (are lacking) (they)

*( )*

pystytty mi
tti pitemmälle ja
able to think

niillä On, (0.5) HUOMattavan, rikas
they HAVE (0.5) a CONsiderably, rich

aineisto siinä sii
-data in there in the sort of.

mm
uhm

hjoo
hyea

In a way (for that) for example for how

(siihen käyttäjään on yritetty
(the user has been tried

esimerkiks lähestyä,)=
to be approached,)=

*Sinä, se on (.)(Kyllä,)*
*There, it IS (.)(Yes,)*
but not to its evaluative features. Instead, Laura's action shifts the locus of action away from the evaluative elements in Karita's prior turn. Laura's turn is "doing being businesslike," to paraphrase the heading of a paper by Sacks (1984a). For example, the knowledge she displays is based on her discussion with Bengt, and she talks knowingly about the Family Federation's data. Also, her turn is constructive: she suggests that there would be data for Bengt who by then had been looking for data for some time. Furthermore, her turn is strategic as well. Both the House's and the Family Federation's interests, as well as the interests of the Institute talked about in this meeting, would be well served should her proposal work out. Bengt's interests would be served as well.

Laura's action in Example 5b is not adversary in any visible manner, for two reasons. First, she is not undermining Karita's prior turn. Instead, she takes the reference established by Karita, and adds her own part to it. Secondly, Karita's prior turn essentially projects two kinds of responses: after Karita finished her opening turn in line 19, the next speaker could either go along with the evaluative item implicit in her turn, or go along with her question about the direction in Bengt wants to go in the future. Laura takes the latter option, and tells what she knows about Bengt's future plans. Since she builds on one possibility projected by the prior turn, no sense of an adversary (or dispreferred) action arises. Still, her turn manages to "bury" the relevance of Karita's derogative characterization in Example 5a's lines 18 and 19.

Example 5c below continues directly from Example 5b. As already mentioned in analyzing Example 5b, Karita did not take
Laura's businesslike reply to her prior turn at face value. Instead, after Laura had finished her turn, Karita recycles her criticism of Bengt, but now more forcefully than in her original formulation (lines 18 and 19 of Example 5a). In line 49, Karita criticizes Bengt for not having found "the big picture." Here she turns the episode away from Laura's suggestion and begins to criticize Bengt by expanding her previous membership categorization (Sacks 1972a,b) that would otherwise have been "buried" beneath Laura's businesslike turn and Jari's initial acceptance of Laura's idea.

**Example 5c.** [A 1/18/95, 2106-2124]

47 L Ja se VOIS OLLA ETTÄ (#e:#) BENKun
And it [COULD BE THAT (#e:#) BENKku]

48 K [Mut siin on se, siin on se, BEN
(There is that, there is that, BENkun

49 pitäis ensin se oma iho,− iso kehyksensä
should FIRST find his bih,− big picture

50 niirikku löytää
in a way

51 J −Nii ja OMA: HA LUNsa,
Yea and (TO SH OW) his

52 K O M A H A L U N S A
own his desire
(T O S H OW)

53 J niiriku< /MIKÄÄN, MUU\
sort of< /NOTHING,− ELSE\n
54 K (P A L j a s t a a)
to uncover
his O W N D E S I R E

55 J ei, sit KU ON SE OMA
won 't, only WHEN [HE] HAS HIS

56 K SE ON TÄSSÄ se,
koska me
IT IS the point HERE , because

57 L

58 J rVOI KU< EI (.) #E− JOO− ei− ei#
Here, Karita pursues her criticism of Bengt by recycling her earlier doubts about him. She first displays Bengt as a person whose ambition for impossibly large things is inhibitive. She then shows that her doubt about Bengt goes deeper than Laura's turn seems to imply. If there is a problem with Bengt for Laura, it is because he does not have suitable data that he could use in his own work. By contrast, for Karita Bengt is not like any other researcher, and the competencies assumed for every researcher cannot be assumed for him (see Garfinkel 1963: 212-123; Smith 1974: 261; D. Smith 1990: 70-74).

This time, Karita is more successful in targeting Bengt in negative terms than in her prior attempt to open up talk about Bengt. In particular, Jari aligns with her turn in lines 51 to 58. In these lines he turns Karita's prior comment about Bengt's "big picture" into a question of "lacking will." Through this item, Jari gets back to the character issue that was temporarily set aside in Laura's and Karita's preceding turns. He also aligns with Karita by formulating Bengt's problem as one of lacking "desire." Karita immediately picks up Jari's words and goes ahead with this item after Jari's turn. By picking up the key phrase of Jari's turn, she aligns herself even more strongly with what Jari has just said (for a discussion of "format tying" in argumentative sequences, see Goodwin 1990: 178-185).

The Local Occasioning of Social Organization in Evaluative Interaction
So far, I have analyzed recipient action without considering who takes which recipient footing in evaluative episodes. Thus, the whole analysis above, so to speak, has assumed recipient constancy. This assumption was reasonable in formal meetings, in which participation is relatively constant from one meeting to another, as well as throughout each formal meeting. Another background feature that made this assumption reasonable in formal meetings was that the target of the evaluation was largely absent. Thus, the local social organization that evolved around managerial evaluations was thoroughly managerial. In non-formal activities, by contrast, this assumption cannot be taken for granted. In particular, non-managerial participants took part in these activities. Consequently, these non-managerial members could, and did, affect the constituting of managerial evaluations in several ways. It is this possibility that I turn to in the next few pages.

How did non-managerial members act in evaluative contexts? To answer this question, we need to distinguish two questions. First, we need to ask whether they made evaluations that were akin to managerial evaluations and that were picked up by management. The answer to this question is straightforward. I found several non-managerial members' evaluations in my transcripts and other data, but not a single case in which they would have targeted the House, its work, or its people so that the management would have acted on this action.

The second question that needs to be posed is the following: what did non-managerial members do after evaluations done by management? Did they go along with management, or did
they do something else that might have changed the course of talk? Again, the answer is straightforward, though less so than the answer to the previous question. The factual, businesslike footing exhibited by Laura in Example 5 aside, I could not find any cases in which workers acted evaluatively after managerial evaluations. Non-managerial members' actions positioned after managers' evaluations are in Table 2.

### Table 2. Non-Managerial Members' Responses to Managerial Evaluations

1. **The Withdrawn Footing**

   **Example 1**
   9 out of 11 recipients maintain a withdrawn footing, one of them being a manager.

   **Example 5a-c**
   During talk about Bengt, Sini and Joanna are withdrawn; Mia laughed in a side sequence.

2. **Non-Managerial Recipient Activities**

   2.1 **Acknowledgement Tokens/Continuers**
   **Example 3** lines 19, 22-23, 26 A project head Laura and the researcher Sini (line 23) align with Jari's evaluations about the quality of one project.

2.2 **Responses that Reorient Talk to Non-Evaluative Directions**
   **Example 5** lines 21-43 After Karita's evaluative opening, the project head Laura tells about her recent discussion with Bengt, and how she suggested she had data for him.

3. **Non-Managerial Activities During Managerial Responses to Evaluations**

   3.1 **Laughter**
   **Example 1** lines 28-33, 43-44 A project head, Anselmi, laughs at Jari's argument against continuous seminars.

1) Notice that here I have listed only those cases in which non-managerial members were present. In Example 1, for example, in which only managers were present, it does not make sense to analyze non-managerial members' action.

A few comments about the implications of non-managerial members' withdrawn footing are necessary. In particular, there may be
several participants who maintain this footing simultaneously. Also, some members maintained a withdrawn footing in every evaluative episode in the House data. The fact that non-managerial members withheld from action in evaluative contexts allowed evaluative interaction to evolve around managers. Although this notion may seem trivial at first, this feature is massively consequential to the way in which the local social organization was occasioned in talk. Since it was non-managerial members who largely maintained a withdrawn stance in talk, evaluation was largely constituted in managerial terms even in the presence of non-managerial members.

Table 2 further shows that non-managerial members did not always maintain a withdrawn footing. They could also do a minimalistic alignment with prior managerial evaluations with acknowledgement tokens, or laughter tokens, or they could maintain a businesslike factual footing in the subsequent environment of an evaluation. Factual businesslike footings aside, these actions do not observably redirect talk. Acknowledgement tokens, for example, are specifically fit for signalling recipiency and for displaying something about the recipient's understanding of on-going talk while another person is still talking. Similarly, laughter does not usually reorient talk, although the speaker may, of course, observably orient to humor, as Jari did in Example 1, line 29. As Sacks noted (1994, II: 571), laughter is one of the few acts that people can legitimately do together in conversation. Furthermore, laughter can take place simultaneously with other talk without necessarily interrupting that talk. Laughter suggests that there is something funny or laughable going on and treats this on-going piece of
action in non-serious terms, but as such, laughter is without content. Through laughter, non-managerial members could partake in some evaluations' subsequent environment in such a way that they could distance themselves from the perceived seriousness of the evaluation, or from other talk in its vicinity without explicitly challenging or aligning with the evaluator.

Finally, it is interesting that evaluative actions are not included in this catalogue of non-managerial activities. Evaluative talk in the House, then, largely remained managerial work. Formal meetings, of course, were a managerial domain from the ground up. In non-formal activities, in which other members were present, evaluations were concentrated in managerial hands, as were most responses to evaluations. Only a few members took action in these transient environments, and even then their participation was largely inconsequential, done through acknowledgement tokens, or through laughter tokens. In a few more dramatic cases, non-managerial members could reorient talk to some extent in a businesslike fashion (remember Example 5b). By and large, however, non-managerial members did not take part in managerial evaluations in the House. Instead, non-managerial members allowed management to make evaluative opinions and utterances, and by maintaining a silent footing in these contexts, cooperated in constituting evaluations as managers' work. This hierarchy is jointly co-constituted in interaction. Notice, though, that this restraint of the non-managerial members is not based on any formal rule that would make participation in evaluative interaction dependent on membership in the managerial category; rather, we are dealing with a self-imposed restriction.

This result should not be taken to mean that workers
were without power. Far from it. They could have substantial powers in the House. In one annual meeting, for example, two experienced researchers, Jutta and Kai, with the soon-to-be manager Mikko, managed to introduce changes in the new working order by pointing out some of its difficulties [A 11/30/94]. Although evaluation was by and large managerial work workers could, and did, act on the basis of their duties and on their expertise, be that based on training (as in the librarian Nea's case), on business experience (as in Laura's case), or on extensive administrative experience (as in Jutta's and Kai's case). Still, the stance-taking footing remained in managerial hands even in non-formal activities.

Results and Discussion

In this chapter, we have seen, first, that in non-formal activities, both the targets and the criteria used in doing evaluations are in many ways different from those found in formal meetings. In formal meetings, it is the organizational context that is reflexively brought in to talk, made available, and mutually maintained in this talk. In non-formal evaluations, managers utilize non-organizational devices, and bring in various kinds of contextual items to bear on action. Secondly, we have seen that non-formal evaluations arise from various kinds of prior actions that do not form a (relatively) stable and recurrent pre-contextual environment for evaluations, unlike the report format in formal activities. All managerial evaluations, then, are not designed to be part of the workplace's managerial processes. Instead, they are locally occasioned through specific
prior actions. Thirdly, we have seen that recipient actions are in some ways different in formal and non-formal activities. In particular, we saw some interesting differences in who made various responses. The managerial group members behaved in non-formal activities much like they did in formal ones, while non-managerial members, by contrast, largely maintained a non-evaluative footing (except for a few acknowledgement tokens and continuers). Consequently, evaluation became a thoroughly managerial activity in the House. Non-managerial members cooperated in co-constituting managerial authority in evaluative interaction.

More generally, this chapter has shown that once the rather specific procedural background utilized in formal activities is not used, evaluation becomes a different kind of phenomena. It is not ubiquitous anymore; furthermore, it assumes a more fleeting and variable local character. Consequently, the organizational and administrative character of evaluation in formal activities is a situated accomplishment that is based on the procedures members use to produce their action in those settings. This is true no matter how natural and uninteresting that on-going accomplishment may seem to anyone familiar with procedures used in managing the workplace. Managers make their organization's structures real and available in a sustained manner; these structures are "produced in concrete interactions, which in turn reproduce... the institutional context" (Maynard and Wilson 1980: 306; see also Bittner 1975: 79-80).

Finally, and in a more theoretical vein, we can pay attention to some of the conceptual assumptions in the theories that bind evaluation to social control and neglect evaluation's
more local functions (this literature was reviewed in Chapter 1). These theories depend upon a concept of "evaluation" which allows them to systematize their thought. This chapter has showed, however, that "evaluation" consists of a wide range of activities that perform different, usually local, functions. Much previous research, then, "leaves unexplicated members' methods for analyzing, accounting, fact-finding, and so on, which produce for sociology its field of data" (Zimmerman and Pollner 1970 [1990]: 99). This chapter throws light on evaluation as "an on-going accomplishment of the concerted activities of daily life" (Garfinkel 1967: vii) instead of relying on these theories. By focusing on these members' skillful practices, a conversation analytic perspective can provide an empirically-grounded alternative way of seeing how an important part of managerial action is accomplished at the workplace.
Notes for Chapter 7.
Chapter 8: Evaluations in the House's Texts

In Chapters 5 to 7, we saw how evaluations are done and received in talk in various House activities. Now we will turn to how evaluations are done in texts. As I mentioned in Chapter 3, various kinds of texts accommodate evaluations. Most importantly, there are the minutes of Board and managerial group meetings, House News and e-mail communications, and memorandums written by the management for the Board. As such, these texts represent but a small segment of all texts produced in the House. For example, this list does not include studies, which were the House's main textual product. Also, it does not include leaflets, handouts, administrative documents, or any other types of texts. Again, evaluations seem to have certain "textual home environments."

Still, as we shall see in this chapter, this selection of texts does not in any way imply that the textual environment is simple, or necessarily less complex than talk, if we approach this environment from the vantage point of evaluations.

Texts have been studied in many different ways by sociologists. Usually, texts have been used as a resource in research interested in social organization and social processes. Thus treated, texts are thought to provide a window onto these phenomena. Some other sociologists, however, have treated texts as a target of analysis in their own right, and turned their gaze onto how texts performs their tasks. In particular, ethnographic studies of texts have shed light on how texts operate in various
social processes (see, for example, Freidson 1980: Ch. 11; Atkinson and Coffey 1997). Perhaps the most ambitious approach to texts has been advocated by Dorothy Smith (1974; 1984; 1990), who has pointed out that for most people large parts of society are construed in texts. Her interest has been in how our understanding of the world is shaped by texts. It is the researchers' task to unravel the ways in which our knowledge of society is mediated by texts (in addition to Smith's work, see Zimmerman 1975). Finally, some ethnomethodological studies of texts have taken an even closer look at how texts function in interaction. Initiated by Garfinkel (1967: Ch. 6), this line of research has studied numerous things, including ways in which medical records are construed out of talk (see Hak 1992), how texts operate in multinational business negotiations (Firth 1995: Ch. 8), and how the procedures of ordinary conversation are used in direct sales letters (Frank 1989; for some less ambitions uses of texts in conversation analytic studies, see Pomerantz 1978: 79-80, and Schegloff 1996a: 207). Rod Watson (1997: 86-88) formulates the basic premise of this approach by noting that texts are "active, operational, and structuring" things that "are anything but passive... inert marks on a page or screen." Instead, they mobilize various resources for their tasks. This chapter stands in this latter tradition. My focus is on the properties of texts rather than on their construction; I am also interested in how they provide us insights into the House's local social processes.

It is important to get one piece of ethnographic background before going any further. The House is a far cry from the textually run public clinic studied ethnographically by Olson
In that clinic, set up to provide prenatal care for soon-to-be mothers in an inner-city neighborhood, most of the staff's time was spent on "tending to forms" (Olson 1995: 49). The clinic's work processes largely took place in documents, and the clinic could be characterized as "record driven, not service driven" (Olson 1995: 51). In the House, by contrast, texts were clearly delegated to a secondary position by management. Some administrative processes, naturally, were textually run. For example, invoicing and travel bills were handled by the Housing Office, the House's parent organization (see Chapter 3), using receipts and forms written in the House as the basis of its work. However, these processes seldom appeared in managers' mutual discussions, and although some managerial members had an explicitly anti-bureaucratic stance towards them, they did not enter into the mainstream of evaluations in the House. Instead, for the most important members of the management, texts were a secondary matter, subjugated to talk and more pressing concerns. In one of my interviews, Jari described the ways in which the managerial team related to texts:

There is a certain difference in that Maria feels that when you write something down on paper, then you have to act on the basis of that paper and she gets anxious if it is changed. For me and for Karita, the idea is that this paper should be taken to the wastebasket if you learn something new. Then you just do something better. There is a clear difference in mentalities, and it is one of the conflicts... ((ends his utterance)) [I 10/21/95, 441-447]

Jari's account nicely formulates the House managers' relation to texts. For example, in the annual meeting of 1994, Jari and Karita were more than willing to change the working order, one of the House's most important documents in terms of its consequences
on House organization, pay, and salaries, arguing that it is just a piece of paper [Ai 11/30/94, 13:30-13:40]. For Jari and Karita, writing was a way to get work going, and texts were a means of giving form to ideas rather than something that should accurately reflect the House's debates and changing structures. Even important texts were neglected or changed if circumstances so required. Also, texts were almost never used in talk to make, justify, or challenge a point or a premise underlying some position. The only significant exceptions to this rule were the Annual Plan that was occasioned in the managerial group's follow-up meetings in the manner described in Chapters 5 and 6, some official statements, research, and official documents in the House's annual meetings.

Thus, the House's textual practices seem to be different than Smith's and Olsen's analyses, which more or less implicitly attribute a great deal more power to texts than House practices seem to imply. Certainly, this practice contrasts starkly with Latour (1990), who maintained that texts are read, and they are able to impute their definitions upon readers. Thus, with the exception of some administrative and fiscal processes, the paper trail was not very visible in management activities, not was it in the forefront in terms of evaluations. Still, managers did various things in texts and, as we shall see in this chapter, evaluation was certainly one of them.

Another thing worth noticing is that in the absence of recipient activity, my analysis in this chapter is "textual" in that it is largely based on explicating how texts provide resources for the reader. I do not rely on a literary critic's sophisticated methods of textual analysis. There is a simple
reason for this. As Watson (1997: 80-81) and Silverman (1997: 239-240) have noted, these analyses are premised on the idea of very complex texts (such as novels and anthropological ethnographies), encompassing descriptions and arguments that may stretch over hundreds of pages. Since we are dealing with a set of humble, essentially practical texts, not written for the sake of aesthetics or amusement but designed to be read at breakfast or on a tram, we need to study them on a practical rather than aesthetic level. Mostly, these texts consisted of rather routinized pieces of writing such as travel reports and conference trip reports. Also, the level of intersubjective knowledge writers and readers could assume to have was rather high. For example, managers' level of knowledge of the developments in the House is generally high, as we saw in Chapter 2. Most non-managerial members were also well aware of recent affairs in the House, and since their interpersonal histories usually extended well over several years, and in some cases over decades, it was reasonable for writers to assume that their readers could rely on knowledge that existed outside the texts in making sense of them. These texts were not scientific reports either, designed to be maximally explicit, and providing grounds for every point they make. Writers in general could well assume that others could "open" even highly elliptical texts; they knew that their readers could use many kinds of procedures to make sense of these texts, and that these readers knew that they shared a large chunk of this sense-making capacity with the writers.

Finally, a brief conceptual note is needed. By "document," I mean texts that are official, such as the Annual
Plan (or the "action plan"), the Annual Report, and managerial group minutes. The category of "text" is a larger one. It encompasses, for example, articles in *House News*. The use of the word "text" in this chapter is anchored in the House's concrete texts; I am not using the term in a metaphorical sense (as does Geertz 1973: 1-30).

**Evaluations in Formal Texts**

Some texts are designed to be parts of formal decision-making processes. Obviously, several types of formal documents were written and kept in the House. However, in terms of evaluations, only two types of texts could be readily designated in this category. First, there were the minutes of scheduled managerial group and Board's meetings. The minutes were designed to communicate and to preserve the decisions and, in some cases, the discussions of these formal decision-making bodies. In addition to these minutes, management wrote a few memorandums at the request of the Board for the ministry funding the institute. In these memorandums, the managerial team gave an account of House activities in terms of some query put forth by these authorities.

1. *Evaluations in the Minutes*

The minutes have several noteworthy qualities. First of all, talk in the managerial group and the Board have a connection to the House's formal structure and administrative processes through the minutes taken by the secretary; they were also
ratified afterwards. Secondly, although the minutes are premised on the idea that they describe talk in meetings, the minutes perform numerous transformations on talk. The minutes thus have interesting properties in terms of evaluations as well.

1.1 "Doing Organization" in Evaluations in the Minutes

The following examples show how it was primarily an organizational context that was brought to bear on evaluations in the minutes. Example 1 provides several examples of this practice of "doing organization" in the minutes. Examples 2 and 3 provide further examples of two additional types of organizational context, plans and schedules, which were occasionally used in the minutes in evaluating work. There are seven reports and evaluations in these three examples. All these evaluations target different kinds of projects, in Examples 1 and 3 studies, and in Example 2 a developmental project (for this concept, see Chapter 4). These examples also show that projects are evaluated using different organizational devices. Example 1 is based on a comparison between the project's current stage and where a "normal" project would be at the same point in time. Example 2 makes an evaluation using "plans," and Example 3 uses "schedules" as the ground for evaluation (for further analyses of how these evaluations are built, see Chapter 5). In the absence of circumstantial detail typical to talk, the difference between these evaluations appears to be small in texts. In particular, the form of these evaluations is virtually identical, as a comparison of Examples 2 and 3 show.
When we compare evaluations in the minutes to talk -- that is, to those evaluations they are supposed to record -- we can make a few additional observations about evaluations. In some cases, evaluations in the text closely match those in talk. In no case, however, was an evaluation done using precisely the same device which was used by the speaker in the original meeting. Some evaluations managed to show the project in terms largely similar to the "original" talk; but the vast majority involved some kinds of transformations. Let us turn to other data to see how these transformations worked. We are already familiar with this example, which is reported here in two forms. The transcript of Maria's report is in Example 4a. Example 4b shows how the secretary interpreted her report.
valmistunu noit korkotukia ja (0.4) tää velkaneuvonta be+ready those interest+support and this debt+informing finished these interest loans and (0.4) this debt settlement

ja vapaaehdosjärjestelmät eli eli Marian ja (0.3) and Voluntary+systems — So So Maria's and and voluntary settlement systems that is Maria's and

ton (.) Iran hankkeet etenee suunnitellusti ja that (.) Íra's projects advance in+planned+manner and (0.3) Íra's projects proceed as planned and

käsikirjoituksest bedene suunnitellusti ja so Maria's and voluntary settlement systems that is Maria's and

→ ton (. ) Iran hankkeet etenee suunnitellusti ja that ( . ) Íra's projects advance in+planned+manner and (0.3) Íra's projects proceed as planned and

käsikirjoituksest bedene suunnitellusti ja so Maria's and voluntary settlement systems that is Maria's and

→ ton (. ) Iran hankkeet etenee suunnitellusti ja that ( . ) Íra's projects advance in+planned+manner and (0.3) Íra's projects proceed as planned and

käsikirjoituksest bedene suunnitellusti ja so Maria's and voluntary settlement systems that is Maria's and

Example 4b. [managerial group minutes, 5/30/95, p. 1, item 4].
1 Projects A National Survey of Units Involved in Debt Negotiations and A Study of the Meaning of Voluntary Debt Settlement Negotiations will be finished as planned.

Note how Example 4a's "proceed as planned" and "manuscripts are (coming) *here* (0.9) this June?" becomes "will be finished as planned" in Example 4b. This change does not represent any readily apparent loss of information, nor does it represent any readily apparent change in the evaluations. Rather, the secretary's understanding appears to match talk closely, though she does not include the manuscript detail in talk in the minutes.

Despite these changes introduced by the secretary, the evaluations she makes are administrative in character. Her interest seems to lie more in where work is at present, not on, say, its quality, the interest expressed towards it, or its importance. Rather, it is plans, schedules, and the current stage of the project that she brings to bear on action. Again, these evaluations formulate House work in terms of its formal structures. Plans are a major element of the formal framework.
held up to maintain accountability, while schedules specify where each project ought to be at some point in the future. Since deviations from the expected course of some project are made specifically visible in a text just as in talk (see Example 1, lines 9 and 10), the absence of such marking of a deviation makes it clear to the reader that the project is doing well. These evaluations are thus connected to the formal groundwork of the House; they make its work reviewable and accountable (see Heritage 1983).

The final, though associated, thing worth noting is that the minutes in general formulate the House in even more formal terms than talk in formal meetings. The minutes almost without exception evaluate projects in terms of schedules, plans, or the stage of the project and, in budget discussions, in terms of how much money has been used so far [for example, managerial group minutes, 5/30/95, p.2, item 1]. Thus, these evaluations are largely similar to those in talk in formal meetings. However, since the minutes do not contain all the detail of talk, they perform formalizing work upon talk. For example, conversational parts are not on record unless they contain information that is somehow seen to be important. Even when the secretary finds important information in the conversational parts, this information is represented as conclusions or designs for action rather than as discussion or written in verbatim. For example, see Example 2, lines 4 to 6, where the secretary writes "The project Households, Housing, and Design -- from Carpenters to Housing Policy continues, but further funding is still open. A grant proposal will be sent to the Ministry of Education." This piece of information was picked up from a discussion that took
more than a page in my transcript [A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1, 119-181].

1.2 Projects as the Main Target Used in Formulating the House's Work in the Minutes

There are further noteworthy aspects of the "organizational" structuring of evaluations in the minutes. Let us open up these aspects with the following example, which is taken from a managerial group meeting. There is no evaluation in this example, but it shows how the minutes are usually structured.

Example 5. [managerial group minutes, 5/22/95, p. 1-2]

NO 4/1995

THE MANAGERIAL GROUP 22.5.1995

AGENDA ((removed))

HANDLING OF ITEMS

1. THE USE OF APPROPRIATION AND BUDGET FOLLOW-UP

It was noted that by May 19th, 33% of appropriation has been used. [We have] stayed within the budget very well. The Housing Office will be asked about unbound monies. Research chiefs can think about the acquisition of necessary research data and recruitment.

4. RESEARCH GROUPS

The Conditions of Sustainable Housing

The research program is in the polishing up stage.

Kati Koivu has begun the project The Assessment of the Effectivity of Norm Guidance in Housing and in Transport.

Cooperation related to the project Citizens' Environmental Knowledge and Consumer Behavior with Statistics Finland is progressing.

The basic structure of these minutes is very simple. It consists of one sentence followed by another sentence, each reporting the current stage of one project. However, most evaluations in the
minutes are based on comparisons between the current status of some project with the course of an imagined "normal" project. Most of the complexities inherent in talk are absent; for example, lengthy descriptions of the status of various projects, multiple overlapping evaluations, conversational exchanges opened by the recipients (or by the speaker, see Chapters 2 and 6), and -- of course -- pauses, hesitations, and other features of the delivery of the original verbal report.

Interestingly, research groups are not evaluated in the minutes, which concentrate wholly on single projects. The multilayered evaluative practices found in talk (see Chapter 5) are thus not replicated in the minutes, which are based on the "project framework" even more strongly than talk in formal meetings. Still, this framework is there. In Example 5, line 15 establishes this target as the heading for reports to come, and line 17 gives an example of one research group by name. Single projects are grouped underneath these "groups." Similarly, Example 1, line 3 gives another example of how "research groups" were imposed upon several projects in the minutes. This structure is similar to the one used in House plans; in fact, Example 5 in Chapter 1 gives the Annual Plan's version of the group reviewed in Example 1, lines 3 to 10.

It is this highly administrative context, as such just one out of many possible ones, that is built into evaluations in the minutes. The minutes get their administrative character largely from this feature. They do not contain other descriptive elements that might warrant other types of reading. For example, questions of quality and questions of proper scientific practice are virtually non-existent in the minutes. The basic target in
the minutes is a "project." Here, the House is arranged into discreet, identifiable and separate projects. There are no exceptions to this rule; larger variously named targets consist of sets of projects. Remember that in formal meetings, various targets could appear in talk in what I called "conversational environments" in Chapter 3. Remember also that this format was also used in plans, in various brochures, in annual meetings and, although we have to be cautious here -- in managerial meetings to present House work in an orderly fashion. The House's formal task structure is used as an interpretive device here.

Several assumptions about the properties of projects go along with this frame. For example, projects can be said to have a beginning, a middle, and an end. They can also be set up and terminated, be temporarily put aside, and resumed -- or, briefly, they are manageable and manipulable. The sensibility of this framework was never challenged in the minutes. Notice that this framework was already used in formal meetings, in the House's most important documents such as the annual plans, various brochures and advertisements, and the annual report, although other frameworks might have been available as well. Here again, we get an idea of the practical basis upon which members' sense of coherence, order, and manageability is built into the House. In fact, the members were so used to this way of making House work visible that it assumed a sense of reality in House interactions; it was unquestioned. By implication, it is in the minutes that the House's formal organization is allowed to run in an unhindered fashion.
2. Evaluations in Memorandums

In analyzing evaluations in formal texts, I quickly realized that evaluations in memorandums did not fit the previous description because in several ways, they are more complex than those in minutes. In particular, memorandums do very different kinds of work than the minutes. They are also targeted to a very different kind of audience, which is available for us in the ways in which the writers construe their texts, and the evaluations in them.

Memorandums are replies to specific queries made by the Board, the ministry funding the institute, or some other agency working for the Council of State. Formally, the primary audience of the memorandums is the Board, which is supposed to keep an eye on the House as a whole, not concentrate on its operative management. Secondary audiences are the ministry funding the institute, and Council of State agencies. Memorandums were written as responses to queries handed to the House by these authorities. This feature helps to make understandable some of the features of these memorandums. Firstly, and obviously, these queries established the topic of the memorandum. Secondly, these queries were always targeted at the whole House rather than at some single project in it. In Goffman's terms (1981: 144-145), the management was treated as "principals" of the House, capable of formulating answers from the point of view of the whole House in a generalized fashion. Thirdly, these queries were "large" in one specific sense: answering them required a long and detailed review of the House and its activities. For instance, an answer to a query concerning the House's ability to conduct research on
topics related to European Union research programmes necessitated an extensive review of these EU programmes, their relationship to the House's work, and a review of House activities related to EU programmes.

Evaluations were not situated randomly in memorandums. Out of three memorandums written during my field work, evaluations were placed at the end of the report in two cases. These evaluations were the culminating point that served to close the report as well. After laying down the evidence, the evaluations summarized the House's response, and thus signalled that the memorandum has sais what it had to say. For example, one memorandum, which had a long and complex structure, contained six evaluations, found from several places (Table 1). It dealt with the House's capacity to work in the new European context, and will here be called the "Euro memorandum." The reader should remember that most of my data comes from Spring 1995, that is, only a few months after the country joined the European Union. This situation caused much reformulation of policy throughout the country, and the House was not exceptional in this respect.

Table 1. The Structure of the "Euro memorandum," and its Evaluations [Memorandum 5/24/95].

- First, there was a two-page long introductory section, which explicated the House's current tasks and duties. There was one evaluation at the end of this section, targeted at the House as a whole, which stated that even given the House's meager resources, several projects in its programme are timely in the new international context, and that the House's previous investments will also "create national and international cooperation [and a] strong knowledge infrastructure in the future" (p. 2). Here, this evaluation, not yet substantiated, made it apparent for the reader that the subsequent parts of the report would provide evidence for this statement, and framed the subsequent text positively in the first place.
- Secondly, there was a two-page section in which the memorandum reviewed EU research programmes, finding that EU programmes had relatively little to do with housing.
There were no evaluations in this section.

- Thirdly, there was a descriptive section, divided into five subsections. These subsections were headed with items picked from EU programmes. For example, one subsection was headed "2. Participating in Developmental Programmes" (p. 5). In this part, the memorandum reviewed the House's work in terms of these categories, and provided three examples of successful projects, each example being closed with an evaluation. Thus, these evaluations were targeted at single research groups and developmental projects. Example 6 below provides an example of these evaluations.

- Fourthly, a two-page long section of the text explicated the "challenges" posed to the House by the country's membership in the EU. Again, this section was organized into subsections, each one with a separate heading such as "2. Requirements in project working and administrative expertise related to it will grow" [Memorandum 5/24/95, p. 7]. There were two evaluations in this section, both targeted at the House as a whole. Examples 7 and 8 below are from this section.

The absence of evaluations in this report can also be accounted for by local reasons. Obviously the EU, being an immense transnational body, had several research programmes. For obvious practical reasons, the House, having less than 40 workers, could not work on all of these programmes. Also, the country had just joined the EU, and was in the process of learning the ropes in this context. Thus, at several places in the memorandum, there was nothing that could be reported. If this was the case, there was a brief description of the EU programme, and an explanation that detailed why the House had not worked in that area. Most reasons were related to the House's resources, which were meager when compared to the the requirements set for participation in EU research programmes.

2.1 Evaluating the Whole House

As the preceding analysis shows, evaluations in some
places of the memorandums could well be targeted at projects and research groups. The memorandums, then, were not cut off from the rest of the descriptive practices of the House. In several descriptive parts of memorandums, single projects, research groups, or persons could be evaluated in the memorandums, which connected these texts to the House's other social processes. In Example 6, which comes from the Euro memorandum, the text tells about the House's developmental work and compares this with "top international work" in the same area. The target here is the SUPERMAN data base. According to my tapes, "top international work" refers to the housing research data bases maintained in other European countries [A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 1932-2184].

Example 6. [Memorandum 5/24/95, p. 5]

2. Participating in Developmental Programmes

In the context of the developmental discussion of the EU, we have been able to note that the development work done by the Housing Research Institute well compares with top international work in this area. Due to its limited resources, the Housing Research Institute has not been able to participate in the tender round of this developmental work. However, the Research Institute has promised to work in the support group set up to support and evaluate the development work.

Notice that this evaluation is done with a comparison to "top international work," and is thus based on an evaluative device that has not been analyzed previously. Obviously, if House work matches "top international work," it must be good, although this is not said explicitly.

Importantly, this evaluation formulates work in the House using the administratively grounded term "research group." However, in the memorandums, this was not the normal case. The main target of evaluations, instead, was the whole House. Example 7 is typical in this respect. In this example, which comes from
the Euro memorandum, the writers are arguing for getting additional resources from the Ministry (see Boden 1994: 138-140). This paragraph tells us that so far, the House has developed well enough to move from the second division to the national league. The reason for this success has been the House's own developmental work. There is nothing that would question future success. Therefore, this development provides evidence for future success in the European league as well. However, this paragraph simultaneously suggests that there are small, medium-sized, and big leagues, and that success in these leagues requires new kinds of resources. Success in the European league requires better resources than those that exist today.

Example 7. [Memorandum 5/24/95, p. 5]

3. The Need for Training and Recruitment will Increase

During the first years of the Housing Research Institute's life, the research capacities of the personnel have improved decidedly because of training and the accumulation of work experience, among other reasons. A move from second division to the national league and nowadays to international research cooperation has been achieved through existing expertise potential. Due to internationalization, investment needs will grow even further. It is a critical question how investments will be allocated in the future: through increasing the average expertise of the whole personnel or...

Notice that in this example, we meet a type of evaluation that has not been analyzed before, a metaphoric comparison to an imaginary succession of "leagues" from the second division to the national league all the way to the International league. I will come back to this evaluation later in this chapter. Here we should note that the evaluation deals with the House as a whole, not with its single projects. This text essentially treats the House as an undivided whole, not as the sum of its parts.

As Table 1 showed, most individual parts of memorandums
oriented to the whole House. In this crucial respect, the managers' evaluative "gaze" in the memorandums differs from their "gaze" in other activities. In the memorandums, they take an evaluative look at the House as a whole, which was not the case in other environments. Here they make the House's work observable, reportable, and evaluable by simply targeting it in terms of the (in this context) largest possible unit: the House as an undivided whole. It is ultimately the whole House and its responsible management that is presented as being accountable for its success.

This feature perhaps orients to the socially organized occasion in which these texts are used. The Board's, the ministry's, and the Council of State's sense-making capacities and interests do not require a more detailed orientation to House activities. This descriptive practice does not assume intimate knowledge of the House. It only assumes that the readers are interested in the House as a whole, and in single projects only in terms of this whole. While evaluations analyzed previously in this study assume that the reader has access to various detailed sense-making resources pertaining to the House, the current referential practice presumes a very different kind of socially organized occasion of use. These memorandums assume that readers are not interested in the details of House work, but in its major lines of working. Also, it assumes that they are able and willing to deal with the House either at a rather abstract conceptual level (for example, the Board's academic members), or with abstract administrative tools (the ministry funding the institute). For example, the ministry's power over the House budget is based on annual negotiations about the House's
objectives. The ministry can affect the House as a whole, but it has little authority over more detailed work. The management's referential practice is well suited to these tasks. Note 2

2.2 How the Whole House is Evaluated

Evaluations in House memorandums differ from other textual evaluations in another important respect as well. In particular, two novel ways of making evaluations can be described here. First, the House and its work could be compared to targets found outside the House. Evaluations were made apparent through these comparisons. Secondly, the House could be evaluated by relating its current or projected position to actions it has previously taken. This procedure could make the House's prior decisions, actions, and choices available for evaluation. Notice, however, that in some descriptive parts of the memorandums, largely similar procedures were used to make evaluations as were used in House e-mail messages and in House News. Still, these instances are exceptional. In fact, in the three memorandums analyzed here, there was only one people-based evaluation [Memorandum 5/24/95, p. 4]. Furthermore, this way of making an evaluation was only used when evaluations were targeted at projects or research groups.

2.1.1 Evaluations Based on Comparisons to Some Reference Outside the House

As I mentioned above, the evaluations in Examples 6 and 7 were different from those studied in previous chapters. In both
cases, evaluations were done with some kind of comparative structure. In Example 6, this structure was based on "top international work," and in Example 7, on an imaginary comparison of research to the hierarchy of sports leagues.

Let us take a closer look at a simpler case to explicate the way these comparisons work. In Example 8, the writer gives grounds for the evaluative item immediately after the evaluation has been done. The evaluation is in lines 5 to 7. Obviously, to be better than a rival is good, especially if this rival is prominent in the evaluator's reference group, and is of a high caliber in some other way. In the context of research, colleges and universities always do well as a point of comparison. In Example 8, the evaluative comparison, consisting of a claim that the House compares well with colleges and universities in the new European Union context, is explicated by pointing out that colleges and universities have rather little experience with international cooperation so far.

Example 8. [Memorandum 5/24/95, p. 7]

2. Requirements in project working and administrative expertise related to it will grow

Organizing and giving birth to cooperative groups requires new skills from researchers; on the one hand, they must participate in administering and preparing projects and, on the other hand, they must connect their own research questions to international scientific debate. In terms of project groups working, the Housing Research Institute may already benefit from its relative expertise in comparison to colleges.\(^1\) International funding is not given to single researchers but to larger groups. There is relatively little experience of administering research projects in universities and colleges. It may be that in the future research institutes, more than today, could support the development of projects and bring academic researchers into them. Getting funding for projects (lobbying) is here part of to project administration.

1) In the Finnish context, "college" is legally
comparable to "universities." In general, these types of higher education differ in that universities offer a wide range of programs, while colleges are usually specialized in one area only.

Through this comparison, the writer(s) can show appreciation to the House without explicitly saying so. If the House is as good as colleges in research-related matters, the House has to be good, even if this is not put into so many words. When the comparison point is high enough, the mere fact that the House can be compared to this comparison point is already a sign of excellence. Again, this evaluation is comparative in character. Note that this comparison point does not have to be concrete. In Example 6, for instance, the comparison point was "top international work," which is much more abstract than "colleges." In Example 7, the comparison point is somewhere in between: in that example, the comparison point was an imaginary succession of leagues, the House being in the national and in the international league, the top category.

Basically, this comparison parallels the "comparison to the previous year" notion mentioned briefly in Chapter 5. Again, there is a concrete, independent yardstick against which current work is deemed successful or unsuccessful, normal or abnormal. Still, the way these comparisons work is different enough to keep these comparisons in different classes. Thus, in Example 6, the comparative yardstick is not a concrete figure, but an implicit metaphorical "league." Similarly, in Example 8, this yardstick is "colleges," not the House's previous year's budget.

2.2.2 Evaluating the House by Relating Its Positive Situation to Its Previous Actions
Another evaluative device that is specific to memorandums in the House works in the following way. By describing the House's current good position, and by showing that this position is a result of the House's own actions and choices, it is possible to point out that the House's previous actions have been laudable. Another form of this evaluative device describes some expected positive outcomes in the future and links them to the House's current activities and choices that are thus implicitly displayed in a positive light.

Occasionally, these comparisons may be almost explicit, as in Example 9, lines 26 to 28, where we learn that "the investments and expertise of the Housing Research Institute have thus produced synergy benefits and created prerequisites for the birth of research in this area..." The first sentence in line 26 shows that the House's promise to be successful in the European context is due to the House's previous "investments and expertise" which have "produced synergy benefits and created prerequisites for the birth of research" in the European context as well. Furthermore, the House's previous investments and expertise (presumably acquired previously as well) provide possibilities for "acquiring international funding for to our country," which, presumably, is also a good thing. To hear this item positively, all that is required is that the reader is willing to understand that "synergy benefits" and "getting funding" are good things (saving work and money is generally regarded a good thing at the workplace).

Example 9. [Memorandum 1/31/96b, n.p., last page]
1 Participating in international cooperation poses new
challenges for resources related to HRI personnel and
time and funding e.g. for the following reasons:
- to ensure that national funding will be adequate for
current activities and long-term development
- to stress formal qualifications and connections with
academic research, although the results of the studies
also have to be clearly applicable to the attempts to
solve social, business, and individual problems
- to keep up with the growing requirements for group
projects and related administrative know-how
- to keep up with the growing need to retrain researchers
and other personnel, and the need to recruit new
personnel
- to develop the necessary researcher and institutional
networks, at both national and international levels

Despite its meager research resources and small size, the
Housing Research Institute, however, has the possibility
to succeed in the face of these challenges. The Research
Institute has a flexible structure and in a short period
of time it has been able to create working cooperative
relations with other research institutes and academic
research on a multidisciplinary basis. HRI research
policy, like the weighted areas in the research
programme, are also in a central position in the EU's new
research policy strategy. HRI research groups are already
today built on flexible project work, so the HRI has been
able to offer, in relation to its own programmes and
context, many interesting research questions and data for
researchers who work in other institutes.

The investments and expertise of the Housing Research
Institute have thus produced synergy benefits and created
prerequisites for the birth of research in this area and
the creation of a science policy network in our own
country, which is also crucially important in acquiring
international funding for our country. In closing, we
note the Housing Research Institute's strengths in the
area of international housing research, in that through
its focus group project, the research institute has an
immediate contact with more than 500 real estate agents
in our country.

Here, then, an evaluation is done by describing the House's
current positive situation, and by pointing out that this
situation is a result of the House's previous actions and
decisions. Thus, the text puts forth an indirect claim -- that
the House's previous choices concerning the allocation of its
investments have been well-founded. Through this fairly simple
structure, the text evaluates the House's previous actions
indirectly without explicitly praising House management for these decisions.

This structure may also be used in a weaker version. By first describing the challenges the House faces, and then by making a positive assessment of the House's future, House members could link their current work to a projected positive future. That is to say, the managers are able to evaluate their current decisions indirectly through this device. Thus, in Example 9, lines 21 to 24, we are able to read that "HRI research groups are already today built on flexible project work, so the HRI has been able to offer, in relation to its own programmes and context, many interesting research questions and data for researchers who work in other institutes." The writer lets us understand that to have a flexible project-based organization is a good thing since it makes the House more open to outsiders, which is a good thing in an organization that prides itself on its openness and networking capacities. By implication, the fact that the House has chosen this organizational form has led to several kinds of positive outcomes, some of them taking place in the future rather than now.

2.3 Discussion

Both evaluative devices analyzed in this section were nicely fitted to the context in which they were produced. In general, it is not possible to assume that the Board members can know the developments and the organizational technologies of the House (for instance, plans) so accurately that they could understand more detailed evaluations. This assumption is
available to us in the way in which evaluations in memorandums are done against yardsticks and metaphors available to any competent member of society: sports leagues, the concept of "top international work," and colleges and universities. Also, linking positive outcomes to the House's own actions is easily understandable to anyone who is familiar with the elementary mundane narratives that celebrate the fruits of hard labor. It is also apparent that any reader can understand that the House's current decisions are good if it is pointed out that the House will have a good future, and this future glory is somehow linked to its current courses of action, its organization, or its decisions. No knowledge of the House is needed to make sense of these evaluations.

**Non-Formal Texts: Evaluations in E-mail and House News**

An analysis of evaluations in formal documents teaches us almost nothing about evaluations in e-mail and House News. In contrast to the minutes, these texts do various things, which is also apparent in the ways in which evaluations are made. Furthermore, in these texts, writers may announce decisions and use evaluations to justify them (see Example 14 in Chapter 4), just make their opinions available for others (see Example 19 in Chapter 4), write Christmas Greetings (Example 10 below in this chapter), and remind people of duties imposed on them by administration (see Example 12 below in this chapter; also E 2/6/95 15:52). Compared to the activity range of the minutes or the memorandums, this variation is significant.

This feature partly explains the rarity of evaluations
in these texts. I read 450 pages of e-mail messages and House News stories to find managerial evaluations, and found only 29 instances in these data. Compared to 109 evaluations in 18 pages of minutes analyzed for this chapter, this number is negligible. The main reason for this difference is that everyone could write e-mail messages and House news stories. Further, these texts, even when written by managers, were written for various purposes, not for those few decisional and conservational purposes that characterize the minutes and the memorandums. This feature also partly explains some features of evaluations. In brief, in e-mail and House News, managers evaluate different targets differently. Simultaneously, their selection of evaluative devices makes these texts different from formal texts that are characteristically and observably "formal" in their outlook (see Atkinson 1982).

Depending on the task, e-mail messages and House News stories may contain several evaluations, not just one. In the following Example, the Director writes her Christmas Greetings for the House. The tone of the whole text is explicitly evaluative. She looks back on the year gone by, and does a series of evaluations at the same time. Due to the ritual character of this letter, all evaluations are positive (the ritual character of her text is apparent precisely in this positiveness). Notice, too, the way she frames her upcoming text in the first lines. She formulates her text as an answer to doubts about the importance of the House work expressed by some (unnamed) outside administrators. Notice how the Director's language is solemn and ritualistic, which is reflected in the translation.

Example 10. [Housenews 12/21/95, p. 2]

1 Dear Friends
Christmas is the time for memories and for traditions, but now let us talk about this year. The message of my Christmas Sermon is that this year is ripening into a Christmas I won't forget. So seldom do I publicly thank my family here at the HRI that I am really ashamed, and deserve a word of reproach. But now: I humbly thank the whole team of the Housing Research Institute for the past year. Stop yourself at the end of the year and look proudly back on your achievements.

In the housing administration there are people who wonder whether research can affect society. Therefore in the managerial group, we decided to evaluate the situation a little over the last five years. The evaluation report will come out in due time. The effectiveness of the Housing Research Institute can surely be evaluated from many points of view. There is no one right way to evaluate the results or the quality of research. And you can't make clear the relevance of research or other quality to those judges who cannot understand it. Despite this, for the sake of our own development, let us stop to evaluate the things we have been good at, what we have achieved, and how we can develop further.

We have had so many teams, chains and game arenas this year that I can't mention each one separately. Taking only a cursory look, we can see that many of our projects and results have been discussed in editorials and in articles. Studies have evoked positive public debate; they have prompted talk about important and timely topics in society. Specifically, Johanna's team comes to mind, whose results we have been able to follow this year at the level of the whole society, the most important media included. So who's to say that research can't have an impact? Here, too, an old rule applies: you can make an impact on something only through expertise. Expertise here means the recognition of relevant research questions, your own strong vision and will in going through the process, common sense understanding of methods, and strong connections to the structures of the phenomenon studied and to its interest groups.

We have really been able to make a mark on society with the Housing Research Institute's studies and developmental work. After completing studies on people overburdened with debt and on reasonable housing levels, we maintained a training and information desk for three years in order to help implement a complex debt arrangement law in our country. A big thanks to Susanna's and Katri's teams for carrying an unbelievable burden and taking care of this job almost in the spirit of brothers in arms.1)
1) In the Finnish context, this expression refers to Second World War veterans.

In lines 4 to 20, we have an opening component and in lines 22 to 32 an evaluative characterization of one of the House projects. This evaluation is followed by a list of most projects and workers in the House (the office included), and a closing component which, in addition to closing the text, collects the lesson of the whole story by noting that the House's work is effective, despite the contrary claims of some administrators. In formulaic terms, the opening components are followed by a string of evaluations (eval₁ + eval₂ +...+ eval₁₇), which is then followed by the closing component. The closing component consisted of the Director's signature and her greetings to the whole House, and an excerpt of an old description of Christmas rituals in the Finnish countryside.

In e-mail and House News, evaluations usually support another on-going activity rather than are done in a focal way. These texts and the evaluations in them may also participate in various on-going activities. Often, for example, evaluations are molded into argumentative purposes. Example 11, extracted from e-mail, gives an instance of the evaluation segment at work. The reason for this e-mail is described in lines 6-8. The writer Jari had witnessed an earlier discussion in which one researcher, Mia, had accused the House of not being capable of analyzing the impact of the European single market on the country. In replying to Mia, Jari lists research that proves that Mia's point about the House's ineptitude is wrong, and uses a procedure typical to
This morning during the coffee break Mia complained that in hri there have been no preparations for the eu solution when it comes to food stuff consumption data. I am here using the opportunity to reply to this critique in terms of hri development.

So we don't have expertise?
Sonja has for several years worked on household survey data, and to a specific question about different diets in different types of households, a reply can be given in a few hours. Nina for her part has done an excellent job collecting food balance sheets and analyzing what kinds of differences you end up with in consumption figures by relying on different statistics. Sonja is making a uniform consumption data base for other food stuffs as well. Myself, I have written a large number of articles about the consumption of food, for e.g. the publications of statistics finland. So the hri has people working on consumption data. Another matter is that researchers cannot always specify their needs (in eu research there are presumably specific needs) and management is unable to organize cooperation. One idea behind the new organizational form is that researchers in particular could present (through research chiefs, for example) specific demands stemming from their own needs. The managerial group's task is to find this information (buy?, to have made? etc.). In the future, I'd hope that criticism about a lack of support is transformed to specific demands, on which we can then take a position.

What about data?
Let us note that in the hri, there are lots of network-based data about the consumption of food stuffs. The whole of the household survey is in the network, as are the Food Balance Sheets, and in the future, the National Accounts, Marketindex (?) and time series data about trade will come to the reach of researchers. Sometimes, to be sure, it comes to [my] mind whether it is worth transferring all that knowledge for use, how much of it will be used. Still an answer to Mia: I don't believe that there is as much expertise in the HRI about any other single thing, as there is about the consumption of food stuffs specifically. I don't believe that the HRI could by itself produce any better data than e.g. Statistics Finland or the Marketindex. The problem now and in the future is how much the producers of knowledge and the users meet each other in the best possible way. From Mia, I hope for a specific list of questions that...
are in need of an answer.  

b) Jari

1) Text in address fields in English in original.  
2) In small caps in original. An acronym of the "Housing Research Institute." As always, I have retained typographical errors if possible.  
3) "The eu solution" refers to Finland's decision to join the European Union in 1995.  
4) An annual survey of consumption done by Statistics Finland, which is the Government's national statistical agency.  
5) Abbreviates "best" or "best wishes."

In the course of countering Mia's challenge, Jari evaluates Nina's study, and thus strengthens the argument he is making against Mia's allegation. Not only is there research, contrary to Mia's claim, but this research, furthermore, is excellent in terms of quality, which further proves that Mia's claim misses the mark. The evaluation segment is used to make an evaluation that is in the service of an argument that is in the making.

Just like other evaluations, evaluations in these texts make available the management's opinions concerning some target. Interestingly, with only two exceptions, these evaluations were positive in character, and thus did not call for further elaboration. Instead, they made it clear that the target was within the bounds of perceived normalcy. In contrast, in both of the negative cases, evaluations were accompanied by various accounting components. To take a look at one of these cases only (Example 12), the information chief Anita sent an e-mail to remind other members about her urgent need to get several pieces of information for the Annual Report which she was currently preparing. It becomes clear in lines 17 and 18 of this message that she had earlier sent a request for these pieces of information. However, these same lines tell that she has not
received the items she needed.

Example 12. [E-mail 1/25/95 16:37]
1 From: ANITA TUULI
2 To: EVERYONE
3 Subject: ANNUAL REPORT
4 Date: 25. January 1995 16:37
5
6 Hello everyone
7
8 No doubt, last year is already behind us, but let us recall it a bit. I ask everyone to send me information for the Annual Report - about publications and articles (those published in our own series are of course known already) - training - travel - international cooperation - lectures and papers (title, to whom, where, when) - memberships and representations
9 I'd like to have this information by the beginning of February. I looked at Sonja's register, but few had responded, therefore this letter
10 Best. Anita

1) Text in address fields in English in original.

Anita's expression in lines 17 and 18 formulates members' negligence in delivering information about their previous year's doings in mildly reprehensible terms. She had asked for this information previously, but "ew had responded," which makes it clear that others had not provided her with the information she had specifically asked for previously. In this context, it is interesting to see how she provides the reasonable, sensible background for her message, and justifies her action by displaying the reasons for this message. Lines 17 and 18 make it clear that she is not writing for nothing, but had checked the situation before writing her message.
2. Discussion

Within House texts, *House News* and e-mail formed quite a peculiar practical background for evaluations. First, the way in which evaluations are occasioned in these texts is sometimes directly related to the type of the text, as Karita's Christmas Story in Example 10 shows. For instance, in Christmas Greetings, criticisms would be noticeable indeed. By contrast, in an administrative text designed to make people correct their behavior, praise of some behavior would be counterproductive. Secondly, in e-mail and *House News*, plenty of other targets became evaluatively available. Thus, in Example 12, the target was researchers' (and other members') negligence in providing information needed for the Annual Report. Although the targets of evaluations were mostly projects in e-mail and *House News*, just as in the minutes, evaluations were not exclusively targeted at various projects. The task at hand could require that some other type of target should be evaluated. Finally, evaluative devices in non-formal texts were radically different from those used in formal texts. Notice in particular that evaluations in Examples 10, 11, or 12 were not based on any organizational point of reference. Instead, members who wrote these texts used various evaluative devices in doing evaluations (for instance, this was the case in Example 10). For the most part, however, evaluations were done by telling how someone or some group of people had evaluated some piece of work. Correspondingly, these evaluations formulated House work in non-administrative terms. Both the targets and the criteria are mundane rather than grounded in the House's bureaucratic procedures.
Conclusions and Discussion

In this chapter, we have seen that evaluations take place in various textual environments that, due to their properties, can be placed in three main groups. When evaluations appear in the minutes, a highly administrative context is brought to bear on the evaluated target. This administrative character is apparent in several ways in these evaluations. For example, most evaluations in the minutes are made by comparing some piece of work to some imagined schedule. Then we saw that evaluations in memorandums differ from other textual evaluations in terms of targets, devices, and environments, and that these features of evaluations in the memorandums are attributable partly to the social organization in which they are designed to be read. Members of the Board, or of the ministry funding the institute are neither knowledgeable nor interested in the House in an "operational" sense. By contrast, in e-mail and House News, which are seldom administrative texts, a much more varied set of targets, criteria, and devices are employed when evaluations are made. This difference lends further support to the previous chapter's analyses: members' evaluative practices differ from one activity to another in many ways, and consequently, they have to be analyzed as situated practices. At the end of this chapter, we saw that textual evaluations are largely a managerial thing in several ways. Managers are largely responsible for textual evaluations, just as they were largely responsible for evaluations in talk.

In contrast to the local social organization at work in
talk-based evaluations, evaluations in texts in some ways have a simpler, in other ways a more complex, relation to the House's local social organization. It is simpler in that, apparently, immediate recipient action does not affect evaluations in texts, teasing out its meaning in real time, and thus impacting the subsequent course of the discourse. It is more complex in that texts can be read in various places and at various times, which represents almost immeasurable difficulties for a researcher interested in their workings in the local social organization. Given these difficulties in getting at recipient action, we lack an important resource for analyzing how the local social organization is run in texts.\(^\text{Note}^3\) Still, a few conjectures can be made.

Note that by default, most texts analyzed in this chapter were managerial in character. All memorandums to the Board, for instance, were plainly managerial. Also, the minutes were thoroughly managerial. By implication, many evaluations in texts were a managerial prerogative (to use Storey's 1983 phrase), regardless of how non-managerial members reacted to these evaluations. Evaluations of projects made in formal meetings were textually constituted in the minutes, and these evaluations remained within managerial prerogatives. Evaluations concerning the whole House were mostly in the Board's memos that, again, were texts written in the managerial realm. Thus, in terms of targets, most evaluations took place within texts that were created by the management, and analyzable as managerial texts as well.

*House News* and e-mail, by contrast, were open to every potential writer. Also, given the House's character as a research
institute, many members were capable of writing out their opinions in a reasoned manner. Still, as already noted in this chapter, even in House News and e-mail, managers could show that they were writing in their managerial roles. Again, non-managerial members did not evaluate the House or its projects in texts. Thus, this analysis of texts confirms my earlier finding that evaluation was a thoroughly managerial action in the House.

A note about evaluations in the minutes is appropriate. As such, the fact that the minutes overwhelmingly target projects in evaluations is but a part of a thoroughgoing descriptive practice found in the House, based on "projects." Due to the fact that members describe almost all work in the House in terms of "projects," such description achieve an almost thing-like quality in the House. For members, it is this way of seeing that makes the House's work appear orderly, consisting of single projects that can be, and are, used as building blocks for larger units. Due to this framework, House work is describable, and exhibits constancy from one descriptive occasion to the next, and from one year to the next. Due to this practical descriptive foundation, the House's work also displays for members such derivative qualities as progress, delays, problems in relation to plans, and so forth. Evaluations largely focus on these qualities, evaluating them in various ways, especially in terms of the current stage of some project and, occasionally, in terms of plans, schedules, and budgetary projections. That there are other kinds of evaluations in other types of texts shows that this project-based descriptive practice is not the only possible way of describing House work. By analyzing evaluations in e-mail and House News, the current analysis has shown further how this
dominant description forms a locally-produced and recurrent institutional reality in the House. As such, it achieves something of the status of a Durkheimian "social fact."

Finally, we can observe that although earlier research has paid little attention to these kinds of textual evaluations, there is one group of studies that forms an exception. Formal evaluation techniques have received some attention from those who start from Foucauldian assumptions (see Fox 1989; Deetz 1992). Although these researchers have not studied textual evaluations as on-going situated practices, they have rightly pointed out that evaluations largely achieve their significance by impacting the way in which the target constructs his definition of himself. However, even though researchers building on Foucault have opened new vistas for analysis, in concentrating on formal evaluative techniques, they have neglected the mundane, on-going textual evaluative practices of the workplace. Correspondingly, they may have attributed too much importance to evaluations in texts -- the House data shows that although evaluation is a stable form of concerted action, this very stability is based on members' situated methods of producing action.
1. Some conceptual subtleties are involved in this sentence. "Queries" do not seek a narrow "reply," but rekey interaction into a response that rekeys the ensuing interaction (for a distinction between "reply" and "response," see Goffman [1981: 43]; and between question and query, see Boden [1994: 122-128]).

2. It ought to be noticed that although these evaluations appear to have some similarities to the "collective" and the "collecting" evaluations analyzed in previous Chapters, we are dealing with a different kind of unit here. For example, "collecting" evaluations were build on the basis of component projects that had been specified earlier. Thus, these evaluations were summaries of distinct evaluations that were targeted at single projects and research wholes rather than genuinely self-standing evaluations. Now, evaluations are targeted at the House as a whole, and are not based on a procedure that summarizes discrete evaluations. Thus, we are dealing with a different procedure here.

3. Actually, the analyst's position is in many ways similar to the members' position here. Notice that the writer does not have access to recipient context either. All she can do is guesswork, and occasional comments afterwards. In terms of the availability of local social organization, she is similarly positioned with the researcher or any other member. She cannot influence the reception process when it takes place, except by accident. This argument can easily be extended to any single reader. In talk, in contrast, the local social organization is at work and available at every moment of talk.
Chapter 9: Accountability and the Consequentiality of Managerial Evaluations

It is time to unpack the assumptions concerning the relationship of evaluations to social control at the workplace. As we saw in Chapter 1, all major sociological traditions see evaluation as a necessary but not sufficient part of managerial control. However, none of the major theories specifies the conditions under which evaluation leads to control or not. In this chapter, I will take a closer look at this relationship by looking at the situated work done by managers in making evaluations. The main argument of this chapter is that managerial evaluations do not automatically lead to managerial action. Instead, I will argue that the consequences of evaluations are bound to the situated work done by management in these same activities. The main contention of this study is that the consequences of evaluations are an achievement that result from managers' situated work.

At the heart of this analysis is accountability as depicted in Heritage (1983, 1987; see also Miller 1983). Managers study action methodically in ways seen in the previous chapters. If managers find that there is a problem in some piece of work, they may study the issue further to find out whether someone or something can be held accountable for this problem. If they find that someone or something should be held accountable, then they
may have reason to ponder taking corrective action. It is this specific, situated managerial work that has not been analyzed in existing research on evaluation. This chapter looks at how managers orient to accountability in their methodic evaluative studies of the House, and how these studies are related to the consequences of evaluations. More generally, this chapter will show that managers largely act (or decide not to act) through talk that is fundamental for understanding the organizational consequences that stem from their activities (comp. Boden 1994: 62-63).

As I argued in Chapter 3, different activities have a different relationship to decision-making in the House as well as in any other workplace. Formal activities are almost by definition evaluative, and presumably tied to decision-making, while non-formal activities have a more distant relationship to decisions. For the purposes of this chapter, then, I will distinguish two types of activities in which evaluations are done, those oriented to decision-making, and those that are not formally decision-oriented. Since this chapter studies the role of evaluation in managerial social control, I will focus on the possible effects of evaluations on workers. However, as we shall see, only few evaluations affect workers directly. Other evaluations impact workers indirectly: evaluations may reorganize managerial action, and thus change the social conditions of work for workers.

Throughout this chapter, one reservation ought to be kept in mind. I am largely talking about possible consequences rather than actual consequences. The reason for this is simple. Any consequence of some evaluation (or any piece of discourse for
that matter) is dependent on future circumstances and a series of intervening actions. This chapter steps back from the detailed analyses done in the previous chapters; I am here working in a more ethnographical way in a manner akin to Chapter 4.

**The Interpretive Basis of the Consequentiality of Evaluations**

The consequences of evaluations depend on the way in which members interpret the consequentiality of evaluations. When someone hears or reads an evaluation, she may make several additional inferences depending on the context of the evaluation. The possible consequentiality of evaluation depends at least partly on these inferences. The most important dividing line is based on how the socially managed (future) uses of this particular evaluation are brought to bear on the interpretation given to that evaluation. Evaluations in formal activities are done in a context that may serve as an "input" to other formal processes. In any bureaucracy, members can assume that these actions are systematic, predictable, and patterned. In short, it can be assumed that they are bureaucratically managed more or less in the manner described by Weber (1964: 329-341). People orient to bureaucratic action in this way, and base their sense of normalcy of action within their organization on bureaucratic anchoring points -- for example, on formal titles such as "office worker," "secretary," or "the Director" (comp. Bittner 1975). Because they make these assumptions -- they are part and parcel of their practical sociological reasoning (see Garfinkel 1967: 1-34) concerning action within a bureaucracy -- they treat evaluations in formal activities differently than in non-formal
activities, where such assumptions about the future socially-organized uses of evaluations are less organized.

Thus, when faced with an evaluation made in a formal activity designed to contribute to some on-going line of action, members know that several parties will act on evaluations in certain, bureaucratically-patterned ways, because they are held accountable for maintaining these institutional patterns (see Miller 1991: 88-91). In non-formal activities, by contrast, evaluations can not be treated this way. Evaluations may act as "inputs" to some future activity, but it is much less easy to imagine how. Thus, to make sense of whether some piece of evaluation is consequential, there is a need to analyze the surrounding context of that evaluation for clues. How this search happens is dealt with below.

On the Possible Consequences of Evaluations in Non-Formal Activities and in Texts

When it comes to the possible consequences of evaluations that take place in non-formal activities and in texts, three cases have to be distinguished. First, most evaluations in non-formal activities and in texts were, for reasons we shall soon see, either essentially inconsequential, or the consequences of these evaluations were dependent on members' situated interpretations of their significance. Secondly, in some cases evaluations may have consequences due to the way hearers (or readers) make sense of the context of the evaluation. Thirdly, there is a third way in which evaluations may become consequential even though the people affected may never be aware
of these consequences. Namely, some evaluations affect management activities, and thus change the situational premises from which future activities spring forth. Out of these three alternatives, the first one is the most basic; the last two cases can be taken as exceptions.

1. The Essential Inconsequentiality of Non-Formal and Textual Evaluations

Many evaluations in non-formal activities and in texts are inconsequential. For instance, in Example 11 in Chapter 8, Jari's e-mail formulates Mia's previous allegation as a provocation, and answers this provocation. As such, this e-mail message puts a reasoned stop to Mia's possible attempt to make changes in the House's research profile, and to rally support for such changes among the management and non-managerial workers. However, evaluations embedded in Jari's message serve to support the message's on-going argument. They are not consequential in any direct manner. Another example, Example 1, is from House News. This text reports the managerial group discussion of the new team-based organization (see Chapter 2). In this discussion, the managerial group had come to the conclusion that research has been going well this year along the lines of the new organization.

Example 1. [House News 12/21/95, p. 6]

```
The Managerial Group

: The current organization of research groups

In the context of dealing with the action plan and the
```
financial plan for 1996, it has been noted in the managerial group that research activity has begun well in the thematic areas specified for research groups in the previous year. ((continues to describe the objectives of the new organization))

Apparently, this evaluation did not have any observable consequences. Rather, it has been reduced to managerial group announcement about the new organization's functioning. In this, it is typical of the House more generally. Notice also that this evaluation is positive in character, and thus does not raise the issues of whether there is something wrong. These kinds of evaluations do not prompt any action, but rather project a continuing of the previous sorts of action. As such, this footing allows the House's social organization to run its course unobstructed.

However, even when non-formal and textual evaluations appear to be inconsequential, they may still cause a stir. Whether they do depends on several kinds of participant inferences. They make the management's wishes and positions available for observation, and may thus act as an intersubjective basis for action. Thus, in reading Example 1, readers know that management is pleased with the on-going organizational change, and can safely conclude that workers' current activities have managerial approval. Similarly, when in the e-mail to "everyone," Jari counters Mia's allegations about the weaknesses of House work, and writes that "Nina for her part has done an excellent job collecting food balance sheets and analyzing what kinds of differences you end up with in consumption figures by relying on different statistics," he also effectively shows his appreciation of Nina's work. These evaluations, though by no means
consequential in any social control sense, thus make open the management's positions on the target, and for their part change the conditions of future discourse on that matter. Evaluations, then, display members' positions on some target.

More complex inferences may also be at stake here. Cuff has noted that "in producing an account of what is happening in the world... the teller... is also unavoidably producing materials which make available possible findings about his characterological and moral appearances as displayed in his talk" (Cuff 1993: 40). These characterological and moral inferences, in turn, may impact the way in which some piece of evaluation is understood. First, evaluations make managers' positions on some piece of work available for other participants, and thus provide materials for listeners' membership analyses (see Sacks 1972a,b; Boden 1994: 57-64). Other participants may use their newly-won knowledge to plan their own actions in the future. Sacks maintained that when seeing or hearing about an action, people routinely see these actions as "belonging" to certain categories of persons. These categorizations are derived not only from actions, as Sacks proposed, but also from opinions, knowledge, and so forth (see Eglin and Hester 1992). They use these categories in making sense of the perceived actions of these people, and predicting how they will behave in the future under varying circumstances. Thus, these simple interpretive activities actually contain whole common-sense theories of social structures (Garfinkel 1967: esp. 92-94). Due to these categorizations, there are various types of "managers" for people. Non-managerial members' activities partly depend on these interpretations. What comes out of evaluations, and what kinds of actions managers
could make in response to these non-managerial members' activities depends on these activities. Members routinely make these membership analyses and use their analyses in choosing their actions. They do not treat managers as mutually interchangeable units.

These inferences are available for us in the simple fact that different managers are treated differently. For example, various members routinely joke Jari, especially Birgitta, a senior researcher. By contrast, such behavior would have been playing with fire with Anita. Once, for example, she had just been put into an awkward position: Johanna had not told her about the ministry's seminar schedule, and during a meeting she received a phone call from a national business magazine asking about this schedule. She had not been able to answer, and was visibly angry when she got back from the phone to the meeting [A 2/2/95]. It was obvious to those present that she can be fiercely aroused (comp. Boden 1994: 156).

In addition, more complex interpretations become available to members. Boden argues that informal meetings are places in which positions are taken and clarified, and where organizational agendas are pursued (see also Boden 1994: 155-157). In these meetings, managers pursue their causes and interests, sometimes building alliances, sometimes competing for resources and other available goods. To a large extent, management's work takes place in these encounters, and in series of several encounters. Evaluations are one element which lays bare the opinions expressed by managers. Opinions and stances made observable in talk or in text make several subsequent actions possible. How managers pursue their organizational
agendas have been analyzed in detail by Boden (Boden 1994: 153-178), and Chapter 7 gave us an idea of how managers team up in interaction, and of their local alliances and situational loyalties. These observations could also serve as materials in talk behind the backs of managers, and as materials for future commentary.

2. Evaluations as a Part of Instructed Action

In some cases, evaluations do have consequences. In some of these cases, the management makes an evaluation in such a way that is linked to an instructed action of some sort (see Amerine and Bilmes, quoted in Suchman 1987: 101-104). In this case, the possible consequentiality of action is related to the instructed character of action and to an understanding that the management has powers to act upon these instructions. In this context, evaluations partition activities, people, or other targets into accepted, proper, adequate, and into improper, inappropriate, and so forth, and thus make observable a link between the instructions, behavior and, sometimes, sanctions linked to certain actions.

In the following case, there has been a repeated breach of an administratively significant procedure, and the managers have to intervene. In fact, the following case is rather dramatic, despite several softening tricks used by Karita in this case. These "softeners" include a colloquial style (for example, she writes as if she were speaking and directs her words directly to the addressee), the use of humor (for example, the expressions "Service Normale," "bisquettes," and "room service"), and the
framing of her evaluative item as "greetings from Santala" (line 15, Santala is an administrator in the Housing Office, the House's parent organization). Thus, she shows that she is not acting on her own initiative, but is someone else's messenger. Then she lists several normal, perfectly good reasons for absenteeism and, finally, she proposes a solution to the current problem as well as an alternative (lines 19-20).

Example 2: [E-mail 2/6/95 15:52]
1 From: KARITA JOKELA
2 To: EVERYONE
3 Subject: A COUPLE OF WORDS ABOUT ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:
4 Date: 6. February 1995 15:52

1 The group secretaries take care of meeting arrangements just as before. Service Normale still means coffee and bisquettes. If, given the nature of the occasion, you need something else, leave your wishes beforehand (preferably well before) with room service. Otherwise you may have to take a little walk by yourself.
2 Leave every payable receipt (also travel expenses) with Mari, who takes care of accounts and the follow-up of monies here. Mari is in verbal and mail contact with the accounting unit of the HO.
3 The same goes with HRI invoicing. Through Mari, these are taken care of too. The housing Office only handles transfers of money.
4 Further greetings from Santala, who a couple of times each month asks embarrassing questions about whether you were a whole day or several days off because of work (travel, training, meetings), sickness (even children get sick) or because of relaxation (vacation). Despite requests, everyone does not inform the office about days off. Sorry for there being these VES and TESs. If bureaucracy annoys you, we can ourselves make a contract to ease it: deduct each of your unannounced days off from your annual vacation. Of if you don't want that, let's develop an electric record for Sanna.

1) Text in address fields in English in original.
2) As in original.
3) The Housing Office, the House's parent agency.
4) Shorthand for the Housing Research Institute.
5) Abbreviations for various national pension schemes.

The evaluative character of this extract is based on item 4, which tells the punishment Karita is going to invoke if the staff
does not get more disciplined in terms of punching in and out. Her message makes it clear that the current neglect is punishable. By implication, workers are held accountable for this particular problem. The consequentiality of this item does not rest on the evaluation as such, but on the threat of sanction invoked by Karita. To lose (paid) vacation days on the basis of forgetting to punch in or out promptly is a rather harsh warning. Still, it ought to be noted that the consequences of this case flow not so much from the implied evaluation, but from the threat of consequences. This threat is based on management's formal powers over institutional rules and resources for sanctioning action.

What is at stake here is intersubjectivity rather than the Director's formal powers as such. After reading Karita's e-mail, the readers now know that management disapproves of laxity in punching in and out properly. Similarly, management knows that House members should know its opinion. Because management can now assume that workers know their instructions, they know that workers cannot continue their lax habits using ignorance or non-understanding as an excuse. Because of her message, there is an intersubjective basis for holding members accountable for their activities if they continue their lax habits. When Karita evokes sanctions and links certain behaviors to these sanctions, her guidelines are particularly clear -- these sanctions are intersubjectively available as well. Finally, a further inference concerning management's formal powers is at work as well: this message's "felicity condition" is that it is done by the Director. Everyone is supposed to know that she is able to act on her threat and sanction other members, should they continue to
act contrary to her instructions.

Notice, though, that these intersubjective layers are not usually explicit — instead, when problems are perceived, they may be relied on as resources for formulating these problems and justifying possible managerial actions aimed at correcting the situation. Notice also that these "instructions" arise from various local circumstances: in Example 1 in Chapter 7, Anselmi not only learned Karita's opinion of his idea of arranging in-house seminars, but could also take her evaluation as an instruction to go ahead with his plan. Apparently, non-managerial workers could elicit such "instructions" by describing their aims and then observing how managers formulate their thoughts. This is what the researcher Laura appeared to do in a meeting on 1/18/95 where she reported on her discussions at a seminar in Kuopio, and offered her travel report as a background for a strategic discussion about the pros and cons of opening a cooperative research effort with another Helsinki-based research institute.

3. On Possible Indirect Effects of Evaluations

Finally, non-formal and textual evaluations may also impact House activities indirectly, and thus they may be a part of organized action that changes the social context of activity in the future. In plain English, evaluations impact activities "behind the back" of workers (and, occasionally, some managers as well). People thus affected may not even know that they are faced with a situation shaped by a prior evaluation.

For example, in the (informal) meeting of 1/18/95, two managers and a few researchers reviewed House projects in order
to find out which ones could be used in initiating cooperation with another institute. Evaluations in these reviews led to a selection of a bunch of researchers who were asked to contribute to this cooperation on the basis of talk in this meeting. Thus, Maria and Ari, whose recent work was praised by Jari (see Chapter 7, Example 3) were immediately informed about the project, while Bengt Vahtera, who was criticized in the meeting, was not asked to join the project (see Chapter 7, Examples 5a and 5b). In the context of the improvised strategic character of this meeting, evaluations could have long-term consequences beyond the bounds of the immediate interactional context. Still, these evaluations drew their significance from the activity context rather than from talk as such. However, evaluations in this meeting show that managerial evaluations could impact workers even though the workers would never have become aware of this background. Those who were selected for this cooperation may have been told about these discussions. Those who were dropped, or were not even regarded for cooperation, were not probably even aware of what had happened, unless they happened to hear about this meeting from their friends who were present. Note

Of course, whether these evaluations impact action depends on many kinds of subsequent contingencies and circumstances. For instance, in the meeting of 1/18/95, despite Jari's positive evaluation of Maria's and Ari's recent paper (Example 3 in Chapter 7), and despite his idea that Maria and Ari should be invited to contribute to the process, neither of them did participate, largely because of their other duties. However, both were informed about talks in the 1/18/95 meeting. Ironically, Bengt did participate in the project's later
meetings. At best, evaluations may represent initial starting points of action, and provide possible justifications for further actions. Whether non-formal evaluations have consequences beyond shaping the cognition of participants depends on subsequent circumstances.

Evaluations in formal meetings often have this character as well. Especially, evaluations in conversational parts of formal meetings all fall within this class of possible effects. For example, it is difficult to see what kind of effects Mikko's evaluative opinion "In my opinion it is, in my opinion the system under which they are put is bad," (Chapter 7, Example 4, lines 3-6) could have if it is not backed up by any formal decision. (Mikko's turn, of course, could have led to a decision proposal and to a decision, but did not).

On The Possible CONSEQUENTIALITY of Evaluations in Formal Activities

In terms of consequences, evaluations in formal activities exhibit these same qualities as evaluations in texts and non-formal activities. For example, evaluations in formal activities also have indirect effects. In Chapter 8, we saw that although formal meetings are public in character, and records are kept of them, these records are highly elliptical and condensed to such a degree that making sense of the minutes generally "presupposes an understanding of that order for a correct reading," as Garfinkel has put the matter in another context (1967: 201). It is exceedingly difficult to construct the interpretations and intentions of the managers using these
records only. Thus, arrangements made by management in, say, formal meetings, are for the most part inaccessible to outsiders.

However, evaluations in formal activities differ from these possible consequences in two ways. First, the right to be present, to talk, and to participate in decision-making in formal meetings is usually restricted to the managerial group (of course, it has a right to allow outsiders to participate in meetings at several levels. - See Boden 1994: 90-96 for some of the membership issues involved here). Thus, in formal meetings, the interpretive consequences studied above are restricted to a small subset of House members. Secondly, in analyzing whether and how evaluations are consequential in formal meetings and other formal activities, a new possibility has to be taken into account. Formal managerial meetings are (formally) "decisional" while, say, informal meetings are so only de facto (comp. Boden 1994: 84-86). Thus, the way in which evaluations are treated differs in these two types of meetings in several ways. Formal activities are thoroughly built with an eye on evaluation that may prepare decision-making. The word "may" is crucial here. In most cases, evaluations in formal activities do not lead to any managerial action. Instead, the managerial group's evaluative meetings are largely reduced to progress reviews, or general follow-up talk about recent House activities. The explanation to this apparent paradox lies in the interpretive activities taken by management in these meetings. These interpretive activities often led managers to realize that no action was needed even when evaluations were alarming initially. This footing by and large allowed the organization to run its course as it would without managerial intervention.
1. How Evaluations are Made Inconsequential in Formal Activities

There is a "preference-like" organization at work in evaluation in formal meetings. This preference organization, akin to that studied by Pomerantz (1984) in another context, can be stated as follows. The preferred case is when the evaluable is on a perceivedly normal course (see Heritage 1987: 240). If so, the situation is recorded, but does not call forth any further elaboration. When a problem is perceived, which is the dispreferred alternative, inquiries into the reasons for this state of affairs is expectable. In the House, these inquiries often served to point out that no corrective action was needed. Section 1.1 deals with the preferred case. Section 1.2 will deal with the dispreferred case.

1.1 Inaction Based on the Perception of Things-as-Usual

Occasionally, inaction was based on the perception that some project was doing well. For instance, in Example 3 Mikko tells about one of his own projects. Since no apparent problems are made explicit in this report, it does not cause the managerial group to act.

Example 3. [A 05/30/95:1 1(2) B:2, 529-534]
1 Mi .hhhh No sit, (.) (nyt nys) no sitte tääl o tääl o<
  hhh Well then, (.) Well then there is here is<
2 Tält osaltahan on tullu nyt tavallaan< Mult on tullu
  this part is come now in+a+sense from+me has come+out
  In this part [it] has come from me< I have written
3 yks::: (0.3) (k) yks: tällanen (0.3) <juttu.> (.)
  one one sort+of story
More or less similar cases can be found in various examples analyzed earlier in this study. For example, in Chapters 5 and 6, several evaluations made visible that these projects were doing "normally" and thus did not call forth managerial action. Note2

Of course, the managerial group minutes are explicitly decisional in character. Thus, they might impact action in multiple ways. However, this does not turn out to be the case. Out of all the hundreds of items in the minutes, only a few were decisional, and these were not usually evaluative. Example 4 provides a good example of this state of affairs.

**Example 4.** [managerial group minutes 5/30/95, p. 4, item 5]

The Preparation Stage of Yearbooks etc.

The SUPERMAN's Research data base's content book is in the finishing stage. The data for the content book of the Goods and Services's [data base] will be browsed through with researchers after the Summer. A separate publication with its own name will come out of the Housing group.

Here we have three reports and one evaluation (in line 2). However, there are no decisional markers. Consequently, the environment is not "decisional" in that it would be meant to carry implications beyond the text. Rather, this piece of text resembles managerial group progress reviews in talk. This was usually the case in evaluations in the minutes. Although in a potential decisional environment, these evaluations were generally not meant to be consequential. Instead, the
"decisionality" of the minutes had to be specifically occasioned in the text. However, it appears that although the minutes are "decisional" texts, evaluations in them are not. I could not find a single instance in the minutes where an evaluation would have been used as grounds for some decision. On the contrary, evaluations appeared in informational and review contexts in the minutes. Thus, in terms of consequences, evaluations in the minutes do not form an exception to the more typical pattern of textual evaluations.

As we saw in Chapter 5, hearers may infer that there is no problem in a project unless the speaker specifically makes it clear that this project is somehow in difficulties. Here, we meet an extension of this result. If problems are not reported, then the implication is that there is no need, nor justification, for managerial intervention. Instead, managers let the project go on without any interference.

1.2 Inaction When Problems Were Perceived

In many cases, the evaluation did signal trouble, and in a few cases this trouble was alarming. Still, most of these evaluations did not prompt managerial action. Next I will look briefly at the reasons for this inaction. In general, there appears to be two types of circumstances in which this was the case. First, in some cases, managers found that the state of affairs behind the original perception of trouble was somehow defective; for example, it could be based on a wrong inference or a wrong premise. Secondly, when they found that the alarming evaluation was correct, they occasionally found out that there
were good reasons for this problem, and that, correspondingly, there were no reasons for taking action: the problem could be accounted for by legitimate reasons.

1.2.1 Accounting for Errors in Information or in Evaluative Reasoning

The simplest reason for not taking action was that the managerial group found an error in some figure used in making evaluations. Such was the case in Chapter 5, Example 5, where the figure printed from the accounting system maintained that the House had used 62% of its monies for 1995 by May 15th. Petri then pointed out that this figure was wrong, and the real figure was 33%, which was not alarming. After this explanation, the managerial group went ahead and reviewed single budget categories.

Another related reason for not taking action was based on showing that the reasoning that had led to an evaluation was somehow faulty and wrong. In one case, Anita defended the SUPERMAN marketing campaign by pointing out that the project is not finished, and thus its success cannot yet be properly judged [A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 1421-1499]. Thus, she disputed Petri's and Mikko's evaluation of the high price of the marketing project by arguing that they were judging the project on unfair and insufficient grounds. Since their evaluation was based on wrong premises, their inference was wrong. Consequently, no action was needed or could be justifiably taken on the basis of this evaluation.
1.2.2 Accounting for "Real" Lapses

The analysis above accounts for a limited number of cases only. In many cases, the managerial group was at least somewhat critical of the target being talked about. Still, this fact did not mean that they were prone to take action on the basis of this perception of trouble. Quite the contrary. If they found that something was going wrong, given their organizationally grounded schemes of interpretation, they went on to study the reasons that accounted for the trouble. These reasons are listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Reasons for Inaction When the Evaluation Was Found to Be Valid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The speaker shows that the problem may be soon over. By implication, there is no reason to take action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 8, Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The lapse can be shown to have taken place in a non-serious context. By implication, the lapse does not lead to serious consequences, or to the disruption of significant activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 7, Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Something in the Nature of the Work May Account for the Discrepancy. These accounts normalize perceived discrepancies and thus show that there is no reason to act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appeals to hurry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appeals to other work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working alone causes problems and delay</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 11, Chapter 6

- Appeals to resources

Non-progress is caused by a lack of resources [For example, A 05/30/95 1(2) A:1 & B:1, 214-217]

4. The Social Context of Action May Account for the Trouble If the Managers Cannot Change This Context

- Others' attitudes and activities

Difficulties in some project are caused by outsiders' indifference or resistance [For example, A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 69-80, 120-150; A 05/30/95 2(2) B:11, 7-29]

Example 6

5. Organizational Reasons May Account for the Lapse

5.1 Proper arrangements have been made before the lapse occurred. If so, the lapse leads to a minor disruption only

Example 5

One budget category had been overrun by 166% by the middle of May, but since this lapse took place in a small category that was reserved for unexpected expenses, it did not prompt worry.

5.2 When the reason for a lapse was a managerial order, the worker is not accountable for it. By implication, the trouble will be over, when the additional duties are over

Example 3,

Chapter 5

Here, Marketta's work was found to be late because she had been assigned to other work tasks by Karita.

Next, I will study more closely two instances of talk to show how the managerial group's in-situ reasoning led them to normalize the perceived inadequacies of action made observable by evaluations, and how this work led them to find out that no remedial action was called for.

In the first instance, the managerial group learned that there was something exceptional going on. However, they also learned that there were exceptional reasons for this state of affairs. Even before mentioning that one budget category has been shockingly overrun, Karita ventures to tell more about the nature of this category (lines 1 to 9), and then proceeds to tell whose project is in this category in lines 9 to 13, where she also elicits an additional explanation from Petri. Then, in lines 17-19 she notes that 166% of monies in that category have already
been used, and formulates this as evidence that this kind of category for "surprises" (line 20) is badly needed. Then she notes that it is probably Pauli Ström's book that has caused the perturbation, and goes on to elaborate this feature.

Example 5. [A 05/22/95:1 1(3) A:3-5, 3-36]

1 K Tässä on tään yksi, (. ) yksi tuota eli here is this one, (. ) this one well that is

2 "tutkimustoiminta erittelemätön"< täähä on "non-categorized research activity"< This is

3 oikeastaan (. ) semmonen (. ) a- ryhmä mikä really (. ) a (. ) group which

4 me Petrin kanssa perustettiin .hhh (0.2) Sen I set up with Petri .hhh (0.2) We don't

5 nimistähän meillä eino, siellä< Meillä on have one with that name, there< >We have

6 tut-< varsinaiset tutkimuskokonaisuudet joit res-< proper research groups There are

7 on kuus, kappaleetta ja sitten on tuota niin six, of them and then there's well ehm

8 (. ) "tutkimustoiminta erittelemätön"< Me pantiin (. ) "non-categorized research activity"< We did put

9 sinne yksi s'mmo'nen ryhmä ihan varalta ja nyt there one group with that name just to make sure and

10 mä en muista (. ) ö-- (. ) e- (. ) kenen (. ) hanke I don't remember now (. ) e- (. ) whose (. ) project

11 siinä sitte nyt tässä vaiheessa jo on viety. has already been taken there at this stage.

12 (1.4)

13 K Muistaksä Petri

14 (0.5)

15 P #En,#

16 (0.8)

17 K Tiliöinnissä (0.8) ku sehän on< (0.2) Siit on In accounting (0.8) we'll it's< (0.2) [We] have
In this example, Karita tells the story behind one alarming figure. In this case, there is a simple reason for this state of affairs, the publishing of Pauli Ström's methods book (it dealt non-mathematically with regression diagnostics in time series...
contexts). The point here is that this figure, appalling as such, is not a source of worry for two reasons. First, should such budgetary disaster have taken place in some "normal" category, this situation would be studied in detail to find out whether there is something totally wrong in the budgeting system. This lapse is in an account that is designed to accommodate surprises, which are by definition difficult to predict and budget. Here, the perturbation is in a place where its consequences for the system are not serious. Secondly, no other problems are mentioned in this context. This project is already finished and thus fait accompli; an inquiry into the reasons for the lapse would still be possible. However, this time there is a legitimate reason for the lapse: a publication.

Next we may take another look at how managers made it clear that some evaluation did not justify action. To describe actions that are designed to mitigate or to neutralize some action or opinion that would otherwise be untoward, sociologists conventionally use the term "account." An early definition of the term "account" is given by Scott and Lyman, who defined it in the following way:

By an account... we mean a statement made by a social actor to explain unanticipated or untoward behavior -- whether that behavior is his own or that of others, and whether the proximate cause for the statement arises from the actor himself or from someone else. An account is not called for when people engage in routine, commonsense behavior in a cultural environment that recognizes that behavior as such. (Scott and Lyman 1968: 46).

Scott and Lyman divide accounts into two classes, "excuses" and "justifications," the former meaning "socially approved vocabularies for mitigating or relieving responsibility when
conduct is questioned" (Scott and Lyman 1968: 47), and the latter "socially approved vocabularies that neutralize an act or its consequences when one or both are called into question" (Scott and Lyman 1968: 53). According to Scott and Lyman, people make excuses by appealing to accidents, defeasibility, biological drives, and to scapegoats (appeals to defeasibility consist of appeals to non-knowledge and to the weaknesses of will). Justifications are made by denying injury, denying the victim ("the victim deserved it"), by condemning the condemner, and by appealing to loyalties (Scott and Lyman 1968: 47-52). These accounts are not necessarily honored by recipients, who may or may not accept them on the grounds of illegitimacy or reasonability. Accounts may be positioned either before the evaluation, or after it. They may be produced by the speaker, as well as by some of the recipients. Finally, in some cases, people may account for difficulties both in their own and in someone else's work.\footnote{Note4}

Sometimes, it was the social context of action that was brought to account for the problem in some project. In the following example, Anita tells about the marketing campaign of the SUPERMAN data base. This campaign had had one full-time temporary worker, who had travelled around the country trying to sell SUPERMAN to a variety of institutional customers. Other members of the information service were also involved in the campaign, which was one of the developmental projects Anita was supposed to report on in the managerial group. Interestingly, in her report, she never voices an evaluation of the campaign, well finished by then. Instead of doing a normal report, she describes in detail several activities she had taken to promote SUPERMAN,
and left the evaluation to her recipients. This report covers more than 250 lines in transcript, and there were several stories embedded in it. This is not the place to get deeper into her report. Instead, we will take a look one of these stories, in which she tells about her attempts to contact the Master Builder's Union. They had their annual training days in the fall, and Anita had tried to get 15 minutes to market SUPERMAN, as she thought they might possibly be interested. Here is how Anita describes what happened when she contacted the Union.

Example 6. [A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 123-143]
1 A ... (1.4) semmonen mi(n)kä mä huomaan on (0.9) tai
... (1.4) something th(h)at I find is (0.9) well
2 /mä kävin eilen pitkän\ puhelinkeskustelun
/Yesterday I had a long\ Telephone conversation
3 esimerkkinä (0.8) .h rakennusmestarien liitto,
äš an example (0.8) .h the Master Builders' Union,
4 .hh /Mä yritin saa
hh /I tried to get
5 sinne\ koulu- koulutus#äiville syksyyn,# (1.0)
at their\ training days in the fall,# (1.0)
6 .hh <ja tota:> (0.3) .mt (0.2) #ö:# Kar- #ö::#
.hh <and well:> (0.3) .mt (0.2) #e:# Kar- #e::#
7 toi Kari Kuuselahan (.) oti sen sitte niitten,
it was Kari Kuusela (.) who took it to in their,
8 (.) johtokunnan (.) tai mikä hallitus se niil On.
(. ) Board ( . ) or council or whatever it is that they HAVE.
9 (0.3) .hh sit se: sitte tota näin eilen(:)
(0.3) .hh then he: well then he called Yesterday(:)
10 soitti et mikä on\ tilan- (s- t-) (0.2) @e::i:
about what the situation- (s- t-) is (0.2) @n::o:
11 he: nyt ei se nyt o@ mikään ei heh nyt halua sinne
they: don't no they don't want it there
12 (ja mikä on/mitään) >/Mäst en mä tarttis ku viistoist
(and what is/anything) >/I=then-[säId] that I only need
13 minuuttia pä-\ puheenvuoron siell#ää (0.3) @#E:i.#@
She makes it clear that she had not managed to arrange to talk about SUPERMAN. In accounting for this failure, she formulates the difficulty by telling about her contacts with possible buyers, and by their negative reactions to her asking for just a small favor. She brings in the social context to account for problems and difficulties in the SUPERMAN marketing campaign by underlining the Union officials' resistance to her query. Obviously, the Master Builder's Union is beyond the control of the House. Thus, a "no" from the Union means that little can be done in this situation. Consequently, although a marketing opportunity had been wasted, it is not Anita's fault. On the contrary, the very telling of this episode proves that she has been actively pushing SUPERMAN on the market.

It was through these kinds of practices that the House managers, to borrow an expression from Freidson (1980: 105-120), made evaluations "neutral" and ineffective in formal meetings. The House managers used several procedures to "normalize" perceived discrepancies between their expectations and the perceived outcomes of some action. In general, they only took
action if they found that they could not find acceptable reasons for the perceived variance in the House's work. The importance of this point is that talk in these meetings was connected to, and constitutive of, the House's formal authority structure. Managers could have used their powers, but did not, due to multiply situated work through which they showed that no action was warranted.

It is important to note that managerial inaction was a result of the managers' mundane, essentially routine everyday work. In doing this work, they relied on several kinds of procedures that "normalized" projects that had originally looked somehow problematic. Consequently, they found that no action was called for even in most of those cases in which they initially perceived disorder, and could not account for this perception in terms of faulty information, some organizational procedure, or in terms of the wrong premises or reasoning that lay behind the alarming evaluation. Due to these procedures, most "abnormal" cases are found to be "typical" and as such, non-alarming. A similar notion of attending to the normality of the scene, and normalizing, if possible, perceived discrepancies before taking action has been described in several other settings as well. As such, this finding puts the current study in line with a mass of ethnomethodological studies of the reasoning procedures used at various workplaces. (For example, see Sudnow [1965], Bittner [1967a, 1967b]; Pollner 1974, 1987; Heritage 1989: 212-221; for more theoretical treatments, see Garfinkel 1963 [1990], and Heritage 1987).

2. Perceived "Moral" Lapses and the Long-Term Consequences of
Managerial group perception of ineptitude in some piece of work led to managerial action in one particular type of situation in which some worker had provided evidence pointing out that the grounds for the perception of difficulties were related to the worker's personal qualities, to his plans, or to his intentions. In these situations, managers went on to talk about possible actions, and in a few cases, took action based on this talk.

For instance, in Johanna's case below (also reported in Chapter 4, Example 16, and in Chapter 6, Example 10), the managerial group decided to talk to the ministry about her project, so they could get this project back onto a track that would take House plans into account as well. This project, ordered and run by the Council of State, was lagging, with little hope of being finished in the forthcoming months. Because Johanna was tied to that project, she could not work on her own (planned) work, which endangered the objectives of her research group. The trouble was not so much that Johanna was working in a ministry-run project; rather, the problem was that she was planning to delay publishing her work for more than a year, and had made non-scientific arguments to defend her plans when confronted by Anita. After hearing Anita's report about Johanna's plans, Karita and Mikko decided to get to the ministry to talk about the project to an administrator, Joki, who was responsible for this state of affairs (lines 46 to 55).

Example 7. [A 05/30/95:1 1(2) B:2, 404-413] (detail)
46 K [.hh No MEIl on .tuota (.) meil on varmaan]
Well, we've surely have

Mikon kanssa nii meiän täytyy sen Kui-kan have to talk with Mikko to Joki about

*kansa sa puhua tuota* että (tästä) mitäs me *what well ab* (this) what we

.hhh *#Täyttyy# miettii miten *#[We] must# think about

(*mh_hmh*)

suunnitelmassa have in plan

(niinku) mitä sen kanssa teh#därän# (what) we're going to do with

*J o* nä in on

*Y* at's true

*m m*

*Ja siin on sit)* *(And there's then)*

That's true and in All< Many things

*(Ja siin on sit)* *(And there's then)*

Johannan (0.2) integraatiotutkimuksen .hhhh Is Johanna's integration+research

are (. ) marked in (0.2) Johanna's

kokoaisuuteen niin merkitty m:nia asioita ja tō+a+whole then marked many things and

integration research .hhhh group

niitten suhteen ei oo oikeestaan hän ei oo ainakaan to+them relation no is really she no is certainly+not she has not done anything

mitään #tehny# anything done for #them#

Ei (. ) *(kä o-)* No (. ) *(she has) n't

#e:# eli tuota (0.2) kaikki on #s:# so so that (0.2) everything
After hearing Anita's story about Johanna's aims, Karita and Mikko are here concluding that they have to take action to make sure that Johanna's project would not be late. The way in which Karita and Mikko make their conclusion available in this exchange show that they do hold Johanna personally accountable for the trouble. Furthermore, Anita's story makes it apparent that Johanna's plans for the future do not promise to change the situation. Thus, Karita and Mikko decide to ponder taking action on Anita's piece of news. Notice that in this case, the perception of trouble grew from the fact that Johanna's personal plans would make it difficult for Johanna's research group to achieve the objectives set in the House plans. The trouble does not lie so much in Johanna's plans, but in the threat they pose to the House's planning process (lines 59-63). Because of Johanna's plans, the results of her group depend on Karola's, her fellow researcher's, work alone (lines 64-67).

Attributions like these could lead to rather extreme forms of sanctioning especially if the managerial group could reliably establish (in practical terms) that the moral lapse was not just an isolated instance, but recurrent enough to suggest that some stable feature of personality was at work. For example, I was told about two cases in which a worker was fired from the House, due to managers' negative perception of their work and
working habits. In one case, a worker had quarrelled with one member of management, who had finally fired him. According to my informant, the initial trouble had been his work. A biologist by training, he had been made to program a data base, which did not prove to be a success. My informant also said that this worker had a generous personality, and still lived in a carefree student-like manner. Often, for example, he had taken an hour off to go to the university to listen to some lecture even though he worked in the telephone service. Calls kept pouring in, but since no one knew where he was, his behavior was a constant source of turmoil in the House. After several incidents, his supervisor got mad and fired him. He stayed in the House during his term of notice, but decided to leave even though the Director specifically asked him to stay in the House afterwards [D 11/3/94, 95-115]. In another case, another manager got irritated with another worker whose work progressed too slowly. His project should have been finished by the end of August, another informant told me in November, which had aroused resentment in the management [I 10/30/95, 539-553]. His contract was not renewed in the spring, and he left the House in April, largely due to the pressure from his supervising manager. However, he came back to the House in June because of pressure put on management by his clients and by his successor. He left for good after the vacation period in Summer 1996. Again, the trouble seemed to be his personality; for example, he had gotten married and taken a two-week honeymoon trip to the Maldive Islands in November, which was a critical time in his project [D 11/23/1994, 8-25]. His vacation was not taken well by management, who got rid of him later in the spring.
There is a clear parallel here to Bosk's (1979) discussion of "moral errors," discussed in Chapter 1: in the medical school he studied, teachers are willing to ignore students' "technical" errors. When they discover "moral" errors, or attitudes improper to future doctors, they react swiftly. Bosk's argument seems to apply to a few cases in the House quite well, but with one difference: the House was not a school, where students are surveyed on a constant basis. Due to this contextual difference, pointing out moral errors was a rare occurrence in the House. A better comparison to the House is the rather toothless "collegial" system of control described by Freidson (1980). It was only if some worker provided verbal or behavioral evidence that showed that she did not even want to comply with the House's schemes, and if the resulting lapse was extreme (or could be projected to be extreme), that managerial intervention was even considered. Again, this finding is corroborated by findings in other studies where it has often been found that recalcitrant offenders, clients, or co-workers who do not go along with the system, and thus make work more cumbersome, receive harsher treatment than those who do not display such "moral" opposition (for policemen, see Bittner [1967b: 708] and Spencer [1988: 70-71]; for lawyers, see Sudnow [1965: 270-274], and Maynard [1984: 350-35]; for court staffers, see Emerson [1991: 205-206]; and for social workers, see Miller [1983], and Miller and Holstein [1995]).

Thus, in the House's managerial evaluative practices, there are built-in assumptions about the desired qualities of workers, and if some member gives evidence that suggests that she does not have these qualities, then a social control machinery
may step in. Here, my data is well in line with those researchers who have argued that evaluation in today's workplaces is increasingly targeted at workers' personalities (see Edwards 1979: 139-152; Barker 1993; Kunda 1992: 14-22; Jackall 1988). Still, it is important to note that the work done by managers is lacking in these accounts, with the result that a good chunk of the specificity of managerial work is lost. Furthermore, the consequences of some evaluation depend on later actions taken by members of the managerial group. For example, even though the managerial group "decided" to name a book "Housing: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow," as a researcher proposed [A 05/30/95 2(2) A:3, 634], the book got a different name when it came out several months later. Exchanges in meetings thus may provide a warrant for managerial action, but need not lead to consequences even if these consequences would seem clear-cut. Issues that came up in meetings may be taken up in a variety of settings after the meeting, ranging from spontaneous cafeteria conversations to later meetings, to printed memorandums and to House News. Even in Johanna's case, the managerial group's actions were not that radical. Still, management could act vigorously, as I have shown above. It knew how to use sanctions, and used its powers if a sufficient warrant for sanctioning was found, and no proper excuses, explanations, or accounts were made available. However, since these more drastic consequences were rare, it can fairly be said that the House's management avoided tough sanctions and carefully studied possible ameliorative circumstances before it decided to use its powers. Sanctions were an option of last resort (Emerson 1981), and management could hardly be seen to be aggressive in its uses of power. In this context, it should be
remembered that most workers had a permanent job, and with three exceptions, all were members of various unions. Most workers were thus quite well protected against arbitrary uses of extreme sanctions. Only a handful of workers were vulnerable in this respect.

**Results**

In this chapter, we have seen that managers routinely evaluate various targets in the House, point out lapses, and thus orient to accountability issues more or less constantly. Still, evaluations seldom lead to any noticeable consequences, except in a few specific circumstances. This is true of formal, non-formal and textual evaluations alike although for different reasons. Because of this apparent inconsequentiality, managerial evaluations are largely reduced to progress reviews in formal meetings, and to expressions of opinion in other activities. We have also seen that there are several reasons for this state of affairs.

The consequences of non-formal and textual evaluations are difficult to pinpoint, because they take place in an environment that is separate from formal managerial powers. However, a few words can be said about them. In most cases, these evaluations appear simply to remain expressions of managerial opinion without any noticeable consequences. The consequences of these evaluations ultimately depend on how the recipients define their significance. In some cases, evaluations are done as an integral part of instructions, and the evaluation derives its consequentiality from this environment. Finally, in some cases,
evaluations have indirect consequences even if the targets may not be aware of these consequences.

Our formal meeting data is richer in this sense. In general, most formal evaluations do not lead to managerial action either, for several reasons. In many cases, the reason for inaction is that there is no perceived lapse in work. No identifiable worker can be held responsible for the lapse, and there is no reason for taking action. Specific reasons for not taking action vary from one case to another, ranging from organizational reasons, to accounts, to locating the source of trouble in social circumstances that are out of the reach of the House. For example, a researcher is not held accountable for being late with a project if it can be shown that the reason for this lapse is a managerial decree, or overwork.

Under certain specific circumstances, formal evaluations may lead to consequences. In particular, evaluations in formal activities may lead to more noticeable consequences under some rather special circumstances. In particular, managers are prone to take action in cases of "moral lapses," evidenced repeatedly or flagrantly by workers, if they feel that such lapses may lead to negative consequences. The most extreme form of sanctioning I found during my field phase was firing, which was often done simply by not renewing some temporary worker's contract. In these cases these workers were seen to be "recalcitrant," i.e. for some reason in opposition to the management or to the values it held dear. Even in these cases, managers usually work in the background, avoiding direct confrontation and reliance on all those means available to them for sanctioning (comp. to Freidson 1980: 197-201). Sanctioning in general is an option of last
resort (Emerson 1981), something to be used only when all other means have proved ineffective, and the trouble still persists. If this situated, concerted work done by managers is neglected, any theory of the workplace misses a crucial feature of evaluative activity. This crucial feature in part regulates the way in which managerial control is exerted at the workplace. Any attempt to understand the significance of managerial evaluations at the workplace is bound to go awry unless this situated work is taken into account.

It is obvious that evaluations may have consequences on action that necessarily go unnoticed when we focus on discourse alone. However, this focus has given us an idea of the rich situated work of making evaluations and showing what kind of consequences these evaluations may lead to.

**Discussion**

The main result of this chapter is well in line with studies of social control in middle-class settings (see also Baumgartner 1984, 1988: Ch. 4; Freidson 1980). These studies have repeatedly found that middle-class people prefer rather "minimalistic" (this term is from Baumgartner) methods in dealing with problems in their vicinity. Instead of taking action, they prefer to wait and see what happens, to see whether the problem will go away without any intervention. This observation raises questions concerning the assumptions at work in the theories described in Chapter 1. It appears that these theories systematically assume too much about the source of order at the workplace. Given our observations of the House, we should see
order at the workplace as the product of a delicate balance of managerial and non-managerial action. Evaluation plays a crucial role in this process in that in and through it, managers make the workplace visible in a way that may call forth remedial action, but does not need to do so. It is through evaluative activity that they keep up an idea of what is normal, what is not, what warrants and calls for some kind of intervention. In evaluation, action and talk interweave. Still, it is important to remember that given the range of organizing processes described in Chapters 2 and 3 that accounted for order in the House, the significance of managerial evaluations seems negligible. Still, although evaluation seldom leads to action, it would be difficult to imagine managerial action without some sort of evaluation and the resulting calculus in which managers decide when and how they take action.\footnote{Note7}

How do the assumptions of social control in the research cited in Chapter 1 fit this description of the House? Again, we see that these assumptions may be right, but are not necessarily so. The reason for the weakness of this assumption is simply that any account that sees evaluation as a necessary component in social control at the workplace neglects situated work done by the managers in making various features of the workplace visible and manageable. This chapter has shown that under certain specific conditions, evaluations may lead to social control. These conditions are not ubiquitous, but circumstantial and assume a different character in different activities. The better accounts take into consideration the ever-increasing importance of normative issues in social control (see Edwards 1979: 139-152; Barker 1993). In the House, managers see as normal certain
"personality traits," and attend to breaches in them. To use a useful distinction made by Bosk (1979), we may note that in the House, most "technical" errors are accounted for, while "moral" errors could prompt more serious consequences. This result should be taken cautiously, but it is well in line with the idea that in the modern workplace, managers expect that workers have certain internalized personal qualities, and that if they provide evidence of other qualities, they receive harsher treatment (consult also such ethnomethodologically informed studies as Bittner [1967b: 708]; Spencer [1988: 70-71]; Sudnow [1965: 270-274]; Maynard [1984: 350-35]; Emerson [1991: 205-206]; Miller [1983]; Miller and Holstein [1995]). With the exception of these ethnomethodologically informed studies, however, the very local work in which these normative concerns are formulated and analyzed is missing in these studies. The result of this "missing what" is that these conceptual and historical analyses tend to rely on several kinds of assumptions concerning managerial work. More subtle issues, involving the interpretations of various parties, have gone virtually unnoticed in literature. As a result, evaluation has been linked to control only, which simplifies the matter greatly.

Thus, although we have seen that evaluations may justify interventions, we have also seen that this is not the case in most circumstances. All these consequences are minor when compared with those of Mari Santala's evaluation report of the whole House. This evaluation report, of course, was not a managerial evaluation in the current sense, but as we saw in Chapter 2, and throughout Chapters 4 to 8, this evaluation study was used by management on several occasions during my field work
to formulate the reasons for, and to justify the reorganization (for example, [A 1/24/95]; managerial group minutes, 1/25/94, item 2, p. 1; Board minutes, 3/14/94, item 3, pp. 1-3; A 1/24/95, 157-383). However, this study was clearly an exceptional case -- the researcher largely wrote down House members' analyses, she was hired to boost change in the first place, and her study was expensive enough to commit management to do something about it. Of course, this evaluation does not fit into the current definition of "managerial evaluations," but it points out that most in-situ managerial evaluations have relatively few observable consequences and they are seldom used to justify some piece of managerial action.

Still, these results point out that unless we look at the specific work done by managers in real-time contexts, we cannot hope to understand why some evaluations are consequential and some others are not. If we gloss over this work, as is conveniently done in earlier accounts of evaluations, we lose sight of the fact that order at the workplace is a constant achievement. If we use common-sensical concepts to make sense of evaluations instead of topicalizing the common-sense concept of "evaluation," we end up with an analysis that is far less elaborate and susceptible to doubts about its validity than an analysis that specifically takes as its topic the specific work done by managers.
Notes for Chapter 9.

1. This is not a unique case. In a post-meeting discussion after the Board's meeting of 5/29/95, as well as in a pre-meeting exchange in the managerial group's 5/30/95 meeting, talk about the Kuikka served managerial decision making rather than social control. Kuikka, an administrator from the financing ministry, had been present in the Board's meeting. After he and a colleague of his had left, the Board's remaining members (the Chair, today a high EU official, had also left by then) were lamenting their lot, and complaining about Kuikka's meager understanding of the dynamics of research. In the next morning, just before opening the managerial group's meeting, the managerial team went through the Yesterday's incident. In that discussion, Karita ended up formulating a policy of circumventing Kuikka in future dealings with the Ministry (this policy was ultimately unsuccessful). Analyzing her experiences with the Ministry's high civil servants, she located more favorable and malleable partner from within the Ministry's hierarchy.

2. See Chapter 5, Example 4, Examples 6 - 7, and Example 10 (lines 13-14). See also Chapter 6, Examples 1 - 3, and Example 4 (lines 1-2 and lines 2-9 have two non-problematic separate reports).

3. A few words about this concept are appropriate. Commonly, "account" is simply defined as some form of action designed to provide a reason for action. Thus, it is an umbrella concept for actions like justification, explanation, and even arguing. However, in ethnomethodological writing, there is another, more technical meaning. For an ethnomethodologist, "accountable actions" are actions that are observable-and-reportable, and have the properties of being orderly, observable, ordinary, oriented, rational, and describable (Lynch 1993: 14-15). Notice, though, that even the first sense of "account" has ethnomethodological origins, as Scott has recently noted in his "Preface" to Richard Buttny's recent book (1993). – See Heritage (1983) for a clarification of these two usages.

4. Further classifications of accounts have been presented by Buttny (1993) and by Antaki (1994), who add such actions as providing reasons for action, providing causes of behavior, descriptions, narratives, and apologies as potential accounts (Buttny 1993: 17-19; see also Antaki 1994: 47-50). Accounts may be utilized in face-saving, in maintaining social relationships, and in social control, among other things (Buttny 1993: 21-23). However, both men point out that accounts need to be analyzed in context as they happen rather than as isolated speech acts (Buttny 1993: 29-34 and Ch. 3; Antaki 1994: 53-67). Without going into details here, we can note that this theoretical analysis has lead to some important results. For example, Antaki has shown that there are several ways in which people can construct slots in which an account is expected from someone else, that people can provide themselves with a slot in which they can give an account, and that accounts may appear in contexts in which there are other lines of action going on (for a catalogue of actions
that provide a slot in which an account is expectable, see Antaki 1994: Ch. 5).

5. Thus, she began her report at 11:32 [Ai 5/30/95 2(2), p. 5]. About 23 minutes later in this meeting (11:54), Mikko asked about the results of the campaign [Ai 5/30/95 2(2), p. 7].

6. Bosk's analysis is based on an analysis of mistakes at work found in Everett Hughes's essay "Mistakes at Work" (Hughes 1984: 316-325). Among other things, Hughes proposed in this essay that in studying any workplace, it might be useful to study who has the right to say what a mistake or a failure is.

7. In the House's case, the systematic quality of evaluation in managerial meetings meant that evaluation was fairly technocratic, and less focused on, say, persons. A workplace in which management acts purely in situ, and takes action on impulsive evaluations, has been described by Juravich (1985). Incidentally, it may well be argued that talk is a particularly cheap and effective managerial instrument in evaluative contexts. First of all, it saves time; it would have been much more expensive to maintain a coordinated and well-informed vision of the developments in the House without systematic managerial talk. Secondly, it is a flexible instrument. As we have seen, in talking, managers routinely monitor for the adequacy of the reports, the adequacy of the inferential basis of evaluations, and the propriety of the accounts concerning some evaluation. It would be cumbersome to do all that using some formal analytic procedure. Thirdly, if done with as much care as in the House, it also prevents impulsive action, which might prompt trouble.
Chapter 10: Conclusions and Discussion

In Chapter 1, I showed that the most important sociological theories of the workplace link evaluation to the process of managerial control at the workplace. This was the case with Weberian analyses of bureaucracy, systems theoretical perspectives, labor process theories, and Foucauldian analyses as well. I also found that the term "evaluation" is used in the literature in several different senses. "Evaluation research" conventionally designates evaluations done by (today) professional researchers. "Performance appraisal," on the other hand, conventionally designates a set of practices used at the workplace to evaluate workers' and managers' performance. Usually, these techniques have their base in organizational psychology. Finally, I identified a layer of evaluation that take place in interaction, and are not based on any formalized research procedure, or social scientists' professional concepts or research techniques. I coined the term "in-situ evaluations" for these actions, and set out to study them. In contrast to mundane, private and often emotionally loaded assessments in ordinary conversations, these in-situ evaluations, when done by managers, are, or may be, connected to House managerial processes.

The Results of the Study

This study has dealt extensively with in-situ
evaluations using conversation analytic methods that are, however, ethnographically situated in one workplace, called "the House." My primary aim was to describe in-situ evaluations, and secondarily to situate them in the various House activities in an inductive fashion. The third aim of the study was to find out whether, and how, managerial evaluations have consequences that reach beyond talk.

1. Evaluation and Accountability at the Workplace

The central thread that has run through all the analyses in the empirical chapters has been the concept of accountability as laid down by Garfinkel (1963 [1990]; 1967: 35-75) and Heritage (cf. 1983; 1987). In making evaluations, managers study work underneath their authority, and in so doing, classify it as good or bad, according to how they see that work. In making evaluations, they make responsibility issues visible and available for fellow participants. It was found that by and large, accountability issues are seldom made explicitly observable in the House. In most cases, accountability can be inferred from otherwise "neutral" evaluations that are outwardly reduced to progress reviews of House work. If some piece of work is found to be within some acceptable limits, accountability issues are not made specifically visible. They are still inferable from the fact that they are not raised. Thus, even when accountability issues are not formulated explicitly, the House's evaluative discourse is not disjointed from accountability issues. Evaluation was largely reduced to reviews that look evaluatively neutral, consisting of the identification of some
project, person, or other target, and making visible how this target is doing in terms of a variable set of standards.

However, this description only fits certain evaluations, namely evaluations done in formal activities. There were also evaluations in non-formal activities, but these evaluations appeared in a variety of environments, not in that relatively standardized environment that characterized evaluations in formal activities. Due to this difference, evaluations were less systematic, and were made with more mundane devices than in formal activities.

Differences between evaluations in formal activities and in non-formal activities are related to differences in the procedural basis of action. For example, in formal contexts, they construed their activity in ways that were observably and sanctionably analyzable as "formal;" this context was demonstrably relevant for them, and procedurally consequential in their activities (see Schegloff 1992a). In their action, managers displayed an orientation to the context of their activity. In so doing, they produced the very character of these contexts. Next, I will look at how I arrived at these results.

2. Situating Managerial Evaluation in the House

We have seen that evaluations are a situated phenomena at several levels simultaneously. We have seen extensively how evaluations differ in the different House activities. These differences are largely due to the ways in which interaction unfolds, and is made to unfold, and due to the ways in which the House managers invoke certain formally oriented descriptive
practices as their main apparatus for making work visible for evaluation (more about this soon). Thus, evaluations are not just a local phenomena oriented to and elaborative of the sequential context of talk, but also of the House's larger on-going activities.

This understanding largely evolved from the main methodological solution chosen for this study, namely the attempt to situate a conversation analytic style of working ethnographically in a real workplace. Using a "normal," non-ethnographic conversation analysis would not have brought this cross-activity variation into focus.

The drawbacks of this ethnographic situating are obvious: the typical conversation analytic style of working -- building a collection of similar cases exhibiting regularity of some sort, establishing what makes just these cases similar, and then studying what people do in terms of this regularity, and how they do it (Hutchby and Wooffit 1998: 110) -- has to be sacrificed to some extent because this variation is there. More focus must be given to how the "reflexive properties of talk necessarily instantiate and creatively extend organizations" (Boden 1994: 215). Interaction at the workplace, as Boden further notes, is "simultaneously embedded in a sociocultural world" (Boden 1994: 215). To understand what talk and discourse do at the workplace we, as analysts, should not forget this lesson. Instead, we should take these peculiarities into account in our analytic techniques, and avoid fine-tuning our research instruments for puristic methodological purposes only.

3. Evaluation and Managerial Social Control at the Workplace
The third aim of this study was to look at whether and how managerial evaluation is related to social control at the workplace. In existing literature on evaluations, there is an assumption that states that evaluation is somehow linked to social control. This study has provided several observations that are relevant in analyzing whether this assumption is warranted.

In formal meetings, sometimes decisional by definition, evaluations may lead to far-reaching consequences on some project, system, or worker. In general, however, this was not so. For several reasons, House managers did not take corrective action even when they found that there were departures from the expected course of action. For instance, when they found that some project was lagging because the responsible worker has had too many management-imposed duties, management did not take action. In general, managers took action on the basis of evaluation only if some worker provided convincing evidence of what Charles Bosk (1979) calls "moral error." In these cases, some troublesome situation was based on the worker's unwillingness to act the way the management would like him to act. Even then, sanctioning was an option of last resort (Emerson 1981) rather than something done by the managers on the justification provided by the perceived lapse. In non-formal activities and in texts, evaluations even more rarely led to action. In broad terms, non-formal and textual evaluations led to consequences only if some recipient took action on their basis. This was not the case in most cases. Also, these evaluations could lead to consequences due to the surrounding activity in which they took place, and due to some interpretations made
possible by evaluations. For example, when done in a spontaneous planning session, a negative evaluation of some piece of work could lead to an exclusion of this piece of work from some project-under-consideration. This was the case with evaluations in texts as well.

Thus, by and large, managers' evaluations did not prompt action. Instead, the managerial team allowed the House's work to organize itself just as it would have done without any evaluation. Because management did not often act on the basis of evaluations, order in the House was largely based on various other organizing methods, research groups being one method, face-to-face discussions between research chiefs and researchers being another, various daily contacts and spontaneous meetings being a third order-producing method. Management's impact on the House took place through their participation in these various processes (described in Chapters 2 and 3) rather than through actions based on their in-situ evaluations. Evaluation was but one of the managerial methods of maintaining order in the House. Note1

The House's Descriptive Practices and the Local Social Organization of Evaluative Interaction

When the evaluations analyzed in Chapters 4 to 8 are compared with Chapter 3, which described the way in which the House was ordered, we find that evaluations were overwhelmingly targeted at work. More specifically, it was one class of work, research and developmental projects, that caught most of the evaluative attention in the House. For example, office work was evaluated mainly through balance sheets in the managerial group.
Similarly, no detailed evaluative attention was paid to what I called "non-work activities" in Chapter 2.

In addition, in formal activities, work was overwhelmingly made observable and thus potentially manageable using one specific set of categories and concepts, namely those based on "projects," "research groups" which consisted of single projects, and further hierarchically classifiable sets of units based on "projects" as the basic target. This set of categories acted both as a perceptive device, and as a device used in making decisions about the need to manage work. It did its work in a manner somewhat analogous to the "convict code" described by Wieder (1974; see also Heritage 1983 and 1989: 198-209), but with one difference: it was based on some of House basic managerial processes -- planning in particular -- unlike the convict code which was indefinite and informal, observable only when occasioned. In the House, these categories were produced in the House's documents, and were made effectual in particular circumstances. The consequences of the recurrent usage of this frame are fourfold:

1. This target collected the House's work into discreet, thing-like units. Since this target is used in the House, ranging from Annual Reports to Annual Plans to various meetings and discussions in the corridors, it brought order, predictability, comparability (both across and within projects), continuity (over time), and coherence to the House's descriptive practices. Consequently, it provided members with a sense of order and continuity over House work. Members' sense of order presuppose such stable descriptive practices;

2. Due to this descriptive practice, mutually constituted in members' activities, members make House work available for a methodic study, and simultaneously are able to perceive this work in essentially invariant terms from one context to the next. Through this descriptive activity, members in the House make work in the House observable and reportable (Garfinkel 1967: vii) in a variety of activities. By implication, they
simultaneously make work administrable and manageable in interaction using this specific descriptive foundation in a privileged fashion;
3. The constant use of this frame connected House evaluative procedures to its formal institutional structure as depicted in its most important administrative documents. Consequently, members maintained and made this institutional structure consequential in interaction and, as Chapter 9 showed, occasionally beyond interaction as well;
4. Finally, the constant use of this frame largely "suppressed" other possible frames. Out of all possible descriptive apparatuses, this project-oriented frame presided over, say, literal, poetic, divine, mystical, juridical, theological, or mythological alternatives, giving evaluative interaction in the House an organizational and administrative character. More importantly, this is also true of such traditional academic criteria as the content, quality, innovative character, and importance (both theoretical and practical) of research. These were secondary matters in House evaluative practices, which treated research much like any other project-based work.

This formal structure-in-action, however, was not occasioned whenever talk turned to the House. Instead, evaluative activities have been displayed in a dualistic fashion throughout this study. I have shown that evaluations in formal activities are made differently than evaluations in non-formal activities. These differences run through all analyses done in this study. For example, in terms of targets, formal evaluations were largely targeted at projects, while in non-formal evaluations, managers evaluated a much larger set of targets. Similarly, in formal activities, evaluations were overwhelmingly made using "organizational" devices, which were largely non-existent in non-formal activities. It is partly in this practice of falling back on administrative categories as a sense-making device that the "organization" is specifically available for study as a course of action in a sustained and sanctioned manner (see Bittner 1975).

What about who participates in all this evaluative
responsibility allocation, and maintenance of institutional realities? I have approached this question by focusing on how the local social organization is accomplished in evaluative interaction. I argued that managers and non-managerial members make the local structure available and analyzable in their activities. Members show their analyses of some situation in their activities, and make their analysis available for others as well in the very way in which they contribute to the evolving situation. In so doing, they contribute to the same situation in which they act, and thus participate in the joint production of the local social organization, which constantly evolves with and around on-going action.

However, talk is made evaluative in the House in different ways in different activities. In particular, it ought to be noted that my analysis of non-managerial members' activities uncovered an interesting asymmetry in evaluative interaction. Evaluation remained a managerial activity for several interactional reasons. For one, non-managerial members largely withdrew from interaction during evaluative episodes. Alternatively, they participated in these episodes with means that seldom redirected talk. In texts, the same pattern held as well. The minutes, of course, were supposedly modelled after the managerial group's talk. Other texts, however, could have provided opportunities for other members to make evaluations. Still, and for several practical reasons, this was not the case. For example, several evaluations appeared in management decisions reported in House News, and it was essentially the Director's job to write such evaluatively dense messages as the Christmas Greetings. Non-managerial members did not make evaluations in
texts either.

It is this non-managerial members' footing that made evaluative talk managerial in the House. The very manageriality of evaluative discourse was a joint achievement, a result of members' concerted action. Thus in all, evaluation in the current sense was very much a managerial activity, done by six persons out of almost 40. Thus, the local social organization of evaluation was thoroughly managerial, and asymmetric in this sense. Here, my results concur with analyses of interaction in other types of work, where it has commonly been found that professionals dominate interaction by "owning" several interactional procedures (for general statements, see Linell and Luckmann 1991; Agar 1985; Drew and Heritage 1992: 47-53; for illustrative cases, see Atkinson and Drew 1979; Frankel 1990; Maynard 1991). Note2

Respecifying the Assumptions of Prior Literature by Studying In-Situ Evaluation as a Concerted Situated Activity

As such, most previous research has not produced similar results, mainly because it has not examined the in-situ qualities of evaluation. For example, even the best ethnographies that have touched upon evaluation have studied evaluation not as it is practiced, but through the perceptions of those who exercise, or are supposed to exercise, evaluation. For example, in trying to map the forms of peer social control in a clinic, Freidson (1980) detailed some of the ways in which physicians got information about their peers, and showed that effective social control presumes a great deal of information about the targets. However,
he did not look at evaluation as it is done at the workplace. Similarly, in a study of how mistakes at work prompt social control, Bosk (1979) touched upon evaluation in several places, but did not focus on that activity per se. With the obvious exception of these ethnographies and Dornbusch and Scott (1975) and the studies they mention, where evaluation's consequences were studied using standard job satisfaction questionnaires, again based on respondents' perceptions, most other studies of the workplace have assumed the existence of evaluation conceptually rather than studied it empirically (see Kast and Rosenzweig 1985; Edwards 1979; Storey 1983; Townley 1994; Ouchi 1977). Finally, perhaps because existing literature largely neglects the situated work managers are performing in making evaluations as well as evaluation's complex relation to action, the assumption that evaluation is an element in social control at the workplace has been rather straightforward. Still, as this study has shown, evaluation is but a possible step towards social control at the workplace. Any social control effects of evaluation depend on, and are secondary to, members' interpretive work. Social control is only one of the possible outcomes of evaluation, and it appears to be an option of last resort rather than part of a process that automatically leads to control (see Emerson 1981).

In contrast to prior studies, the current perspective gets at the heart of the practice as it is done. In this, it goes beyond various theories used by researchers as well. For example, it goes beyond theories in the Human Resource Management tradition, reviewed in Chapter 1 underneath the rubric of "performance appraisal." Similarly, it goes beyond formal
research technologies, analyzed by those with Foucauldian aspirations (see Townley 1994). These research methods are used at workplaces around the planet to make work visible, reviewable, and evaluable, but behind them, there are yet other "what mores," as I have amply demonstrated in this study. By implication, this study takes us beyond Bosk's (1979) and Freidson's (1980) ethnographies, based on members' theories and ethnographers' understandings (see Chapter 4 for discussion of ethnography as a method of analysis. For a more analytic treatment, see Sacks 1984b). Furthermore, it takes us beyond an understanding of evaluation as part of social control, and shows us that the assumptions that evaluations are related to social control are plainly too homogenizing to be useful in an attempt to understand evaluation as a feature of the workplace. In the same vein, evaluation is seen here as a situated practice, with an endogenous, evolving organization, not as something that is explained by some stable contextual or situational feature -- for example, by the age or gender of the evaluator and the target. Nor is evaluation depicted here as a component in the "emergence" of the local social organization (see Boden 1994: 50). If the situated character of action is overlooked, any analysis of evaluation will run into difficulties in trying to capture the phenomenon.

Unlike analyses that have used members' practices as a resource of analysis rather than something that ought to be topicalized for analytic purposes, the current study has turned to this "what more," and tried to provide an initial analysis of how that "more" is members' joint accomplishment. In recovering and describing a practice, my analysis has recovered some of the
ways in which managerial action is skillfully constructed. This complex web of in-situ practices and reasoning upon which House managers rely in their daily work has previously been taken for granted as an unexplicated, seen but unnoticed, set of practices that form the foundations of managers' evaluative work. Whether these practices are "universal" is something to be established in years to come, not something that should be assumed on the basis of an *ex cathedra* pronouncement. For example, it may well be that at universities, work is evaluated on quality-based criteria rather than on the administrative criteria that were used in the House. Still, it is important to note that the practice I have described is universal in one specific sense. When no formal analytic techniques (see Garfinkel 1996) are used at some workplace to make evaluations, evaluation is reduced to in-situ evaluations. Furthermore, even when formal analytic techniques are used in evaluation, it is likely that these technologies are either partly based on in-situ evaluation, or complemented with in-situ techniques. In any case, in recovering some of the managers' in-situ practices, I have respecified some of the issues in the literature, and provided massive support to the proposal that much of (managerial) work is accomplished in and through talk (cf. Boden 1994).
Notes for Chapter 10.

1. A methodological reservation has to be made here. It is obvious that a lone fieldworker cannot capture the richness of action at any real workplace. Many evaluations, and many subsequent discussions prompted by evaluations, have gone unnoticed by me and my data gathering techniques. Other data could perhaps justify other conclusions; thus, further research is needed.

Notes for Chapter 10.

2. Of course, this picture may be flawed in one specific way. It does not acknowledge workers' resistance to the evaluative managerial characterizations of them and their work. Still, to my knowledge, no significant resistance took place in the House. Sure, workers did do things I did not register, and some of these may have (and surely have) been adversary in character, and some of them even related to the evaluation. Still, despite the fact that I spent a year in the House, I managed to record very few cases in which workers challenged managerial evaluations either in public or in the private. Evaluation clearly was not a hot issue in the House, at least when judged by non-managerial workers' activities. Some trade union effort concentrated around the renewal of job descriptions [D 3/8/95; I 01/03/95; I 06/14/95], but, as already mentioned, evaluations did not loom large in union efforts. Furthermore, some of the House's formal practices created relatively "safe" locales for managers to do their evaluative work. For example, the fact that most evaluations took place in managerial meetings served to locate evaluations largely outside the ears of the staff. Whatever the reason for non-managerial members' non-evaluative orientation, they largely did maintain a withdrawn footing, or took part using acknowledgement tokens and continuers, or partook laughter when managers made interaction evaluative. It was this very "inactivity" that made evaluation a managerial activity in the House. Evaluation is one of the procedures in which managers make their work visible and effective at the workplace.
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