Visually available order, categorisation practices, and perception-in-action: a running commentary

Robin James Smith
Cardiff University

This article is concerned with the organisation of visual order, and seeing and perception in embodied activity. More specifically, it describes how perception gets done in the work of running through a city centre. The article describes the 'self-reflexive' or 'auto-ethnomethodological' analysis of a transcribed commentary and video footage, produced by a runner (the author) wearing a chest-mounted camera. The article critically revisits two articles published in this journal – the first, an ethnomethodological treatment of visually available order during a walk to the supermarket (Hester and Francis, 2003), the second an 'auto-ethnographic' treatment of distance runner's vision (Hockey and Collinson, 2006). This article is especially concerned with the categorisational grounds and sequential organisation of (visual) perception and how 'observing' and 'describing' are done in ways relevant for and tied to the contingencies of a given task. Phenomena available as seeable are a continual, local, and practical accomplishment not of a generic, detached, 'observer' but as realised in and through specific activities; this article thus aims to further develop the understanding of 'perception-in-action'.

The article begins with a brief discussion of the ethnomethodological treatment of perception and considers some of the ordinary troubles of researching and writing about running. The remainder of the article is concerned with the commentary and the analysis thereof. Grounded in ethnomethodological studies of categorisation practices (e.g. Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002; Hester and Eglin, 1997a,b; Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002; 2015; Watson, 2015), the analysis aims to demonstrate how perception and description are jointly and practically organised in relation to aspects of running in three sections: navigational troubles and 'routing', the perception/description of 'normal' and 'incongruous' features of the street scene, 'decision making' and 'prediction'. The article concludes by revisiting the claims of Hester and Francis (HF) and restates a radical understanding of the accomplishment of visual order in which the 'world out there' is not simply used or described in and for the practical purposes of running, but is assembled, moment-by-moment, by the runner for the practical purpose of running through it.

Ethnomethodology, membership categorisation practices, and perception-in-action

Among the features that mark ethnomethodological studies as distinct and radical is the policy of treating observable phenomena and the possibility of the observability of those phenomena as a methodical accomplishment. This recognition is thus the beginnings of an inquiry in to the production of any observation, rather than taking as resource the observation for providing evidence of, or support for, social scientific concerns. In this sense, this article is not concerned with 'visual methods' nor with 'visual sociology' as usually construed – that is, how it is that sociologists find their own problems and solutions and methods for the visual order of a given domain (public space, advertising, art, and so on). Instead, the article contributes to a sociology of the visual that topicalises the intelligibility of a given scene and, indeed, 'the world' as a members' concern and accomplishment (e.g. Emmison and Smith, 2000; Ball and Smith, 1992; Reynolds, 2017; Sacks, 1995[1] (eps. L. 11); Smith, 2017). To treat visually available social phenomena ethnomethodologically is, then, to ask how, in mutually intelligible ways, the phenomenal field comes to be organised in just that way, for just that task, in just that context.

Visually available order

In a paper published in this journal in 2003 (in a special issue featuring ethnomethodological treatments of visual order), HF investigated visually available order as exhibited in a commentary produced on a walk to a supermarket. In analysing the organisation of the commentary, they speculated that members' perception of a commonplace scene may well mirror the organisation of categorisation practices found in talk, as in the example: "Just walking along, another car goes by, had a family in it" (p. 38). This description is produced/heard as unproblematic and makes sense to the viewer/reader in and as the context of an expected street scene; the configuration of a car, 'going by' on a road, with people that are appearedly constituents of a 'family unit' sat in it, gives no cause for speculation that they maybe witnessing, say, a kidnapping.[i] The elements are viewable as commonsensically 'belonging

together' in a 'normal' way. This seeing relies upon how members' see elements of a scene locally and relationally; through one another, in and as a mutually elaborated contexture, as a commonplace scene (Gurwitsch, 1964; Garfinkel, 1967; 2002). As such, it is a feature of commonplace scenes that they exhibit a 'glance intelligibility' predicated upon categorial 'knowledge' (Jayyusi, 1992)

An issue with such a formulation is that it retains a good deal of the decontextualised model of categorisation practices and 'culturalism' present in Sacks' work. Hester (with Eglin, 1997a,b), was a strong critic of this aspect of Sacks' work, and across his various studies developed an ethnomethodological approach to the study of local categorisation practices in context, or 'culture-in-action' (with Eglin 1997a,b, and see Francis and Hester, 2017). Instead of referring to 'knowledge', HF suggest that the intelligibility of the car driving as a 'normal' or expected element of the scene is produced in a situated and radically local manner through the 'observers' maxim'; 'namely if the parties to some observed scene or activity can be perceived as "belonging together" then see them that way' (p. 41). A second element is that that the activity of those persons – driving along in a car – is seeable and accountable through 'the viewer's maxim'[ii], that is that the activity can be seen as one 'being done by the incumbents of a category to which that activity is bound *in this context*' (my emphasis) – a street, in the middle of the of the day. Thus, 'families driving in their cars are a typical and expectable feature of such a context' (p. 41). 'Category, context and activity stand in common sense relational configuration to one another; they thereby compose a mutually elaborated whole.' (p. 41). Such elements are not therefore treated by members as they are in formal analysis, in reconstitutive, additive, stepwise fashion: elements combined in analysis in a recipe for what is 'really' there to be seen. Instead, the perceivability of a scene and its constituent elements are radical phenomena (in Husserl's sense; emergent), assembled and organised moment-by-moment. Observations are also demonstrably 'ego-logical' in that they are made in relation to the concerns of the observer's local task at hand (Schutz, 1967) or, as this article aims to demonstrate, in terms of a *practical adequacy* for a given activity. Put more succinctly, 'the classes and categories permit you to see' (Sacks, 1995[1]: 87); but that permission is granted in particular, contingent, situated, and dynamic terms.

In what follows, the article develops an analysis of the 'observers' maxim' in action in the production of a running commentary of doing running in public space. The organisation of the observations and the demonstrable relevancy they have for running are described across three sections; navigational troubles and routing; the situated visual availability of assemblies of persons and objects; seeing 'individuals' and 'groups' and 'individual actions'. First, however, it is worth considering how the ordinary troubles of perception in running have been treated thus far.

The ordinary troubles of running and researching about running
There is a growing scholarly interest in running that, presumably, emerges from the more general interest in mobility practices, space and place, the allied concern with public health, and the fact that running has itself seen a boom in recent years and has, for such a basic activity, become big business. Current studies have, for example, conceptualised running in terms of a 'jography' (Cook et al, 2015) which offers an engagement with the relationship between running, interaction, and space that – through the use of video data and running interviews – recovers something of the methods of navigation employed by runners in an urban environment. Other recent studies have adopted a more theoretical stance, discussing running in and through an application of rhythmanalysis (Edensor et al, 2017). There are few ethnomethodological studies of running, although Pehkonen (2017) is developing a conversation analytic research on interaction in orienteering.

Prior to these efforts, articles by Hockey and Collinson (HC, 2006; 2013) proposed an ethnomethodological treatment of running. In those articles, HC provide a post-hoc auto-ethnographic narrative of the 'usual' and 'normal' experience of running a given route. In the article published in this journal, they note that "sociologists need to make use of the capacity of visual images 'to reveal what is hidden in the inner mechanisms of the ordinary and the taken for granted'" (2006: 70, citing Knowles and Sweetman, 2004: 7). HC take up this (visual) attention to the taken for granted by combining a sociological visual approach with the analysis of the observation-based narrative. There are, of course, many issues with the relationship between post hoc accounts and the constitutive practices in the ongoing stream of the past events accounted for. One might also note how claims based on 'what usually goes on' in running suffer from limitations as (certain treatments of) fieldnotes and interviews. Still, HC's auto-ethnographic narratives are an attempt to access the hard-to-access phenomena of

running (which is itself a gloss for the work of the practical handling of matters such as route finding, navigation, the haptic feedback of terrain, the organizing of seeing and what is see-able to the runner running that route, the coordination of mobile bodies in space, auto-, and augmented biomonitoring and so on). The approach presented in this article emerges out of the same concerns as HCs – to attempt to access the 'things themselves' produced in the activity of running.

Despite limitations in the method and analysis developed by HC, and the current article, there are good practical reasons for the attempt taking that form. Capturing the 'experience' of running is very difficult. Initial experiments undertaken as part of this research involved simply running through the city centre with a chest mounted GoPro. It was intended, then, that this would be developed in to a group scenario, with multiple cameras, to attempt to capture the ways in which the runners organised their movements in and through public space (in a manner similar to that developed by McIlvenny (e.g. 2015), for bikes, and Mondada (2019) for walkers). The experiment never reached this stage due to the paucity of the video data at capturing, representing, and recovering the *in vivo* action. I was, for instance, hoping to analyse something of relations between 'runners' and 'pedestrians' and had reviewed the video data to examine an experience, on an early test run, of a fleeting but seemingly significant interaction with a pedestrian. I had cut across his path, making him pause in his stride ever so briefly, occasioning a momentary focused interaction through the mutual fixing of gaze. At the time, the meaning of the gaze for both parties was clear, yet the video enabled no access to this, even when viewed frame-by-frame. And so, in search of another way of accessing the *in vivo* organisation of perception in running, it seemed the 'self-reflexive' approach of HF (2003) may provide a way forward.

Primarily, the method supports an attempt to deal with the stubborn residue of the objective-subjective dualism in accounts of 'seeing the world' (Zimmerman and Pollner, 1970); as present within that very formulation – a world to be seen, pre-existing the encounter thereof. The revisit to the 'self-reflective' method of HF is, then, in part, an attempt to see the seeing of the runner differently. Narratives of what 'usually happens' or might normally be seen when running a particular route provide only scenic access to what it is 'usually' like to run in a given place (that is, that there some expectable features of that setting, experienced along the route) or what it is generally like to do running there (that is, that running is experienced in such a way, by the narrator, embodiedly). The narrative produced whilst running, is thus analysable for its categorial order. Such an analysis asks how is it that perception is organised for the relevancy of visual order *for running* as *running's work*?

There are, of course, also a number of troubles with the self-reflexive commentary method. Producing commentaries, of this form, whilst running is not a 'members' method'. That said, commentaries of the phenomenal field are occasioned in encountering an obstacle when running together, in orienteering pairs who communicate what can be seen or felt in the terrain that is of relevancy for the route's work, or when a visually impaired runner is being guided.[1] In this case, however, it remains a contrivance and, in some senses, does not produce naturally occurring data (although this distinction is not as sustainable as often claimed (Speer, 2002)). The key point is that the commentary is produced and analysed in and through members' methods for producing/observing/reporting the world (Garfinkel, 1967; Garfinkel and Sacks, 1970). People routinely do 'doing a commentary'. In this sense, this commentary should *not* be treated as a psychologically oriented 'thinking aloud' exercise. I am expressly *not* claiming that the commentary or the analysis thereof gives access behind the skull to some kind of cognitive, mentalistic, or neural order. I am, however, along with HF, suggesting that the ethnomethodological analysis of such a commentary might give access to the ways in which perception is organised in and through and as the work of a particular task, in this instance, running and the emergent organisation of the running and the route and the local, situated, organisation of perception-in-action.

Remarks on data and analysis
The analysis of the commentary itself falls under what HF describe as 'first person' ethnmomethodological studies that topicalise the experience of researcher-as-practitioner in whatever task or activity was the focus of the research. The analysis of the commentary is 'self-reflexive' in that the concern is not with the content of the commentary, but how the content and the reading thereof get organised in such a way that it is intelligible for what it is without further query or investigation. Such a method is at the heart of a well-known and, in some ways, foundational analysis by Harvey Sacks

---

[1] This would make for an excellent study of the collaborative accomplishment of running involving embodided, multi-sensorial, methods.

of the sentence: 'The baby cried. The mommy picked it up'. Sacks (1974) produces a series of first readings that could be made by anybody; for example, that the 'mommy' who picks up the 'baby' is that mother's baby and not just any mother. That anybody can see/hear this relationship in this sentence without being provided that information poses the question of how this hearing is possible? The answer comes in the explication of methods deployed in doing and hearing descriptions which provide for things like categories being used to describe persons in such a way that is relevant for the description (and objects, too for that matter), that categories are heard as belonging together in 'devices' (that is, that 'baby' and 'mother' are hearable as belonging to the 'family' device and so we hear them that way), and that activities can be heard as being 'bound to' particular categories (that is, that crying is what babies do, and picking up their crying babes is what mothers do). In this article, I am interested in the describability of visual scenes, and examine the commentary for the production of its intelligibility *as* a description by a reader/analyst *and* as means of further considering the ways in which such an examination might or might not provide further insight in the practical organisation of perception-in-action in and as an aspect of the work of running in public space.

Two further notes are required here. The first is the initial unpacking of the gloss that the production of observation and observability is relevant for the activity of 'running'. The commentary is produced whilst doing running, but the consequentiality of the categories invoked and their organisation is shown to be tied to emergent and sequential matters of doing many other things that comprise the (extra)ordinary competencies of running in cities. The second is that a good deal of what is recovered in relation to the ordinary troubles of running is made available through the fact that the running commentary is produced wearing a chest mounted camera, rather than the tie-clipped microphone used to produce HF's walk. The availability of audio and video might be taken as an opportunity to 'test' what it is that is described in the commentary against the landscape available via the camera's production of the 'complete' scene. This is not what this article is up to. The very notion comparing the 'reality' of the video to the description affords an unwarranted completeness and relevancy to the observations of the camera, thus obscuring the *practically adequate completeness* of the observations and commentary; a matter returned to in the conclusion.

A running commentary
The running commentary is not reproduced here in full.[iii] The section of the run consists of moving through the central area of the city. The run took place on a weekday afternoon on a day of fine weather. The run is a 'new' route in that this is not the 'usual' route taken from place of work to home. The route is approximately 4 miles and on this day lasted just under 30 minutes. The simple rubric of HF was adopted, requiring: "the observer to describe in detail what he observed and experienced as he walked along the street..." (p. 36). The commentary begins as the runner moves through a pedestrianised area of Cardiff which merges with a road controlled by entrance barriers.

```
01. back up on to
02. ah I've ended up on the road now
03. um
04. I'm gonna run through the err
05. station
06. I should be able to get back on the
07. pavement
08. just up here
09. hopefully
10. when this fence finishes
11. there's a guy in front of me ------------→   Fig. 1
12. a woman on her phone on the pavement
13. I can cut back in here then
14. past the bars and restaurants
15. a guy walking around a sign
16. someone's jacket's on the floor.
17. err
18. slowing down now
19. and coming to a stop at the junction
20. there's uh six or seven people ----------→   Fig. 2
```

21. on the other side
22. a few people here
23. a woman's moving
24. I'm going to go for it
25. the light's red
26. going round a few people wondering
27. whether to go or not
28. a clump of people here ------------------→   Fig. 3
29. go through between the two blokes
30. uhh
31. follow these people as we make our way
32. toward the train station
33. slowing down
34. check the road --------------------------→   Fig. 4
35. it's all right
36. coming up to the forecourt
37. there's a woman with a trolley thing
38. and
39. uhh
40. one or two people heading to the station
41. there's a couple of homeless guys sat
42. on the low wall there
43. a guy in an orange jacket walking towards me
44. a couple
45. a guy carrying a double bass
46. a couple of girls talking there
47. police officers -------------------------→   Fig. 5
48. a couple of people drifting out
49. of the station
50. just running past
51. getting some funny looks
52. from the police
53. a queue at the cash machine -------------→   Fig. 6
54. and a guy on a bike
55. coming through
56. on to the forecourt
57. just coming round to the
58. other side of the station now
59. err no idea if this is picking up or not
60. hopefully
61. just going to over take this girl
62. on her own -----------------------------→   Fig. 7
63. before we get to the barrier
64. I'm gonna stay outside
65. a couple of pedestrians coming along
66. quite busy now
67. ones and twos
68. but it's a narrow path
69. entrance to building works there
70. on the left
71. err a few cars waiting
72. err ------------------------------------→   Fig. 8
73. past a couple of people stood there
74. by a lampost---------------------------→   Fig. 9
75. and three lads just walked past
76. we're coming out up past the stadium now
77. in to the little err pedestrian section
78. past the building works
79. past the entrance to the station car park
80. round a guy walking on his own
81. wondering what I'm doing

```
82. three pedestrians in a line there
83. gone round them no trouble
84. just going to turn left down here
85. to get on to Clare Road
86. there's a guy walking up the ramp -------→    Fig. 10
87. he's on to the pavement
88. turned left anyway
89. there's a guy on a bike ----------------→    Fig. 11
90. coming up from underneath
91. the underpass
92. going pretty fast
93. guy on his own
94. another two cyclists
95. on the road going to go up the ramp
96. guy walking on his own
97. looking at his phone
98. couple of women walking
99. through the barriers ------------------→    Fig. 12
100. guy walking
101. in shades with his shirt open
102. err less people here now
```

Navigational troubles and routing

We might begin by considering the commentary as exhibiting and orienting to particular navigational troubles. It is clear that the features described are intelligible as features that belong to an urban street scene, and that the description gets done in relation to the movement of the runner through the scene. Indeed, HF's walking commentary exhibited how navigational troubles arose and were resolved through the coordination of action with others, the management of pace, and the observation of hazardous objects. In this running commentary, as a signature of the enhanced speed at which the observer is moving, there is a more consistent concern with objects and persons in the sense in terms of their emergent status as potential 'navig-ables', as hazards and, in the case of moving persons, their potential intersection with the runner's trajectory. These matters, as demonstrated below, are bound up with the handling of what and where the boundaries of these static and moving obstacles are.

The work of the relationship between running and the management of mobility and space, route finding and 'navig-ables' is present in the start of the commentary.

```
01. back up on to
02. ah I've ended up on the road now
03. um
04. I'm gonna run through the err
05. station
06. I should be able to get back on the
07. pavement
08. just up here
09. hopefully
10. when this fence finishes
```

Here, the commentary includes a projection of the runner's next movements (l.01) which is interrupted with an 'ah' token and an account of having "ended up on the road". Being 'in the road' is a spatial description that can be read as something going 'wrong' navigationally. Categories of space are viewable as tied to particular categories and bound activities. Mobile actions are predicates of bound categories and are also viewable as 'belonging' in a particular category-relevant space (Smith, 2017). In the case of running, the spatial 'home position' is ambiguous – the pavement being usually understood and treated as for walking, bike lanes for cycling, roads for driving on, and so on (Cook et al, 2015; Smith, 2017). The utterance on line 02 is hearable in this way. This micro navigational problem is then, hesitantly, followed by a macro account of route direction, toward the station (l. 04); a decision and an account of a decision made in movement. On reorienting to the immediate navigational issue, the

commentary displays a speculation as to the point at which the runner can return to the 'correct' location of the pavement, tied to the fence finishing.

This form of projection work occurs throughout the commentary and appears to be central to observations made for running. The extract below demonstrates how the relative pace of the runner to the 'girl on her own' requires and overtake and the material organisation of the scene – the barrier visible in the background of the image – is consequential for this action. A 'plan' is thus formulated making resource of these relational elements. The 'plan', however, changes very quickly when the observer comments (l. 64) that they are 'gonna stay outside' and, again, run in the road.

```
61. just going to overtake this girl
62. on her own ------------------------------→      Fig. 13
63. before we get to the barrier
64. I'm gonna stay outside
```

What we see here is the arrational, *emergence* of a route, the combination of movement in and through the environment that makes relevant elements thereof (such as the fence and the barrier), rather than some notion of rational pre-planning that produces the correct route. It is not so much the case that the runner didn't 'know' that the fence produced a separation between the pavement and road but, rather, that the relevancy of that 'fact' emerges at just that point in the run, a point where it is too late. This is a matter lost in the post-hoc reconstruction of a route, which, like all accounts, produces a smoothed narrative thereof. What is often glossed as 'local knowledge' can thus be seen to be dynamically assembled, and tied to *just that time* and *just that place*, prone to error, and always contingent and emergent.

The situated visual availability of assemblies of persons and objects
Various assemblies or people and objects are seeable and described across the commentary. The ways in which they are assembled can be understood as demonstrating how members' view scenes as comprising of relational elements, seen through one another, and how those assemblies are produced in relation to the activity of the observer. For example, in the following excerpts, the commentary handles elements of the scene as organisational phenomena. People engaged, together, in an activity are seen and described in terms of spatial procedural relevance that indicate distributed mobile rights; for example, a queue is visible for what it is and 'normally' should not be walked or ran through in order to display recognition on behalf of the observer (Watson, 2005). Also, in relation to the point made above regarding category relevant space, 'runners' 'should' avoid 'pedestrians' as one can be seen to properly 'belong' on the pavement where the other does not. In this instance, the queue is accountable in relation to its organisation in relation to the cash machine in the wall of the station (other observers, looking for a cash machine, would, of course, see this too, and make use of it).

```
53. a queue at the cash machine          Fig. 14
```

In other instances, people and their actions are viewable in relation to the immediate material environment in ways that are not seen through a particular action formation (queuing for cash) but in terms of a more general relationality in the phenomenal that is of consequence for navigation. For example:

```
73. past a couple of people stood there
74. by a lamppost
```

As has been well documented, individuals in public space observably organise themselves in to various 'vehicular units' such as 'withs' (Goffman, 1972) and other formations produced through bodily alignment, the matching of pace, holding hands and so on. There are a number of examples of this in the commentary. In this instance, the 'couple of people stood there' are understood to 'belong

together' in the sense that they are not simply individuals who happen to be standing near each but are observably 'together' via visibility arrangements (Watson, 2005) of bodily position and embodied actions. From the point of the view of the observer/runner, the fact of their standing by a lamppost is of consequence for the navigation in terms of the 'expected' ways in which people stood talking close to an object should be navigated – that is, that the resultant assemblage and 'preserve' (Goffman, 1972[2010]) is accomplished by their actions, the spatial relations of those actions to the lamppost and other features of the scene such as the pavement, *and* the observation and the display of the observation in motion of them by the runner.

In a similar sense, another set of descriptions are concerned with or, rather, display a concern for the co-ordination of running with others moving in the scene and potential hazards.

```
15. a guy walking around a sign
16. someone's jacket's on the floor.
```

The descriptions on lines 15 and 16 include two potential obstacles that, again, stand out from the background contexture (the guy, walking around the sign, and the jacket on the floor) as incongruities (see Sacks, 1995: 89). We might say that the attention of the runner has been 'snagged' by these items. This, however, is to suggest that the visually available environment and attention are separate elements, rather than reflexively produced in mutual elaboration. Thus the 'jacket on the floor' is accomplished as a relevant element of the scene in and through its treatment in the commentary and the run at that point. Here we also read the movements of the 'guy' as accountably 'normal' and as viewed relationally with the sign. Descriptions of persons, again invoking minimal categorial referents, are continually made in terms of the persons, their activities and location, and often, their direction of travel and their pace.

The descriptions of guys on bikes are indicative of this organisation in that they display what we might call an 'arc of relevancy' of the bike produced through assessments of speed and an accompanying account of their trajectory in relation to the space they are moving in to (on to the forecourt (l. 54), coming up from underneath the underpass (l. 90-91)).

```
54. and a guy on a bike
55. coming through
56. on to the forecourt


89. there's a guy on a bike
90. coming up from underneath
91. the underpass
92. going pretty fast
```

Seeing 'individuals' and 'groups' and 'individual actions'
As described in HF's commentary, and well noted by others, public space is a 'category rich arena' (Jayyusi, 1984; also, Lee and Watson, 1993). When in public space we do not see co-present others as 'strangers' but as, through the viewer's maxim, individuals and groups that accountably belong to (in appearance) and are representative of (in their actions) various membership categories. Something of this work – and the sense in which 'categories allow you to see' – is visible in the phases of the commentary concerned with producing descriptions of co-present others. For example:

```
37. there's a woman with a trolley thing


40. one or two people heading to the station
41. there's a couple of homeless guys sat
42. on the low wall there
43. a guy in an orange jacket walking towards me
44. a couple
```

```
45. a guy carrying a double bass
46. a couple of girls talking there
47. police officers
48. a couple of people drifting out
49. of the station
50. just running past
51. getting some funny looks
52. from the police
```

Membership categorisations are available and 'permit seeing' (Sacks, 1995[1]: 87) in these instances in two ways: through the direct invocation of a membership category for which appearance can be inferred, and through the description of objects carried or worn by individual members of the scene. The former includes 'homeless guys', 'police officers' and the latter include the descriptions of 'a woman with a trolley thing', 'a guy in an orange jacket', 'a guy carrying a double bass'. The latter are, through these descriptions, available to be heard (through the reading of the description) as a 'shopper' (possibly of older age), a 'worker', and a 'musician'. The point, however, is that these are not the 'correct' or operationally relevant categorisations of these persons for the act of running in and through the mutually constitutive whole of the scene (HF: 41). That is to say, a description of this scene, in the context of running is unlikely to feature the use of the category 'musician' to describe a 'guy carrying a double bass'. The running, of course, affects the production of the commentary in terms of the increased pace of movement of the observer through the scene being described. The description of the carrying of the double bass is relevant in the sense that for the purposes of the commentary and the running, it provides for the 'guy' to stand out from the crowd which is of consequence in terms of predicates such as his pace relative to others, the bulk of the object carried, the size of the obstacle he and his 'bound' object represents and so on.

Another notably feature of the production of the commentary is the exhibition of the ways in which minimally referent categories ('blokes', 'woman', 'guy') are used to simply identify individuals and withs, but to distinguish individuals and their actions from groups (and the shared actions that make them visually available as a group). For the majority of the commentary, minimally referential categories ('guy', 'woman') are used in the identification of people who are 'in the way' and, importantly, the commentary includes locative descriptions ('in front of me', 'on the pavement', coming up the ramp'). In other instances, we find these minimal categories used in the context of decision making in terms of routing and micro navigation. This happens in two instances in different ways, in the following excerpt:

```
19. and coming to a stop at the junction
20. there's uh six or seven people
21. on the other side
22. a few people here
23. a woman's moving
24. I'm going to go for it
25. the light's red
26. going round a few people wondering
27. whether to go or not
28. a clump of people here
29. go through between the two blokes
```

'A woman's moving' (l. 23) works to display and exhibits a noticing of an individual's movements against the 'few people here' (l. 22). The category 'woman' is used here as a minimally adequate description for displaying the noticing in the commentary. The category use, here, is not procedurally consequential. That is, it should not be taken in some cultural way that the fact it is a woman doing this thing has any bearing on how the action is seen at that point. Such a noticing is, however, produced as sequentially relevant for the decision making relating to the crossing of the road. Note that 'the light's red' (l.25) comes *after* the noticing of the woman moving *and* the verbalisation of the decision to 'go for it' (l.24). This step-wise organisation should not be taken to reflect a cognitive sequence or even cumulative confirmation, for example that the following decision by the runner is now 'seeing what the woman must have been seeing' (the red light) but rather that this is an accounting for and display of

the viewing of the woman's actions as viewable *relationally* with the traffic light at just that time, in just that context, also provides for the movement of the woman as ordinary and 'reasonable' in terms of the consequentiality for the runner (that is, whether the woman's action can be taken to index this moment as a 'good' time to cross the road or not).

Further navigational troubles arrive in the negotiation of the 'few people wondering whether to go or not'. Interestingly, in a manner tied to but distinct from HFs observation that walkers will describe 'withs' in relation to navigating around them as a couple rather than individuals, the 'few people' is a minimal adequate description of those a group of people who are identifiable as a group through shared activity; an absence of movement, in this instance. Similarly, the next group of people are described as a 'clump' (l.28) to be navigated around. The absence of membership categories here is worthy of note and, so, might be taken as indication that in terms of the occasioned corpus of this scene, membership categories are not required for the handling of the task of navigation in these instances, but, rather, the category devices of 'clump'. The seeing of a 'group' can be understood to be tied to shared actions (the walking along on pavement) but also to the sense in which the clump's witnessable 'togetherness' is seen from the perspective and practical purpose of the runner. It's not that they 'belong together' as if, for example, they are observably a 'group of students' but, rather, that there is a togetherness to this group of people that emerges against the mobility and increased pace of the runner.

In accomplishing this work, the commentary exhibits the runner's shifting phenomenal field in switching from foreground to background, from immediate navigational concerns to broader descriptions when moving through more 'open' space, and through the ways in which the commentary documents categorial reasoning relating to categories, bound activities, and local assemblies of person and non-person categorisations. In this way, such formulations provide access to members' methods for the practical assembly of the perceptual field an occasioned corpus or gestalt of relational features (Gurwistch, 1964; Zimmerman and Pollner, 1970) in accomplishing the commentary and observations for running. And the word *exhibits* is important here. I use it in the ethnomethodological sense described by Weider (1974) in which the usual, common sense understanding that there is an objective world over there and then a subjective instance in which it describes is collapsed. The commentary is, in this sense, a way of telling the world. The commentary might thus, in Weider's terms, be conceived of as an *occurrence* in which the organisation of the observations of the runner and the visual availability of the scene in, through, and with which they are moving, is not simply described but rather is *displayed*. And this is important for retaining a properly ethnomethodological sense of what it is that is getting done when people do descriptions of the (visually available) world.

Conclusion

In applying the methodology of Hester and Francis (2003), this article has aimed to further consider the ways in which perception and seeing are organised in action. In this sense, the article has also aimed to describe something of the categorial organisation of perception in running at speed through public space. In sum, the article has aimed to contribute to an ethnomethodological understanding of vision and perception and, thus, a respecification of the relationship between movement, perception, and 'place' or 'landscape' as a members' concern, rather than a social scientific one. The article has focused, in particular, upon perception-in-action in relation to the consequentiality for running of a) obstacles and routing troubles b) 'assemblies' of people and objects and c) the availability of individual and group actions.

In developing an attention to the practical work of observing and describing on the move, HF provided a convincing account of the ways in which, a) observations/descriptions of commonplace scenes have about them a categorial organisation and b) observations made have a situated and practical relevance *for the activity in which the observer is engaged*. I have, here, furthered the sense in which very observability of a scene is embedded in, endogenous to, and mutually elaborated with and for the observing members' ongoing activities, location, and context. Through the analysis of the running commentary, the article has demonstrated the ways in which the observer is not 'surveying' an *a priori* visually available world, but is engaged in the accomplishment of a reflexively oriented phenomenal field. Moreover, the article has demonstrated an aspect of observation that is perhaps less recognised: members, in the course of their everyday lives, are seldom simply 'observing'. Indeed, membership (as a set of natural language competencies), is bound up with and inexorably embedded

within a series of ongoing activities, such as walking to the supermarket, or running through a city centre, within which observation forms part of that activities work in relation to some category and associated predicates. Elements of a scene are viewed not by an 'observer' but by a runner, a pedestrian, a parent, a police officer, a pickpocket, an assassin and so on. Members do not 'see' everything, nor do they straightforwardly 'miss' elements of the scene in the course of their activities. They 'see' just enough.

The relationship between the social order and the availability and intelligibility of the commonplace scene is also at the heart of debates regarding the direction of ethnomethodology – and, particularly, the doing of ethnomethodological fieldwork and analysis and the unique adequacy requirement – that are beyond the scope of this article (see, for example, Qéuré, 2012). What is of direct relevance for visual sociology, however, is that this analysis demonstrates how the massive and abundant visual availability of the world is not simply 'perceived' in the sense that that world is somehow filtered or selectively attended to, but, in a more radical sense, that there are ethno-methods for perception that assemble the world in and as the world in any given context. Perception, then, operates from *within* activities and commonplace scenes. As noted above, the runner is not simply 'seeing' a world through which they are running but are, moment-by-moment, assembling the intelligibility and sense of that world, as a categorially organised, occasioned corpus. And in many senses, this understanding is what positions members' practices for seeing/describing outside of the objective/subjective dichotomy found in visual sociology and across the social scientific analyses of commonplace scenes.

The use of video and 'visual analysis' can consolidate the sense that is the work of social science to fill in the gaps or provide a completeness for the commonplace scene from the position of the detached disembodied all seeing observer. The corollary to this issue is the temptation to treat peoples' perceptions/descriptions of a given scene as incomplete, partial, or subjective. Indeed, in broader terms, the analysis presented in this paper might also give cause for visual sociologists more generally to reflect upon what is being done when 'visual scenes' are analysed for 'content' or 'meaning' outside of members' own practices and ongoing activities in and through which the relevancy of different visual elements, in relational configuration with other aspects, may or may not be salient at any one moment from the perspective of any given activity. As this article has aimed to demonstrate, observations made within ongoing courses of action have about them a practical relevancy and a practically adequate completeness. In the context of the proliferation of forms of visual communication and media, this, then, further emphasises the need for a practically oriented engagement with perception-in-action.

References:

Ball and Smith (1992) *Analyzing Visual Data*. London: SAGE

Cook, S. Shaw, J., Simpson, P. 2015. Jography: Exploring Meanings, Experiences and Spatialities of Recreational Road-running. *Mobilities* 11(5): 744-769

Edensor, T., Kärrholm, M., & Wirdelöv, J. (2017). Rhythmanalysing the urban runner: Pildammsparken, Malmö. *Applied Mobilities*, 1-18.

Emmison, M. and Smith, P. (2000) *Researching the Visual: Introducing Qualitative Methods*. London: SAGE

Fitzgerald, R., & Housley, W. (2002). Identity, categorization and sequential organization: the sequential and categorial flow of identity in a radio phone-in. *Discourse & Society*, *13*(5), 579-602.

Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Garfinkel H. and Sacks H. (1970) On formal structures of practical action. Theoretical Sociology. pp. 338-66. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Garfinkel, H. (2002) *Ethnomethodology's program: Working out Durkheim's aphorism*. (ed. Anne W. Rawls) London: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Gurwitsch, A. (1964) *The Field of Consciousness*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Hester, S. and Eglin, P. (1997a) Membership categorisation analysis: an introduction. In: *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis*. University Press of America, Washington, pp. 1-24.

Hester, S., Eglin, P. (1997b) "The reflexive constitution of category, predicate and context in two settings." In: Hester, S., Eglin, P. (Eds.), *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis.* pp. 25-48. Washington: University Press of America.

Hester, S. & Francis, D. (2003) Analysing visually available mundane order: a walk to the supermarket. *Visual Studies* 18(1): 36-46.

Hockey, J., & Allen-Collinson, J. (2006). Seeing the way: Visual sociology and the distance runner's perspective. *Visual Studies*. 21(01): 70-81.

Hockey, J. and Allen-Collinson, J. (2013). "Distance running as play/work: training-together as a joint accomplishment." In P. Tolmie and M. Rouncefield (eds.) *Ethnomethodology at Play*. pp. 211-226. Farnham: Ashgate

Housley, W., Fitzgerald, R. (2002) The reconsidered model of membership categorization analysis. *Qualitative Research*. 2(1): 59-83.

Housley, W., Fitzgerald, R. (2015) "Introduction to membership categorisation analysis." In: Fitzgerald, R., Housley, W. (Eds.) *Advances in Membership Categorisation Analysis*. pp. 1-22. London: SAGE.

Jayyusi, L. (1992) The reflexive nexus: photo-practice and natural history. Continuum: Aust. J. Media Cult. 6(2).

Knowles, C. and Sweetman, P. (2004) *Picturing the social landscape: Visual methods and the sociological imagination*. London: Routledge.

Lee, J.D.R. and Watson, R. (1993) *Interaction in Urban Public Space, Final Report - Plan Urbain*. Dept. of Sociology, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.

Livingston, E. (1987) *Making Sense of Ethnomethodology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

McIlvenny, P. (2015) The Joy of Biking Together: Sharing Everyday Experiences of Velomobility. *Mobilities.* 10(1): 55–82.

Merlino, S., Mondada, L., & Söderström, O. (2019). A walk in the city: using video to understand everyday life with psychosis in urban spaces. *Qualitative Health Research*.

Pehkonen, Samu (2017). Suunnistuksen kielioppia [Grammar for orienteering]. In Semi, Jussi, Tanskanen, Minna, & Mustonen, Tero (eds.). Marginaalien maantiedettä [Geography from the Margins]. OSK Lumimuutos, Kontiolahti (Finland), pp. 87–93.

Qéuré, L. (2012) Is there any good reason to say goodbye to "Ethnomethodology"? *Human Studies* 35: 305-325.

Reynolds, E. (2017). Description of membership and enacting membership: Seeing-a-lift, being a team. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 118: 99-119.

Sacks, H. (1974) "On the analysability of stories told by children" in R. Turner (ed.) *Ethnomethodology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Sacks, H. (1995) *Lectures in Conversation* (vols. I & II). Ed. G. Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell

Schutz, A. (1962) "Common-sense and scientific interpretations of human action" in *Collected Papers* (vol. I). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Speer, S. A. (2002). 'Natural' and 'contrived' data: a sustainable distinction?. *Discourse Studies* 4(4): 511-525.

Watson, R. (2005) The visibility arrangements of public space : Conceptual resources and methodological issues in analysing pedestrian movements. *Communication and Cognition*. 38(3-4): 201-227.

Watson, R., 2015. De-reifying categories. In: Fitzgerald, R., Housley, W. (Eds.), Advances in Membership Categorisation Analysis. pp. 23-50. London: SAGE.

Weider, L. (1974)"Telling the Code" in R. Turner (ed.) *Ethnomethodology.* pp. 144-172. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Zimmerman, D. H. and M. Pollner 1970 "The everyday world as a phenomenon." in J. Douglas (ed.) *Understanding Everyday Life.* pp. 33-65. Chicago: Aldine.

---

[i] As Erving Goffman noted in various writings, it is this assumed normality of appearances that means that driving in a 'normal car' with appearances of a 'normal family' unit is a highly effective way for any kind of uncover or otherwise clandestine unit to travel in plain sight. The first assumption will be for ordinariness in that context, rather than the unusual or extreme.

[ii] The viewers' maxim is: 'If a member sees a category-bound activity being done, then, if one sees it being done by a member of a category to which the activity is bound, see it that way' (Sacks [I]: 259).

[iii] The commentary is also not transcribed, here, with the Jeffersonian conventions associated with conversation analysis. A separate analysis, enabled or at least supported, by a fully detailed transcript, might make a good deal of the rhythmic organisation of the commentating in terms of breathing, enunciation and prosody, but such matters are not attended to here.