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ABSTRACT

Studies of power in professionals’ relationships are generally situated in the workplace (e.g. Holmes & Chiles, 2010; Schnurr & Chan, 2011). Inspired by this work, I extend the study of power to interactions between professionals enrolled in a graduate business school’s executive education leadership program (EELP). I employ interactional sociolinguistics’ (Gumperz, 1982) analytical tools to explore linguistic strategies used to enact power.

First, I investigate students’ uptake of powerful and status-oriented positions (Bamberg, 1997) relative to professional colleagues, classmates, and the EELP when recounting past professional experiences during class discussions. I show that referencing past experiences in class discussions allows students to enact power by making the influential roles they hold in their workplaces visible to other students. Next, I report on dialogic voicing (Bakhtin, 1986; Tovares, 2010) as a strategy for creating power in an analysis of the texts students select as persuasive evidence. I introduce persuasion as a type of directive discourse used by leaders in professional contexts to enact power and control (Saito, 2010; Cialdini, 2013). My examination of the texts students draw on to persuade finds that students animate voices through constructed dialogue (Tannen, 2007), recount personal narratives, and reference authoritative figures as strategies to influence their classmates’ actions. Third, I draw on Goffman’s (1974) notion of frames to explore
how knowledge about entrepreneurship is brought discursively into the classroom in question-and-answer sessions. My analysis of intra-turn organization of questions finds that an advice-giving frame emerges in Q&A sessions and creates asymmetries of knowledge between questioners and recipients. Giving advice alongside requests for information transforms questioning into an opportunity to enact power and status.

My work contributes to an understanding of how power, as a relationship of control between professionals, can be created discursively. In broadening the contexts available for studying professionals’ discourse, I am able to explore the complexities of workplaces where the ability to act powerfully is relevant to professionals in leadership positions. My work supports management education’s perspective that business schools provide opportunities for developing identities for the workplace (Petrigleri & Petrigleri, 2015), and extends the tools of discourse analysis into this community.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Power and leadership are prevalent themes in analyses of workplace discourse and scholarship focused on the relationships and identities professionals build through talk in interaction. Discourse analysts have seen leadership as a “product of interaction” (Fairhurst 2007, p. 57), and an identity that is connected to, or indexed by, displays of power, status, and authority (Schnurr & Zayts, 2011). Inspired by that work, this project investigates classroom interactions among professionals enrolled in a business school executive education program that focuses on leadership. This program, which moving forward I will call the executive education leadership program (EELP), is a space where students create power in interaction with one another through their use of language. My analysis is a continuation of the Talking Business Project (Trester, 2015): a multi-year study of professionals’ identity construction while enrolled in the EELP. I analyze interactional data collected from one cohort of students. The analysis of these interactional data is supported by contextual data in the form of student assignments, course documents, and my own notes. These resources allow me to explore how professionals enrolled in the program use language to enact power and to be seen as status-holding, experienced professionals.

Power created in interaction is an asymmetrical relationship between parties in interaction marked by differing levels of status, and the ability to control another’s actions. Status, in this definition, describes prestige, a position in a hierarchical position, or an advantage over other individuals. This view of status is influenced by Heritage’s (2012a) discussion of epistemic status as a more durable relation to a state of affairs,
rather than a relationship like stance that shifts moment by moment in talk. My analyses focus on power in relationships in the EELP classroom and in the professional world as durable positions that students work to solidify as they create asymmetries in classroom interactions. In this study I document the use of specific linguistic strategies— recounting past experiences, intertextuality (recycling, repeating and creating relationships between texts [Kristieva, 1986; Tannen, 2007]), and giving advice— to highlight asymmetries of status, to attempt to control others’ actions, and to otherwise enact power in interactions between professionals. The project is also interested in how students bring their existing professional knowledge, practices, and ways of understanding events (Goodwin, 1994) to the learning environment of this program. I will argue that students treat their professional experiences as a resource for enacting power in the classroom.

The executive education program at the center of the study has a focus on leadership, and students come to the program to develop capacities (e.g. the ability to plan for an organization’s future, or learning how to reduce employee turnover) associated with leadership and management roles. These are roles that necessitate power in interaction. Executive education has been theorized as an experience that responds to the changing nature of work in a world where traditional hierarchical relationships are breaking down. In this view, professionals in leadership and management positions in the future will be working laterally with professionals of similar status rather than with subordinates (Conger & Xin, 2000). Thus, experienced professionals need to prepare for this coming reality by enrolling in educational experiences that will build their management and leadership skills. The EELP is an institutional context that brings professionals into a space where, as learners, they can in theory practice the ability to
control and direct the actions of others in the workplace. Given the opportunity to learn about the capacities associated with leadership and management, I argue that students enact power in interactions with each other, and call on their professional experiences from the workplace as resources for showcasing their identities as professionals. To understand how a focus on ways of using language (linguistic strategies) in classroom, asserting status or asymmetrical relationships, and professional experience can come together in one analysis, consider the following interaction that was captured on video during the data collection process for this project.

EELP students take a course on decision-making and risk management. One of the course assignments has students plan how to respond to fictional natural disaster by weighing the risks of flying a military aircraft, a four engine C-130 plane, on a rescue mission. To aid their decision-making, students are given a log of how other C-130 engines have performed in cold weather conditions, along with forecasted weather data for the next several days. The data presented suggest that cold weather may cause problems for a C-130’s engines. The students are tasked with analyzing the two sets of provided data to evaluate risk and decide whether or not to launch the mission using a potentially impacted C-130 aircraft. Presumably this exercise is designed to give students practice interpreting multiple data sets when making decisions with serious consequences. However, the group discussion about how to interpret the engine data alongside the weather data creates a space for students with military backgrounds to talk about their experiences with military aircraft. Instead of focusing on how to interpret the two sets of data simultaneously, these students lock in on the detail of the C-130 plane and how, based on their experience, the possibility of engine trouble has been handled.
“poorly” in the case assignment. In their view, the details from the assignment about cold weather possibly being linked to engine trouble directly contradict their professional experiences making decisions about military aircraft. In short, the scenario described in the case “never happens” in real life and therefore the assignment is flawed.

Five students (in a class of thirty-two students) report having flown C-130 planes themselves, or having ridden in them. Instead of completing the task of analyzing the weather data and assessing risks relative to the costs of the natural disaster, students emphasize that in their experience C-130 planes never actually have engine trouble in cold weather. Additionally, they report that flying a plane where one or multiple engines are malfunctioning is not a problem; they know based on experience that a C-130 can fly with only 2 or 3 operational engines and as a result they are willing to launch the rescue. They also disagree with the case’s reasoning that engine and weather data should be consulted at all before deciding to fly this kind of multi-engine craft. The professor responds to their perspective and asks how these students interpreted the data they were given. The students continue to hold up their professional experiences as valid resources that should be used for completing this assignment and reject the notion of relying on the weather data.

The example above illustrates how students use examples from their past professional experiences as resources for completing assignments and participating in class. Recounting these experiences allows them to highlight their status and authority in the workplace and to present their professional ways of seeing the world as relevant to the EELP program. Scenarios like this one cemented my interest in exploring how talk in interaction allows for students to both assert their status and power and talk about the
workplace in the classroom. The third chapter opens with a closer analysis of the interaction I described above, and analyzes the positions that one specific student with a background takes up while talking about his professional experiences with C-130s and military aviation. Recounting past experiences not only draws a contrast between the student’s background and the professor’s goals, but also allows this student to showcase his status in the workplace as an authority figure that makes critical decisions and manages others. This example reflects the complexity of the EELP and the interactions taking place within it. My analysis of this exchange and others like it are designed to show how students present themselves as powerful figures on the basis of the power relations they experience in the workplace and how they take up positions in the classroom relative to their classmates and other professionals. This particular example also illustrates another key point of my analysis: that students can use their professional experiences as they participate in class to present themselves as professionals whose experiences reflect or conflict with points about leadership and management that the EELP espouses. My upcoming analyses in this project consider how EELP students position themselves in the classroom relative to their classmates and the program itself by recounting details about the responsibilities, roles, and power relations they experienced in the workplace.

This project moves the understanding of professional, leadership, and workplace discourse forward in three ways. First, it moves the setting for studies of professionals interacting out of the workplace and into a new and liminal context. I call this context liminal because while professionals are not interacting with each other in the workplace, there is a relationship between interactions in the classroom and interactions in the
workplace. Interactions in the EELP are connected to students’ professional selves and activities in the workplace. As I discuss in Chapters 2-5, the activities of the classroom are designed to reflect the future needs of leaders in the workplace. At the same time, classroom activities respond to and are shaped by students’ past professional experiences. Second, my analysis of classroom interactions brings the tools interactional sociolinguistics (Schiffrin, 1994) to an institutional context (the executive education classroom) that has not been widely explored by linguists. This study preserves institutional discourse’s interest in analyzing how institutions function through “ordinary” talk that has been “pressed into service for a more specialized setting (Heritage, 2005, p. 104) and embraces a deeper knowledge of context as a tool for understanding how it is that language constructs social activity in an institutional context. Sociolinguistic discourse analysis of recordings of verbal interactions among students and between students and professors, supported by contextual data in the form of student assignments, course documents, and my own notes, enables to me to explore how these professionals use language designed to allow their classmates to understand them as status holding, powerful professionals. This project also allows me to comment on the complexity of power relationships between professionals, by reflecting on the multiple ways power can be signaled across types of interaction the classroom.

Third, I put sociolinguistics in conversation with management and leadership scholarship. In this work, language is my lens for examining a space where power and capacities related to leadership are learned and acquired. Taking a discursive approach to power and by extension leadership also helps move the leadership studies field away from reliance on interviews or surveys (Schnurr, 2008) and toward exploration of
naturally occurring discourse in interaction. Bringing an approach to analyzing the
everyday interactions that accomplish leadership to a community interested in
understanding how leadership can be enacted more effectively may bolster management
scholars’ ability to speak to the challenges of the workplace.

The remainder of this chapter proceeds as follows. In the next section (Section
1.2) I situate this study of professionals interacting in the classroom within a broader
context of discourse analysis in institutional and profession contexts. Section 1.2 also
offers an overview of literature on the discursive construction of leadership and power in
the workplace that informs my work. In this section I pay attention to which populations
workplace scholars have studied, where they have looked for dimensions of power in
interaction, and how they have identified applications of discourse and units of analysis
that are relevant to the construction of a leadership identity through enacting power.
Section 1.3 provides an overview of management education scholarship on executive
education programs in business schools. Section 1.4 lays out the research questions I
pursue in this study. Section 1.5 provides an overview of the remaining five chapters and
provides a transition to the Chapter 2, which discusses my data collection and analysis
procedures.

1.2 Professional Identity, Power, and Leadership in Discourse

Institutional talk is talk that orients towards institutional tasks and goals (e.g. a job
interview or medical exam) while maintaining constraints on how participants can
contribute to the interaction and specific patterns of drawing inferences that might differ
from everyday conversation (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Well-known institutional
discourse contexts can also be interpreted as workplaces for institutional professionals.
For example, courtrooms (Eades, 2008), medical settings (Sarangi, 2010), or media interviews (Heritage, 2002; Thornborrow, 2014) are simultaneously contexts with specific institutional orders and spaces where lawyers, judges, doctors, nurses, and journalists live out the routines that shape their professions and regular responsibilities. Our understanding of the workplace depends on understanding and acknowledging the connections between professional and institutional discourses (Sarangi & Roberts, 1999) and attending to the details of the talk between professionals in these settings. Across workplace contexts, power, status, and asymmetry are treated as features of social organization that have an analyzable impact on talk in interaction (Schegloff, 1992). One feature of that impact is a speakers’ ability to meet his or her institutional objectives through language that illuminates, amplifies or relies on a speaker’s power relative to others. For example, in a classroom setting, the power and status that an instructor has relative to a student is what allows them to carry out objectives like offering assessments of student work (Koshik, 2010).

Power is a well-established dimension of analyses of workplace discourse, particularly for those studies that are interested in how professionals in leadership and management positions accomplish tasks and meet objectives in the workplace. Leadership itself has been defined by discourse analysts as a “discursive performance” in which “influencing others advances the goals of the organization” (Schnurr, 2008b). Professionals can be recognized as acting as leaders effectively when they have the “freedom to act” (Sillince, 2007) and their “ideas expressed in talk or action are recognized by others as capable of progressing tasks or problems which are important to them” (Fairhurst, 2007, p. 3). Power, defined by discourse analysts as the ability to
accomplish goals and to control others’ actions (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003, p. 3; Holmes, 2005a) has an overlap with leadership if both are used to discuss who in professional interactions is able to accomplish objectives, and how language is used to do this.

Power, without question, is present in relationships in the workplace. Understanding who has power and how it is “done” or enacted in interaction is a mainstream approach popularized by Holmes and the extensive work of the Wellington Language in the Workplace (LWP) project. This project is dedicated to recording naturally occurring interactions between professionals across multiple workplace setting in New Zealand (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003). One feature of the project is its ability to look at both sides of the field’s binary of who gets studied. Current workplace studies reflect two main entries into studying power, and leadership, in interaction: (1) studying interactions between professionals who are employed at different levels in organizations or (2) analyzing interactions when professional peers and people at similar levels interact with one another and accomplish tasks. My study of professionals enrolled in a business school program is tied to both of these approaches. As I will discuss in Chapter 2, all of the students enrolled in the EELP hold management or executive positions in their workplaces (the EELP is designed for students who are still working, rather than those who go to school full time). At the same time, in the EELP classroom and outside of the workplace they are peers who share an identity as high-status professionals with power relationships in their organizations. The power that EELP students have in relation to others in their workplaces, as well as power that they work to enact in the EELP classroom itself, are both topics I cover in my upcoming analysis. I understand my
connection to workplace discourse not only in terms of who the informants are, but also where discourse analysis should look for power creation and leadership talk.

Previous scholarship connecting power to leadership explores how professionals make power in relation to others explicit as a way of building a professional identity. Holmes, Stubbe, & Vine (1999) discuss how superiors “do” power through discursive acts like negating a subordinate’s position or moving to close a topic after previously interacting collaboratively with a subordinate. These uses of language reinforce managers’ status as professionals with authority and the ability to make key decisions. While these are examples of exercising power, Holmes, Stubbe & Vine (1999) couple analysis of enacting power with analysis of doing “collegiality” (p. 377). This reflects the complex and relative natures of some strategies that can enact multiple kinds of relationships, like power and solidarity, or distance and closeness (Tannen, 1994). Even though collegiality downplays asymmetry and creates solidarity between professionals in interaction, ultimately professionals in leadership positions maintain power and status in interaction. The interplay between power and solidarity is a recurring theme in this literature. For example, Vine’s (2004) study of power and professional identity looks at how management styles can both mark and downplay the power relationships between professionals at different times. Vine’s qualitative and quantitative analysis of the use of directives, requests, and advice as strategies for managers to control subordinates’ and peers’ future actions details the range of linguistic forms professionals have at their disposal to enact their power. Tracing dimensions of power and solidarity has also been applied to studies looking exclusively at how peers interact in the workplace. Daly, et. al. (2004) and Kliefgen (2013) are both examples of this work, that explore how face threats
Brown & Levinson, 1987) and relationships between workers are managed on factory floors. While the studies consider peers in interaction, power and status at the expense of solidarity are still relevant constructs.

Gender, as a consistent identity in variable sociolinguistic research (Holmes, 2015), also represents an important strand of power relations in workplace discourse. At the forefront of an interactional sociolinguistic approach is Tannen’s work on gender and the use of linguistic strategies to navigate interpersonal relationships in the workplace (Tannen, 1994a, 1994b). Tannen (1994a) advocates for an approach to workplace discourse that views power and status in conjunction with the need for solidarity, or connection. In this approach, linguistic strategies should be analyzed in terms of their ability to balance needs for solidarity (connection) or power (status). These dynamics can be ambiguous, or carry both dynamics simultaneously. Men and women in the workplace are all balancing these needs as they interact with colleagues. Kendall & Tannen (1997) discuss how the need for asserting power while establishing solidarity or connection can be best explored by an analytical approach that examines the alignments professionals take up towards each other; I approach this challenge in my upcoming analyses. Speaker alignments and positions are addressed in workplace discourse scholarship focused on gender and politeness (e.g., Mullany, 2006; Stubbe, Lane, Hilder, Vine, & Vine, 2003) that understand politeness as a strategy for producing professional identities in the workplace in addition to establishing relationships like solidarity and power.

Within the realm of gender, a common thread of inquiry is exploring the extent to which interactional styles in the workplace that carry out managerial tasks are gendered. Contributors interested in the strategies that women in particular have at their disposal
(e.g., Holmes, 2005; Schnurr, 2008; Holmes & Schnurr, 2005; 2006; Baxter 2011, 2012; and Mullany, 2004; 2007) consider women’s use of devices like double voiced discourse (Baxter 2011) or humor (Schnurr, 2008) to get things done at work while maintaining good relationships with colleagues (Schnurr, 2008). For example, Ladegaard (2012) explores female leaders’ use of rudeness and insults to express their own power and downgrade or “attack” their interlocutor’s face (Brown & Levinson, 1987) when they are interacting with subordinates, and to use the same strategies to delegitimize others’ power when they are positioned as subordinates themselves. This study speaks to the flexibility of linguistic strategies for enacting power relations and complicates the idea that any single feature contributes exclusively to leadership identity performance, or another social role like gender. Instead, many discursive features involved in the creation of leadership enact multiple aspects of a speakers’ identity (Holmes, 2015). Across studies, women and men are seen having access to a wide and overlapping set of discursive features to accomplish tasks and get things done in the workplace. However, as Kendall & Tannen (1997) and Tannen (1994b) points out, men and women using the same strategies are often interpreted differently in interaction. The observation that the resources leaders have available are used by women and men is further borne out by Saito (2011), whose investigation of Japanese male superiors’ styles for giving directives draw from features that are stereotypically associated with both male and female styles.

Beyond considering the populations workplace and professional discourse studies focus on, this work can be categorized according to where analysts might find professional interactions that speak to power relationships between professionals. For example, meetings and meeting rooms are a reliable context for studies of professional
interactions and workplace discourse. Discursive behaviors in meetings like holding the floor (Edlesky, 1981), sharing information through narrative (Holmes & Marra, 2004), decision making (Schnurr & Zayts, 2011), or giving directions (Ladegaard, 2011) can be taken as examples of professionals in leadership positions enacting their power and status in relationships and constructing a professional identity. An example of discourse in meetings is Holmes & Chiles’ (2010) study of questions as linguistic devices enacting power relations between professionals interacting in this setting. Questions serve as “control devices” in meetings and let managers exert their power and authority to set agendas and seek agreement from other professionals. Angouri & Marra (2011) offer analyses of how senior managers construct the role of meeting chair in formal and informal meetings in Europe and New Zealand, finding that across contexts the role of a chair involves control of the meeting event and has some affordances related to power, like holding the floor for longer periods of time, allocating turns, and giving the meeting structure. Wodak et al (2011) also consider the role of chairs in meetings and the strategies they use to build consensus in meetings. In particular, Wodak et al (2011) discuss the effectiveness of authoritarian and egalitarian leadership styles to influence consensus building. They find that an egalitarian style not only influences a team’s ability to reach consensus, but that the consensus reached is more “durable” beyond the closing of a meeting (Wodak et al 2011, p. 612). This finding resonates with the idea that the world of work, and of leadership, is changing and shifting away from a reliance on authority. I will revisit this idea in Chapter 4, and again in my conclusion.

When thinking about where professional interactions that enact power relations occur, Sarangi & Roberts (1999) suggest that distinctions between front stage and
backstage contexts—contexts that a professional world is represented in (front stage) and constructed in (back stage) (Richards 2006, p. 11)—are blurring. This characterization (borrowed from Goffman [1959]) of the regions and spaces professionals move between as they interact with other professionals and institutional clients is a key issue for the discourse analysts (Sarangi & Roberts 1999, p. 23-24) who want to understand the nature of work and communicative practice in the workplace. Some studies exploring power relationships and leadership in interaction do frame themselves as exploration of the back stage. Wilson (2013) and Richards (2006, 2010) consider how professionals in status holding positions (coaches and teachers, respectively) build professional identities through discursive performances and interactions on the front and back stage. Wilson (2013) analyses talk between leaders as a backstage performance while talk that carries out the organizational duties of leadership is a front stage performance. This study breaks with tradition by describing interactions that take place in the same physical space; front stage and back stage in this work are truly metaphors to describe the objective of institutional talk. Richards (2006) preserves the consideration of physical space in investigations of teachers’ interactions in break rooms. Richards (2006) casts teachers’ break rooms as a space for sharing narratives that allow teachers to accomplish important tasks that help them do their jobs more effectively, like sharing information about students, finding solutions to problems, and through the co-construction of narratives, reinforce shared professional commitment (p. 163). These two studies are evidence of Sarangi & Roberts’ (1999) notion of blurred divisions between front and back regions. In Richards (2006) the performance of teaching is informed by and responds to a back stage practice of information sharing. The EELP could be a context that is informed by or
responds to the workplace, or a context that serves as a back stage for the workplace. I return to this idea in Chapter 6. I discuss the EELPs status as a liminal context, between stages and regions, where students’ learning and capacity building is both an institutional performance and preparation for interaction.

Another stream of work on leadership is the interplay of power and discursive activities like analysis like humor or small talk. The role of humor in enacting power relations is a robust area. While humor can be used a strategy by people in leadership positions (Holmes & Schnurr, 2005; Holmes & Marra 2006), humor is generally analyzed as a way to establish group membership, manage conflict, establish solidarity, and even do power in a way that is “socially acceptable” (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003). Mullany (2004) discusses meeting chairs’ use of humor to disguise less acceptable activities like issuing warnings against poor performance or asking for gossip and to gain compliance by downplaying the status differences between managers and subordinates. Mullany points out that although this specific strategy of “repressive humor” does not seem to be used by male leaders, male leaders also attend to politeness norms by making sure their attempts to gain compliance are not direct and unmitigated (p.29). To invoke Tannen’s (1994a) point of view, this discussion of humor and politeness reflects the need to balance expressing power in professional relationships with solidarity and connection. We can also see in this work that men and women both use humor and both balance status and connection, albeit in different ways. Humor in workplace discourse stands out as an approach to investigating alignments between professionals. The theme of balancing displays of power with other alignments continues through work like Schnurr (2008) that combines a focus on humor with gender to discuss how women in in
leadership positions in the information technology industry use humor to navigate around masculine norms. An example of this use of humor is acting with authority by silencing, and following that act by swearing as a way to “ease” tension (Schnurr, 2008, p. 306). Given that those in leadership positions have the ability to decide when off task, small talk is appropriate for employees to engage in, managing small talk in the workplace is also an indirect way of doing power (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003). Small talk in professional contexts has also been explored as a way to build rapport (Holmes, 2015) and as a marker of in-group membership for new professionals who are acquiring new professional identities (Holmes & Woodham, 2013).

A number of the studies of power relations in interactions between professionals that I have cited here draw on data collected in the Wellington Language in the Workplace (LWP) project. This effort has produced much of the seminal work that brings sociolinguistics to the study of leadership and management as capacities related to discourse. This project collected its data primarily through naturalistic recordings of interactions between professionals in their workplaces. In this study, I use a similar method (which I describe in Chapter 2) for collecting interactional data representing professionals interacting and enacting power. In the next section I describe the executive education context as this projects’ source for interactions between professionals.

1.3 Defining Executive Education

My work in the business school context joins work relating this type of educational experience to students’ identities and future outcomes in the workplace. For example, Northcott’s (2001) ethnography of the MBA classroom presents lecture-style instruction as a barrier to academic success for students who spoke English as a second
language, and therefore formed a barrier to their preparation for the international business workforce. Ehrensal’s (2001) ethnographic exploration of the business schools’ “hidden curriculum” argues that the environment acculturates students to the values of white-collar work in a capitalistic society. Trester’s (2015) narrative analysis of interactions taking place in an executive education classroom (also from the Talking Business Project) also documents the connection between business school and the world of work; in Trester’s study executive education students’ claims of leadership in talking about themselves and their work as they interact with fellow students in the classroom constructs a particular vision of leadership within corporations (p. 148). Trester’s work models how exploring students’ mechanisms for enacting leadership through their discursive choices in in-class interactions moves beyond a study of classroom discourse and becomes a window into the lives of professionals.

Executive education programs in business schools mark a redesign away from an exclusive focus on functional skills (e.g., accounting, marketing, operations management) and towards thematic domains like organizational change, strategic planning, and preparing for transitions and leadership (Conger & Xin, 2000). Executive education students enroll in the EELP program in order to develop the qualifications, skills, perspectives and capacities needed to occupy leadership roles in their home organizations. In this context, leadership becomes an aspect of students’ professional identities. As educational experiences, executive education programs offer students “identity workspaces”, or “holding environments for [the] identity work” that underscores leaders’ development (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2010, p. 44). The use of executive education programs as a site of professional identity construction, studied
through interactions between professionals, is connected to American business schools’ confrontation of what the business education community calls a “relevance problem” (Nicolai & Seidl, 2010).

The “relevance problem” is the debate over university faculty’s ability to conduct research and design curricula that are relevant to their students’ professional lives and aspirations (e.g., Burke & Rau, 2010; Clinebell, 2008), such that management science can actually be used in managerial practice (Kieser, Nicolai, & Seidl, 2015). Executive education programs have been theorized as a response to the “relevance” question for management education as a whole because of their potential to improve both research and teaching by bringing researchers into contact with more experienced management practitioners. Tushman et al. (2007) attribute the success of executive education programs for students in the highest ranks of their organizations to this population’s ability to apply course material to their professional lives. For these students, building their capacity for new management activities, contexts, or events like leading organizational changes and transitions, strategic planning, and leadership sits alongside the opportunity to reflect on and assess their own identities and views on management. In recent years, management scholars have addressed questions about practically relevant curricula through program design, putting teaching and research in alignment with business communities and managerial practices, and “rebalancing their curricula so that attention is paid to developing the skills, capabilities, and techniques that lie at the heart of the practice of management and the values, attitudes, and beliefs that form managers’ world-views and professional identities” (Datar, Garvin & Cullen, 2010, p.7). In addressing the relevance question, executive education programs incorporate both capacity building and identity
construction into a business education experience that can be specifically marketed toward students with more professional experience than an undergraduate or MBA student may have. The executive education program at the center of this study, the EELP, shows signs of following this movement to incorporate professional capacity building and identity construction into its institutional practices. For example, the curriculum includes assignments designed to let professionals practice skills they will need for the workplace (e.g., decision making, persuasion). The EELP is built on the premise that professionals will enter the program and become surrounded by normative practices and institutionally sanctioned roles and responsibilities of graduate education; that is, attending classes, engaging with professors, completing assignments out of class, and interacting in the classroom in a student role. As my analysis points out, the way professionals in the EELP enact the student role is greatly influenced by their professional lives, experiences, and goals.

In the upcoming analysis, I take an interactional sociolinguistic approach analyzing interactions between professionals in the executive education classroom. Interactional sociolinguistics (IS) is an approach to discourse that offers a framework for uncovering situated meanings in interpersonal communications (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 134) by exploring the relationship between language in interaction and context. Interactional sociolinguistic analysis of discourse bundles analysts’ contextual knowledge about an interaction together with applications of tools for analyzing talk in interaction (e.g., attention to turn-taking, use of discourse markers, pausing and pacing, narrative analysis) to track how meanings are created. Interactional sociolinguistic studies of leadership in interaction capitalize on the IS approach to track the relationships between speakers in
professional contexts. Applied to the workplace, this approach to discourse asks how professionals in interaction may use language to achieve their communicative and relational goals.

1.4 Research Questions

In this section I present the research questions that inform this project. My analyses of classroom interactions in the EELP program address the following questions:

1. What linguistic strategies are used to enact power in the EELP classroom?

2. As they interact in the classroom, how do EELP students reference their professional knowledge and experience? How are these professional pasts used as resources in classroom interactions?

The first question aligns my work with other studies of professionals’ performance of power and leadership in discourse (e.g., Holmes, Schnurr, Chan, & Chiles, 2003; Holmes & Stubbe, 2003) by asking how power is performed discursively. The term “linguistic strategies” is used to describe “a way of speaking” (Tannen, 1994, p. 47). The second question addresses a more specific interest in what aspects of students’ own professional identities are represented in classroom interactions, and how they are encoded discursively.

This project is built on the premise that power, and by extension leadership, are made visible in the EELP classroom through students’ language use. That is, students interacting among themselves and with professors enact power by drawing on professional experiences. Students use their professional identities as a tool for constructing an identity inside of the classroom. Professional identities also help students participate in typical classroom activities like answering a professor’s questions, commenting on a lecture, working on a case exercise, or giving presentations.
1.5 Overview of Chapters

Joining this introductory chapter in contextualizing my analysis of students’ classroom discourse, Chapter 2 gives an overview of the EELP program and describes my procedures for collecting and analyzing data. The subsequent analytical chapters are arranged to first discuss interactions that are fairly typical in the EELP classroom (recounting professional experiences from the workplace during class discussion) and then to analyze interactions related to two specific assignments students complete. In Chapter 3 I analyze instances of students recounting personal experiences from the workplace. These examples represent various points in the focal cohort’s time in the program. Chapter 4 analyzes students’ use of intertextuality and recycled texts as a strategy for incorporating evidence into a persuasive presentation assignment. Chapter 5 analyzes students’ practice of giving advice to each other during question and answer (Q&A) sessions that follow capstone presentations. The capstone presentation is one portion of the final, summative assignment for the program that is a requirement for graduation. Chapter 6 reviews the findings of each analysis and discusses the contributions this project makes to sociolinguists’ and leadership and management scholars’ understanding of power in discourse.

Chapter 2 is essential to the construction of my arguments because it explains the EELP program’s public-facing perspective on leadership, as well as how classroom interactions arise as a site for considering professional identity. In this chapter I also explain how I selected specific classroom interactions for analysis over others. Ultimately, these choices relate to the research questions I hope to address through my work. In Chapter 3 I explore how students share professional experiences during class
discussions. Recreating the activities, roles, and relationships with other professionals EELP students participate in allows them to position themselves as powerful figures both in their professional worlds, and in the classroom where they are interacting. As they enact power through taking up positions in past events (Bamberg, 1997), I argue that EELP students can connect the leadership practices and activities that the curriculum provides in their past and current actions. This chapter exemplifies my earlier point that students make their professional selves visible to their classmates by referencing their workplaces in class.

Chapter 4 shows students using resources beyond their own personal experiences to perform power as they try out discourse connected to leadership (i.e. persuasion). Students recycle and incorporate external texts as persuasive evidence in presentations that are designed to persuade others. Persuasion in turn is an opportunity to enact power because it is an attempt to influence others’ actions. In this chapter I discuss persuasion as a form of directive discourse. The literature I present in Chapter 4 on the role of persuasion in the workplace argues that the ability to persuade is an important capacity for leaders over other directives (e.g., commands). The changing nature of the workplace can mean that people in leadership and management positions will be increasingly called to work laterally and collaboratively with each other. At the same time, professionals in these positions will be less able to rely on authority and their status in organizational hierarchies to inspire action, or persuade, colleagues (Cialdini, 2013). Giving directives with persuasive speech has been proposed strategy for professionals in leadership positions to maintain positive and collegial relationships with their subordinates (Saito, 2011). The EELP curriculum includes a persuasive presentation assignment in which
students write and deliver appeals that they have crafted to inspire their peers’
cooperation. My analysis reviews the “voices” (Agha, 2005) students invoke to explain
why the audience should follow their proposals. In this chapter I argue that through
voicing, intertextuality (Kristeva, 1981, 1986) becomes a strategy for attempting to
exhibit control (a form of power) over the actions of others.

The final analytical chapter, Chapter 5, describes question and answer sessions as
opportunities for EELP students to construct asymmetries of knowledge between
themselves and their classmates. These sessions are also an opportunity for students to
give each other advice. I analyze the questions that students ask each other following a
set of presentations about student research, and discuss advice-giving as an activity, or
frame, emergent within the interaction. Both seeking information and advice-giving are
interactional activities that point to asymmetrical distributions of knowledge. The first
section of the chapter discusses how turns at talk that are understood as questions contain
an information seeking frame, as well as an advice-giving frame cued by the marker
“have you thought about X.” Giving presenters advice provides an opportunity for EELP
students to suggest that they have access to knowledge and information about successful
business practices that the presenters they are advising lack. In this chapter, students
construct a power by constructing asymmetries and pointing to their own knowledge.

I conclude my examination of power relationships between professionals and the
use professional experiences in Chapter 6 by reviewing the findings of the analytical
chapters. I use those findings to present responses to the two research questions I pose in
this chapter. After addressing these questions I situate this study within the larger
scholarly community dedicated to understanding the construction and use power through
language in interactions between professionals. In particular I discuss my contributions to
leadership and management studies, to the use of discourse analysis and interactional
sociolinguistics for studying leadership, and to the value of drawing on multiple units of
analysis in understanding power.
Chapter 2: Collecting and Analyzing Interactional Data from the Executive Education Classroom

2.1 Introduction

The interactional data used in this study were drawn from a corpus of video-recorded classroom sessions collected during a larger, ethnographically based, study of professional identity construction in the EELP program. Known as the Talking Business Project (TBP), this project saw leadership as a linguistically enacted identity (Trester, Marsters, & Price, 2013, p. 1) and applied the tools of interactional sociolinguistics to explore students’ linguistic behaviors in the EELP setting. These video recordings created a corpus of recorded classroom interactions, including lectures by EELP professors, students working on assignments in groups, student presentations, and class discussions and activities. This chapter outlines how I structured my project and performed an analysis of the interactions captured in these recordings.

My goal in studying the business school context was not to identify and only record a specific kind of talk (e.g., narratives, constructed dialogue, uses of humor) in classroom interactions. Instead, I joined the Talking Business Project team because I was broadly interested in identity construction in institutional contexts, and the opportunity to make recordings of institutional encounters attracted me to the EELP as a research site. As I spent time sitting in on classes to make recordings, I observed students making, in my opinion, frequent references to their own experiences in workplaces and institutional and professional contexts outside of the EELP classroom. This behavior originally stood out to me in comparison to my own experience as a graduate student; my past professional experiences were seldom, if ever, brought up as a part of my learning. In the notes I took to accompany any video recordings I commented that in the EELP talking
about professional experiences stood out as a strategy for participating in class. This observation gave shape to my interest in EELP classroom discourse. As the number of classes I sat in on and recorded grew, my interactional sociolinguist’s (Gumperz, 2005) general interest in the role language plays in interactions between interlocutors became more focused on the role language played in how EELP students interacted with their classmates. And if talking about professional experience was, as I observed, an unmarked way of participating in class, what role did those discursive choices play in students’ interactions with each other and their ability enact power in the classroom?

Before presenting an analysis based on these questions, I use the remainder of this chapter to describe the EELP program and how I collected, selected and analyzed data. The next section (Section 2.2) gives an overview of the program’s structure and the types of experiences students have while enrolled. In Section 2.3 I explain how I interacted with the program, and collected the data for this project. I describe the process of recording classroom interactions, as well as outline how the interviews I conducted for this project came to be. In Section 2.4 I discuss the type of interactions I analyzed in this project (general class participation, student presentations, question and answer sessions) and the approach I took to analyzing them.

2.2 Overview of the Executive Education Leadership Program

The Executive Education Leadership Program is a thirteen-month program housed in the graduate business school of a university in the eastern United States. Students graduate with a Master’s level degree in Leadership. This project analyzes data collected from one cohort of 32 EELP students (13 women, 19 men), who I observed and recorded interacting in their classrooms during their entire thirteen-month enrollment in
the program. In pursuit of this degree, students take fifteen courses over four semesters (courses begin in a spring semester, continue through summer, and end the next spring), participate in three off-campus residencies, and receive individual leadership coaching. The students take all of their classes together; the entire cohort rotates en-masse through each course rather than having smaller sections of courses running concurrently. The courses are taught in modules organized around four themes: research about leadership, leadership tools, leadership in organizations, and anticipating the future. Courses in the research strand support students in their completion of a final capstone project intended to give students space to explore an aspect of leadership of interest to them. The remaining strands combine a number of instructional styles (lecture, seminar, case study method, simulations, and learning games) to tackle the program’s established and publicized learning goals. The description of the programs’ goals below appeared on EELP website and in promotional materials during the time that the data for this study was collected.

“With a focus on organizational leadership, the [Executive Education Leadership] program analyzes the following interrelated aspects of leadership: 1) Anticipating how the future is likely to unfold; 2) Identifying your organization’s desired position in that future; 3) Implementing steps to place your organization at the forefront; and 4) Influencing others to join you in advancing toward successful outcomes.”

My aim in presenting these goals is not to pave the way for a discussion of the EELP’s success in meeting them. Instead, these learning objectives indicate that the EELP itself has a perspective on leadership that focuses on organizational change, and
values students’ employment as an aspect of their learning. I return to the importance of
the students’ work experience and employment throughout my analysis; my research
questions are both aimed at understanding how talking about the workplace plays a role
in students’ participation in class and performance of power.

The most represented industries in the cohort of EELP students I followed were
the federal, state or local government (11 students), corporations (7 students) and
secondary or post-secondary education (7 students). The remaining seven students
worked in consulting, technology and engineering, media, and finance. Across these
industries, nine students were current or former members of the Armed Forces. All of the
students had management experience, and most of them held positions that entail
management (e.g., C-level executives, presidents, vice presidents, executive directors,
directors, managers). Multiple students in this cohort hoped to start their own business in
the future (discourse about entrepreneurship from seven such students appears in Chapter
5). The program’s promotional literature places participants’ average level of work
experience at 15 years. Students’ work experience is said to “broaden the education of
[EELP students’] peers” (The University Guide to Executive Programs brochure).

Students’ work experience has the opportunity to “broaden” the EELP educational
experience because, as I will discuss in detail in subsequent chapters, professional
experiences are regularly brought into the classroom via students’ discourse, and used to
enact power and display leadership. My observation that sharing past experiences was a
favorable practice in classrooms is supported by the program’s policies regarding
participation. In course syllabi participation is repeatedly defined as “active discussion”
and “enthusiastic contributions” in the course. One professor explicitly sanctioned
“sharing your experience” as a way “to enhance learning”. This focus on participation made for a vibrant classroom environment, in which students regularly interacted with one another as a part of their student experience. The result is a rich corpus of interactions between professionals working to establish themselves as leaders and powerful figures in their workplaces. The practice of using the past as a learning tool both connects the EELP to practice of the wider management education community and also paves the way for considering the function past experiences serve in classroom discourse.

2.3 Collecting Data in the EELP Program

I was involved in the Talking Business Project as a member of the data collection team, and the agreement with the EELP program gave the project permission to both record and sit in on classes and social events. To make the recordings, I, or another Talking Business Project colleague, would set up a small video camera on a tripod and position it to capture both the students and whichever professor was teaching in the frame. The process of recording classroom interactions for the focal cohort in this study yielded 96 hours of recorded classroom sessions. These recordings became the corpus of raw data that I would work with in my analysis. Table 1 below outlines the courses students take across the four semesters.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Reynolds</td>
<td>Leadership Theory</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lewis</td>
<td>Working with Teams</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mandel</td>
<td>Leading Organizational Change</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steele</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Walters</td>
<td>Leadership and Culture</td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Wilson</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Reynolds</td>
<td>Residency Preparation/Directed Reading</td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jack</td>
<td>Human Capital Management</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Reynolds</td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the video recorded interactions, I collected three forms of contextual data to inform my understanding of the EELP program: one-on-one interviews, playback interviews, and a collection texts and artifacts relevant to the program. Early on in the focal cohort’s time in the program, I conducted one-on-one, semi-structured interviews with two students (one male and one female) to discuss their motivations for enrolling in the program. The students in the cohort knew that their program was being studied (in fact they had all consented to being recorded in class), and these two students in particular were enthusiastic about the program and the Talking Business Project. Towards the end of the program, and as I revisited the recordings I was making, I saw an opportunity to conduct playback interviews (Tannen, 2005) as a tool for checking my interpretations of the interactions I had recorded and to clarify any misunderstandings of what I had observed. Playback interviews arose in the Talking Business Project as a strategy for “giving back” to the students by inviting them to review some of the footage they had so graciously let us record. Whenever a student was interested in a playback session, the team would select a few interactions from the recordings that we had difficulty interpreting, and allowed students to watch the footage and comment on their communicative intent in moments that stood out to them. I performed playback interviews with three students in my focal cohort who volunteered to watch and comment on recordings in which they were featured. I also received access to
written artifacts of the program: course syllabi, student enrollment data, student comments on a course blog, a directory of the cohort, and access to assigned readings. These textual artifacts were an important supplement to my analysis because they allowed me to understand the wider context of the program beyond what was taking place in the interactions I was recording.

2.4 Selecting Interactions for Analysis

I analyze three types of interactions among students and between students and professors taken from this data set: participating in class discussions, students completing a persuasive presentation assignment, and students’ questions asked during the question and answer (Q&A) session in a presentation assignment. These types of interactions represent the variety of types of activities students engage in through the program. Analyzing data from three types of events also allows me to consider data that spans students time in the program by showing interactions that were both routine (e.g., participating in class discussions) and specialized interactions (i.e., presentation assignments). I was drawn to these examples of student participation in the program through my interest in the role of personal experience in classroom discourse. Earlier studies of executive education classroom discourse from the Talking Business Project have analyzed references to students’ past experiences and the role they play in students’ interactions among the cohort and with professors. For example, Trester, Marsters, & Price (2013) analyze students’ references to professional experience in student introductions, student presentations, and asking and answering questions as examples of types of interactions that took place repeatedly in any given cohort. Across these types of interactions, references to the workplace were a mechanism for enacting leadership and
signaling how students “know what they know” (Trester et al., 2013, p. 1). Trester (2015) focuses on storytelling by analyzing narratives about the workplace students tell in the classroom. Students used their narratives about the workplace to “entextualize” (Bauman & Briggs, 1990) parts of the EELP curriculum, and as a result, enact leadership through narrative claims of behaving like a leader in their professions.

Influenced by these two treatments of data from the Talking Business Project, the first step I took to selecting excerpts of classroom interaction to analyze was revisiting my notes and watching (and re-watching) footage from the classroom. This process led me to flag interactions in which past professional experiences and events were being recycled and repeated (Tannen, 2007). This part of the process uncovered talk that drew on events from students’ workplaces; talking about professional lives emerged as way of participating in class that students used at all stages of the thirteen-month program. I transcribed (I will describe the transcription process in the next section) a total of fifteen examples that featured an EELP student holding the floor and recounting past experiences from their workplace. In Chapter 3 I analyze four examples of students bringing their past experiences from the workplace to the classroom, which were chosen to reflect a diversity of courses and students. These examples are also from students whose employment while they were in EELP I knew the most about. These four examples reveal the diversity of roles, relationships and identities EELP students experience as professionals. Students recreate these roles in the classroom as an aspect of asserting power and status in the classroom.

I also transcribed and analyzed data reflecting two specific assignments that all students complete: the persuasive presentation assignment and question and answer
sessions that took place after students’ capstone project presentations. The persuasive presentation assignment is a reflection the EELP’s work to cultivate specific skills, like persuasion, related to leadership. Chapter 4 discusses the role of persuasion in leadership and the workplace. In Chapter 4, I analyze seven of the presentations that use dialogic voices (Agha, 2003, 2005) to recycle and repeat information, language and events in an effort to use language as leaders do.

While all the EELP students gave presentations about their capstone projects that the Talking Business Project recorded, I was present for seven of the presentations and the question and answer sessions that followed them. At the time of the recordings I observed that the opportunity to question classmates was also an opportunity to give presenters advice. These tokens of advice, like the recounting of past experiences and persuasive presentations, also recycled information and knowledge to help students enact power in these interactions.

My discussion of advice in Chapter 5 starts with a discussion of frames and framing (Goffman, 1974), as a way to describe how turns at talk intended to be requests for information (questions) can also contain another type of discourse (advice), and how these different frames are signaled using contextualization cues (Gumperz, 1982; Gordon, 2008, 2009). My analysis in this chapter discusses frames in classroom discourse as a way to introduce professional knowledge and experience into interactions with classmates in a way that highlights speakers’ own status and knowledge.

2.5 Data Analysis

After I selected the classroom events I would analyze (sharing professional experiences in class, persuasive presentations, and Q&A sessions), I performed close
qualitative analyses of each set of data. As I mentioned in Section 2.3, the first step of this was transcribing the interactions I had recorded. I developed a set of transcription conventions drawn from Schiffrin (1994) and Schlegloff (2007), and my own needs. A full list of the conventions I used appears in Appendix A. My intent in using conventions was to capture not only what was said, but also the use of overlap, pauses, changes in pitch and intonation. On rare occasions I noted students’ gestures that were observable in the classroom footage. The transcription process created a record of interactions that I could use to move forward with my analysis. After transcribing selections of my data, the next step was to review and further annotate these transcripts.

I used interactional sociolinguistics as the conceptual framework for this stage of the project, and drew on the following constructs in my analysis: positioning (Bamberg 1997; Davies & Harré, 1990, 1999), intertextuality and the heterogeneity of texts (Bazerman, 2004; Fairclough, 1992), framing, contextualization (Heller, 2005, p. 258) and attention to contextualization cues to signal how an utterance can be understood (Gumperz, 2005; Gordon, 2008). Chapter 3 presents a positioning analysis of four experiences from the workplace that were introduced in class discussions by EELP students. These four represent a larger set of fifteen examples that I identified in my review of EELP classroom recordings. I transcribed these examples and performed a positioning analysis (Bamberg, 1997, 2004) to understand how EELP students “make sense” of themselves as professionals and leaders when they recreate their past experiences in class discussions and interact with audiences as a storyteller. Positioning as a form of linguistic analysis is concerned with the discursive and linguistic choices speakers make to place themselves relative to one another in roles that occur along story
Positions and positioning are evaluative or explanatory in nature, making a person’s actions “intelligible” (van Langenhove & Harré, 1999). As an analytical framework for studying narratives, positioning provides similar insight into evaluation clauses in narratives, by revealing what larger purpose the recreated events serve in the lives of both narrators and storied characters. Positioning analysis looks to linguistic and extra-linguistic devices as performance features that “index how narrators want to be understood” (Bamberg, 1997, p. 341). Bamberg’s model of positioning analysis works on three levels: the positioning of characters in a story world based on their relationships with characters and their roles in the story, what narrators display about themselves in the story-telling interaction, and how narrators attempt to construct themselves by telling a story. These levels correspond to three questions that when asked together, help analysts develop a sense of how students are positioned as they talk about the past: first, how are speakers positioned relative to others in the story worlds they create, secondly, what do speakers reveal about themselves to their audiences in interaction, and finally, who are speakers as the result of recounting past experiences and how do they want to be seen? My analysis in Chapter 3 addresses these questions and connects positioning to enacting power in discourse.

My analysis of intertextuality in persuasive discourse in Chapter 4 also began with a process of transcription of each student’s persuasive presentation. The persuasive presentation assignment is part of a unit on persuasion in a leadership communication class that is offered in the EELP’s final semester. The syllabus describes the presentations as follows:

“The persuasive presentation is intended to convince the audience of the correctness of a particular position or course of action. This presentation will be
To prepare their presentations, students used a planning worksheet provided by the professor. The worksheet directed students to design an introduction, conclusion and transitions between ideas. In keeping with the definition of persuasion, which is moving the audience to a future course of action, the worksheet asked students to articulate what they wanted the audience to do, what the theme of their presentation would be, and what evidence supported this theme. Students also answered a set of guiding questions, which were the first step of persuading by connecting with the audiences. Shown below, the questions directed students to consider the audience’s beliefs and point of view.

- What do they need to know? Why?
- What will [your topic] mean to them?
- How does your audience feel about the topic now?

The guiding questions above prepared the students to select evidence that responded to the audiences’ beliefs and to strategically match them. The assignment also instructed students to think about “which examples to include,” to plan the organization of that information, and to consider which “word choices will most effectively suggest your intent” (Persuasive Presentation Assignment).

To analyze persuasive presentations in Chapter 4, I transcribed each presentation and assigned each utterance a score of zero or one based on whether it contained recycled text. At this stage, “recycled text” described text whose connection to a prior text I could identify (e.g., statistics attributed to research report). I then reviewed the scored
transcripts, and noted how each piece of recycled text was embedded in the text (e.g., another’s speech embedded with a dialogue introducer) and what made it recognizable as recontextualized (Bauman, 2004) text. Over time, I developed a sense of the techniques for intertextual representation (Bauman, 2004) that were being used in these assignments to embed “examples” or persuasive evidence. The analysis in Chapter 4 discusses how three of those techniques (animating voices, recounting professional experiences, and invoking authority figures) help students meet discursive (persuasion) and relational (power and control) goals.

Broadly put, intertextual analysis describes the relationship between texts. Intertextuality as a characteristic of text was first introduced as a quality of the novel by Kristeva’s characterization of Mikhail Bakhtin’s work on dialogism (1981, 1986). Bazerman (2004) states that Kristeva’s goal in identifying the relationship of “absorption and transformation” between texts was to describe “a mechanism whereby we write ourselves in the social text, and thereby the social text writes us” (Bazerman 2004, p. 54). This means that in addition to texts being composed of other texts, social persons are shaped by the texts to which they have access and exposure, what Becker (1994, p. 165) calls the “repertoire of prior texts.” Intertextuality becomes a resource for creating identity in interaction as texts are introduced and reshaped to point to a particular identity. For example, Gordon (2004, 2006) shows how the relationships between texts can be exploited within families to articulate certain familial roles or to create shared identity within the family unit. Trester (2012) explores how members of an improv comedy group cement their group identity by demonstrating that they have access to the same texts to reintroduce anew in performance. One application of intertextuality as an
identity construction tool that has had particular influence on my study is Tovares’ (2010) description of intertextuality as a resource for creating personal identity by using inner speech as a text that interacts and combines with other texts. Tovares (2010) uses the notion of intertextuality to explain how a text (athletes’ self-talk) emerges “dialogically” as multiple voices are brought together, combined, and placed in interaction with each other to form a new text: an inner polemic (Bakhtin, 1984). This inner dialogue constructs the dialogue of athletes’ multiple selves and allows them to reproduce narratives about athletic events and identities that recreate the culture of sport in interaction (Tovares, 2010, p 264). This work reflecting how personal experiences and perspectives can be a voice or text that is reproduced anew in order to achieve an effect supports my use of intertextuality and voicing to explain how students draw on their own experience, particularly in the persuasive presentation assignment.

I view intertextuality as the repetition of written and spoken texts from one source, in a new context. Repetition is the linking of prior discourse to present speech through recurrence and recontextualization (Tannen, 2007). Drawing on prior texts as a form of repetition is a linguistic strategy in discourse that creates alignments or relationships between participants in interaction that can be useful for structuring identity. I also view intertextuality as a multi-stage process of identifying a stretch of discourse as a text, removing the circumscribed bit of material from one environment and placing it in another, what Bauman (2004, p. 4) describes as the entextualization, decontextualization and recontextualization of texts. In persuasive presentations, evidence is intertextual material that has been entextualized, decontextualized and recontextualized in the classroom, in order to inspire the audience to take a course of action.
Chapter 5 presents an analysis of questions posed during Q&A sessions, following students’ capstone project presentations. Completing a capstone project on any subject related to leadership is a requirement for completing the program (EELP Capstone Syllabus). In the program’s final semester, all students come together to give fifteen-minute presentations about their projects, and field questions from the audience afterwards. I personally recorded and observed seven of these presentations and Q&A sessions, given by a group of students in the cohort who were working on opening their own businesses while enrolled in the EELP. My notes from that particular day of recording notes that when given the opportunity to ask questions, audience members were providing commentary on these presentations. This type of behavior—using an opportunity for asking interrogative questions to introduce other types of discourse into an interaction—has been explored in other analyses of academic presentations (e.g., Konzett [2012]). I was interested in how questioning, or other types of discourse, might offer opportunities for constructing a professional identity. After transcribing the Q&A sessions and reviewing transcripts, I realized that interrogative syntax was being used. However, many tokens of interrogative questions could be interpreted as tokens of advice. Chapter 5 uses the notation of framing (Goffman, 1974) and contextualization cues (Gumperz, 1982; Schiffrin, 1994) to explain how advice is introduced into these turns at talk, and how this behavior connects to students enacting power in classroom interactions.

Scholarship on framing takes the work of Goffman (1974) and Bateson (1972) framing as the starting point for this type of inquiry into defining activities. A frame is a definition of a social situation or an answer the question *what is going on here,*
accompanied by a metamessage about how actions within a stretch of activity should be interpreted, e.g., “this is play”. Metamessages can carry information about footings, or how participants in interaction are aligned with one another. In these data levels of knowledge and power largely define relationships between participants. Metamessages about knowledge that promote asymmetries of power are conveyed by contextualization cues (Gumperz, 1982). Contextualization cues are features in language that guide how participants interpret language and ultimately identify that situation underway.

There are also a variety of ways to account for how frames change. For example, frame shifts can be studied through the dynamism of relationships between participants in interactions. Changes in footing (Kendall, 2006) and in key (Kendall, 2008; Tannen, 2006) both describe this kind of relational shift. Another approach to changing frames is a change in activity, as seen in Watanabe’s (1993) discussion of linguistic features that bracket, or distinguish one activity from another, as well as in Gordon’s (2008) analysis of laminating frames through both reframing and blending frames. All of these approaches lay out how multiple frames can be organized within one interaction. Understanding how changes in frames can be identified is necessary for demonstrating that seeking information by asking questions and giving advice are two frames or answers to the question what is going on here found within one type of interaction (Q&A sessions) between classmates.

In this chapter I have outlined my process for collecting and analyzing interactional data from recorded classroom interactions in an executive education classroom. While I collected data for a period of thirteen months and created an extensive collection of class recordings, I selected three events—participating in class, persuasive
presentations, and question and answer sessions—for analysis. My analyses are based in
the principles of interactional sociolinguistics, and explored the role that language plays
in students’ ability to enact power. The next chapter analyzes the positions that EELP
students take up through telling in-class audiences about past professional experiences. I
will discuss how these positions allow students to enact power, and how professional
experiences are referenced in this process.
Chapter 3: Enacting Power through the Sharing of Professional Experiences

3.1 Introduction

This chapter opens my investigation of talk in the EELP program with an analysis of the positions (Bamberg, 1997) students take up as they share details about their professional experiences during class discussions. This type of participation can create asymmetries between members of the EELP cohort because students’ recounts reflect the powerful positions they hold in the workplace. I analyze four examples of students recounting professional experiences in class; these excerpts were selected to represent not only a variety of graduate courses across the thirteen-month program but also a range of storylines and positions (Bamberg, 1997; Davies & Harré, 1990) that students discursively create. As students share details about their professional lives, they also position themselves relative to other professionals (as characters or participants in past interactions), to their audience in the classroom, and to themselves (Bamberg’s ‘who am I’ question). My analysis presents positioning, enacted through recounting experiences, within this three-level framework as a strategy that EELP participants use to enact power and the identity of a status-holding professional and leader (a person in relationships with an asymmetrical distribution of power and control).

I focus on incidents of recounting personal experiences about the workplace specifically as one reflection of the role past professional experiences play in EELP students’ participation in the program. Talking about workplace experiences makes students’ professional lives visible to others in classroom interaction. A positioning analysis of these events demonstrates how past professional experiences can become a resource for enacting power in classroom interactions. My goal in this chapter is to
explain how students use their past experiences in class and position themselves as powerful professionals by virtue of the relationships they have in the story world (Positioning Level 1), the role their recounting of professional experience serve in the classroom (Positioning Level 2), and the claims about their own identity they construct (Positioning Level 3). This analysis builds on past work from the Talking Business Project, that discusses narratives a way for students to “entextualize (Bauman & Briggs, 1990) leadership experiences” (p. 149) from the workplace, and bring them into the classroom and as a way to align or dis-align with professors in the EELP program (Trester, 2015). In this chapter I show how students take up positions relative to their classmates and the program as they talk about their experiences from the workplace in class. After situating Bamberg’s approach within sociolinguistic perspectives on narratives about professions and professional discourse more generally (Section 3.2), I present four examples of EELP students recounting past personal experiences during class discussion (Section 3.3). In conclusion I review the positions students have taken up in the analyzed excerpts and discuss how these four students’ participation in class expands understanding of how power can be performed in interactions between professionals.

3.2 Recounting Professional Experiences in Professional Contexts

While this chapter discusses how events from the workplace are recounted in business school classrooms, sociolinguistic literature about professional identity in the workplace typically captures narratives (recapitulations of past events) about professional experience that are in fact told at work. Seminal insights on this topic and in this setting include Orr’s (1996) description of “war stories” signaling community membership,
Linde's (2009) narratives as institutional memory, and narrative as a discourse of leaders in the New Zealand Language in the Workplace Project (LWP). In the LWP corpus of professional interactions, the term *workplace narrative* identifies a distinct form of business talk in which professionals recount past personal experience as means of carrying out their daily work tasks. Business talk is information-rich, ‘on-task’, transactional, and relevant to the goals of an organization (Holmes & Marra, 2005a; Marra & Holmes, 2004). Narratives told as a part of the workday and about work-related topics are analyzed as a site of professional and personal identity construction (Holmes & Marra, 2005). Holmes (2005) introduces a distinction between *working stories* and *workplace anecdotes* to capture how some narrative discourse (workplace anecdotes) does not “contribute” to business related tasks, but is instead offered for amusement and “interrupts” the activities at hand (p. 675). Anecdotes as narratives are “not ratified” as business talk, are not “required” in conversational sequences, have minimal narrative structure (a complicating action and evaluation), and unlike working stories, do not “inform” listeners (Holmes & Marra, 2005b, p. 199). These narratives often occur in the margins and boundaries of professional activities like meetings, whereas working stories are a part of the “core” of business activities (Marra & Holmes, 2004).

Narratives that report details of work and the workplace provide details about professionals’ identities by laying out the type of actions, knowledge and information, and relationships available to them in the workplace. Within organizations, narratives can be used to maintain values and practices. For example, institutions can use narratives like “founding stories” or “success stories” to select elements of their pasts that are relevant to an institution’s present goals (Linde, 2009, p. 80). Within institutions the act of telling
and retelling narratives, and of telling narratives in a style that matches the institution’s style, can be symbol of membership in an institutional community (Linde, 2009, p. 178-179). As a means of verbalizing lived experience, narratives can be “preserver” of work (Orr, 2006), allowing community members to learn about and remember the work practices of their community (Orr, 1996). Richards (2007) discusses narratives told by teachers in “back stage” contexts as a way of constructing identities of difference relative to students. Dyer & Keller-Cohen’s (2000) notion of “professional selves” crafted through narrative investigates the narrative practices of experts in the workplace. Vásquez (2007) traces identity construction in the narratives of novice professionals. Narratives told in the workplace can also be used to negotiate power in relationships, as Aignsworth-Vaughn’s (1999) analysis of narrative in doctor-patient interactions reveals. Creating story worlds through narrative diffused power between interactants by giving both patients and doctors the ability to participate in diagnosis.

### 3.3 Recounting Professional Experiences the EELP Classroom

In this chapter I discuss four examples of students embedding their past professional experiences in class discussions. My selection criteria for narrative elements to analyze preserves the distinction made by Holmes & Marra (2005b) and Marra & Holmes (2004) between *working stories* and *workplace anecdotes* (potentially interesting stories that are “digressions from core business tasks” (Holmes, 2005b, p. 675). Working stories in the EELP data are on-task recapitulations of professional experience that contribute to activities of the classroom (Holmes, 2005b, p. 675).

I analyze cases of recounting professional experiences in the EELP classroom that are on-task stories that students use to engage with both professors and fellow
students as they participate in class discussions. My approach to identifying narratives shares characteristics with approaches to narrative-in-interaction that consider a more expansive view of ‘narrative’ than the structural approach to analyzing narrative discourse in interviews advanced by Labov & Waletsky (1967) and Labov (1972). Labov (1972) characterized narratives as talk that conveys a series of past, reportable events. This work uses narrative clauses—abstract, orientation, complication action, evaluation, resolution, coda—as defining features of narratives. My approach to identifying narratives follows Norrick (2002, p. 27) by identifying strings of narrative elements (past tense clauses) and the involvement of audiences and tellers in order to form recounts for analysis. The narrative elements I analyze resemble Georgakopoulou’s (2015, p. 260) conception of ‘small stories’ as events that share ordinary or everyday occurrences, detach them from the context where the event took place, and recontextualize them a new environment. In the upcoming analysis I refer to the narrative elements I analyze as stories and to the students sharing them as tellers.

In keeping with Bamberg’s positioning model that I described in Chapter 2, the analysis of each example in this chapter lays out how the EELP students are positioned relative to each other professionals and what their roles in their workplaces are, what EELP students reveal about themselves to their audiences of fellow students through sharing personal experiences in class, and lastly how are students attempting to be understood by audiences as a result of telling the audience about their workplace. As an additional dimension of the analysis, I demonstrate how stories about the workplace can be an opportunity to present professional experiences as texts related to leadership. In some cases, personal experiences are treated as texts when they are entextualized (or
presented to others as a text that is moveable from its original surround, and able to be referenced or integrated into other texts [Bauman & Briggs, 1990, p. 74]) as leadership practices when they are linked through narrative to lectures, class discussions, assignments and other verbal and written texts produced by the EELP curriculum. While this is not a uniform feature of recounting past experience in the executive education classroom, the entextualization of experiences does point to the value of telling stories about the workplace: entextualization is one strategy for locating leadership in a student’s professional practices. Being able to point to “leadership” within one’s own activities is one way that EELP students can create the identity of a leader through their participation in class.

Tables 2 and 3 below preview the narrative elements I analyze in this chapter. My analysis of each example covers the positions available for tellers in the story world, the teller’s relationship with the audience, and who the teller signals she or he is as a result of the past event that has been recounted. Table 2 summarizes the teller’s positions relative to characters in the past, their relationship with the audience, and who the audience can “see” them as, as a result of hearing these experiences from the work world recounted in the EELP classroom. As Table 2 points out, the first example I analyze in this section (Example 3.1) is the interaction between a student and a professor that I first mention in the introduction to the project. I use the example here to introduce my analysis because it is unique as the only example I consider where a student does not align their professional experience to class discussions. Examples 3.2–3.4 reflect the positions that are aligned with class discussions.
### Table 2

*Examples of Recounting Past Experiences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example (Student)</th>
<th>Teller’s positions in the story world</th>
<th>Teller’s relationship with audience</th>
<th>Who is this teller?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example 1 (Morgan)</td>
<td>• Team member&lt;br&gt;• Supervisor&lt;br&gt;• Decision maker</td>
<td>Not aligned with professor’s goals</td>
<td>Experienced aviation professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 2 (Reagan)</td>
<td>• Middle manager&lt;br&gt;• Responsible for others&lt;br&gt;• Shares responsibility</td>
<td>Responds to professor’s question; Aligns with class discussion</td>
<td>Former military leader; prepared for leadership transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 3 (Cassidy)</td>
<td>• Team member&lt;br&gt;• Work on large, high value projects&lt;br&gt;• Subject to poor management/leadership</td>
<td>Responds to a professor’s question; Aligns with class discussion</td>
<td>Has experienced poor management and leadership changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 4 (Cyrene)</td>
<td>• Team member&lt;br&gt;• Supervisor&lt;br&gt;• Works with other managers&lt;br&gt;• Problem solver&lt;br&gt;• Take alternate approaches</td>
<td>Responds to a student’s question; Aligns with class discussion</td>
<td>Manager with a strategy for building relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 makes several types of relationships visible. By explaining the roles tellers occupy in the story world, the second column reveals information about each teller’s professional world and the relationships it contains. The third column explains the teller’s relationships to the members of the EELP cohort and the teller’s status in the classroom. Finally, the fourth column summarizes what the audience can take away from the story, and what the teller has communicated about his or her experience with leadership by telling this story.
Table 3
Context for Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Course Topic</th>
<th>Time in Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example 1</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Dr. Gardner</td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 2</td>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td>Dr. Mandel</td>
<td>Leading Organizational Change</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 3</td>
<td>Cassidy</td>
<td>Dr. Lewis</td>
<td>Leading Teams</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 4</td>
<td>Cyrene</td>
<td>Dr. Baron</td>
<td>Understanding Leaders’ Power and Influence</td>
<td>8 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 gives details about which students and which professors are interacting in each example and when in the program each interaction took place. The examples were chosen from four different points in the program, and from four different courses. The remainder of the chapter uses the insights summarized in this table to explain how a powerful identity is built when students recreate their past professional experiences in the executive education classroom. In the remainder of the chapter I analyze four EELP stories from the workplace. For each example I introduce the exchange and explain the events leading up to it. After presenting the data I move through the recounted events and then summarize how EELP students are positioned relative to characters, how students build relationships with the audiences of their colleagues, and how students position themselves through sharing events from their pasts.

### 3.3.1 Morgan: “So it’s like what I do.”

The first example I consider is the same excerpt that appear in Chapter 1. This interaction between a student with a background in military aviation and a professor took place in a course on critical decision-making while the class was working on a case exercise in small groups. As I discussed in Chapter 1, the exercise is about a fictional environmental disaster that calls for the military to mount a response. The professor (Dr.
Gardner) tasks the students with weighing the risks of flying a four-engine military aircraft (a C-130) in potentially inclement and dangerous weather to respond to the emergency. Students read in the case that the planes under their control have been experiencing trouble with the ‘prop shaft seals’ in their engines. The assignment suggests that bad weather is a potential cause for the engine trouble and that the problem is severe enough for a catastrophic outcome to occur. At the same time, the case offers alternate explanations and solutions for the damaged prop shafts seals. Even though most flights have been fine, multiple flights have experienced engine trouble in weather that is not as bad as the current conditions described in the assignment. A supplementary data worksheet on engine performance statistics shows that there is a temperature threshold beneath which the prop shaft seals fail uniformly. Another possible solution in the case is to fly, but to avoid exacerbating the problem by reducing the amount of power to the engines. Students must decide based on the data they have about engine failure whether their flights should take off or wait for new equipment while the environmental and fiscal impact of the disaster deepens. After the students finish their discussions, Professor Gardener shares the correct answer with the class: students should wait because their engine failure data clearly shows that below given the weather conditions described in the assignment their engines are likely to fail. The leadership lesson in this case exercise is that decision-makers should always ask questions and use all of the available data they have to inform their answers, rather than succumbing to the pressures and exigencies of their workplaces.

The example below occurs as students are reporting back about how their small groups completed the assignment and weighed the data they were given. At this point in
the discussion, Dr. Gardner has emphasized that the engine failure data should concern students. After instructing students to discuss the known facts of the case and that data worksheet in teams the professor asks each group to report what they elected to do; Example 3.1 below opens with Professor Gardner giving the floor to Morgan as a member of the next group to reveal its answer.

Morgan’s group decides to fly the mission in response to the disaster. Morgan, who works in the government contracting industry, is one of the nine students in the cohort with a military or aviation background. Morgan’s contribution in Example 3.1 is used to share his experience with military aircraft, and to critique the case exercises’ fidelity to “real life” aviation. By sharing past experiences, Morgan shares that he has experienced planes with the precise type of engine trouble the case describes. Faulty prop shaft seals reportedly have not led to catastrophic engine failure in Morgan’s experience. By conveying this information in class, Morgan is able to connect his experience in the workplace to the classroom despite the fact that his experience does not align with Dr. Gardner’s perspective. When Morgan is given the floor in line 5 he draws on his experience and references past events as a part of his participation in the case exercise.

**Example 3.1**

```
1 Prof. G.: We’re gonna keep working our way this way.
2 Morgan, And then I’ll get to you guys in a second.
3 Morgan.
4 Morgan: So if this is like– in a um a like a supply chain
5 issue ah thing for a paper mill then I’m handing
6 over to Sam.
7 So it’s like what I do:
8 Class: {@@@}
9 Morgan: Yeah alright.
10 Um, First of all
11 Morgan: The reason I asked if it was a seep not a leak.
```
Ah a leak is a grounding condition so it’s puddle-ing on the ground. It’s not- no question =

Prof G.: =Right

Morgan: If it’s a seep it is ah pilots’ discretion (.)
But it’s not a grounding condition.
The prop shaft seals fail a lot (. so).
I ju- I just pulled up an e-mail,
I have like fifteen emails the prop shaft seal failures
They all wrote {unintelligible} something like prop shaft seal failed!
What do we do.

→ Ah we,
→ They were cleanin’ a engine {unintelligible} a uh couple- couple months ago.
→ Oil literally just poured on the ground.
→ Ah we flew it.
→ Ah it’s not the end of the world,
→ Prop shaft seal leaks.
→ Or seeps!
→ Excuse me.
→ So our group decided to go↑
→ Ah without delay.
→ You ah don’t reduce,
→ Ah takeoff power.
→ The reason you don’t do that is,
→ Even if it’s a long field.
→ You’ll be off the ground and flying and establish positive rate climb as soon as possible.
→ Because if you do have a flame out and have to land you have more options available.
→ {unintelligible}
→ So (.). we go a hundred percent takeoff.
→ If we lose an engine its then a question then of triple engine {unintelligible} performance in a C-130.

Lane: Wait a minute.
Let me- let me take this back.
That means that there are three engines.
If we lose one engine
This is for someone who has no clue what’s going on up there-

Prof G.: Well: so:
Class: {Students talking at once}
Prof G.: Let me go this way {gestures to next group}
Example 3.1 begins with Professor Gardner laying out the order in which the students will present their decisions about flying to the class. Students who take the floor before this exchange with Morgan report what they elected to do and how they evaluated the levels of risk. When Morgan receives the floor in line 5, he first states that if the problem is a “supply chain issue,” he will “hand over” to another student named Sam. Sam is an executive in the consumer products manufacturing industry, and supply chain management as an aspect of this industry has come up in other classroom interactions observed for this study. Line 8 (“This is like what I do”) can be interpreted as claiming that the case exercise is directly relevant to Morgan’s professional experiences in military aviation, just as supply chains are directly relevant to Sam’s experiences in manufacturing. This claim introduces Morgan’s professional vision (Goodwin, 1994) as a valid resource for deciphering the exercise and making a decision about flying the fictional mission. In lines 10-16, Morgan begins to explain this team’s decision making process. In line 13, he refers back to a question he asked earlier about whether the engines were “leaking” or seeping. In explaining how leaks versus seeps are different scenarios and lead to different outcomes, Morgan is making his familiarity with military aviation and airplane maintenance visible to the class and to Professor Gardner. In lines 14 and 15, Morgan explains what constitutes a leak, and what it means for a flight. In line 19, Morgan states that opting to fly despite ‘seeping’ prop shaft seals is the choice of pilots themselves, and that this kind of event should not necessarily ground a fleet. The written case only describes the prop shaft seals as “damaged”, but Morgan keeps referring to seeping, a more specific form of damage. This lexical choice is an indication that Morgan’s professional experience is present in the classroom as a resource. In line
21, Morgan claims that these types of engine issues are commonplace, and in line 22 Morgan begins to report experiences from the workplace as evidence of the ubiquity of prop shaft seal issues. In line 22 and 23 Morgan describes reading multiple emails on his laptop about engine trouble. In lines 25–26 Morgan animates those written texts for the audience, and in line 27, adopts the position of a decision maker when voicing subordinates asking “what do we do.” The implication is that composers of the emails are looking to Morgan for guidance about how to handle the engine failure.

The first event from the past (cleaning an engine) is presented in line 29 in a past tense clause. Morgan first attributed that event to “we” in line 28, but shifts to “they” in line 29. This distances Morgan from the activities of cleaning engines himself, but also authenticates the event as being relevant to a discussion about planes and aviation. Line 31 describes the severity of the problem, as oil from the engine “literally just poured on the ground.” The increased level of drama makes the end of the past event in line 32 more impactful: “we flew it.” In this line, Morgan has been presented in this recounting as an actor or character who is able to make the decision that conflicts with the professor’s assessment of what ought to happen. Lines 28–35 summarize Morgan’s conflicting position, evaluate the previously shared experience as evidence of the ubiquity of engine trouble, and offer an alternative view of the facts of the case. In line 37 the marker “so” positions the decision to fly “without delay” in line 38 as a direct result of the information Morgan has shared.

After explaining what the group decided to do, Morgan offers more details, presumably from his professional experience, about what a pilot would do if he or she experienced engine trouble on this particular type of military aircraft. The discussion of
reducing takeoff power in lines 39 and 40 references a remedy to the engine problem suggested in the case. Lines 41–46 are offered to explain why this would not work. In these lines Morgan continues to measure the facts of the class exercise against his professional experiences. Lines 47–49 explain that even if engines fail as the case portends, a C-130 has three more engines that should perform. In line 50, another student with a military background named Lane, takes the floor and reiterates that a C-130 has multiple engines. “This is for someone who has no clue what’s going on up there” in lines 54–55 signals an awareness that this kind of professional experience is not common across all students in the class. Professor Gardner steps in in line 56 to direct the floor to another group to share their decision. The exchange between Morgan and Professor Gardner continues beyond the end of this excerpt as Morgan continues to compare the case exercise to his professional experiences and to take issue with the details in the case. The exchange ends when Professor Gardner eventually moves on to the next group of students. Throughout the interaction Professor Gardner states and restates that students should focus on what the supplementary worksheet shows: engines fail below a temperature threshold. Furthermore, the professor argues that the students are reaching faulty conclusions because four identical engines with the same problem, exposed to identical circumstances should all fail. The professor’s reliance on the case data to reach a conclusion reinforces the analysis that students were supposed to use the provided data to complete the assignment, instead of relying on their professional experience with military aviation.

Bamberg’s (1997) levels of positioning help to organize the information about Morgan’s identity gleaned from this excerpt. The first level of positioning asks us to
determine how characters in a story, or recounted past events, interact. In this example Morgan is seen as a member of a team who has some decision making power and the ability to direct the actions of others. Morgan’s role as a decision maker and a person in a management position who controls others’ actions is also supported by earlier lines in the excerpt, in which Morgan received multiple emails asking for direction in response to more damaged prop shaft seals. Moving to the second level of positioning, which considers the positions that tellers take up relative to their audience, Morgan introduces his personal experience at a point in the discussion when he should be talking about the decision team made. In this excerpt Morgan’s professional experience is being presented as the rationale for the entire group. While this allows Morgan to successfully participate in class discussion, the excerpt also obscures the real decision making process the team actually went through. Lines 37–38 (“So our group decided to go/ Ah without delay”) summarize Morgan’s position as if it were truly the experience of the whole group and suppresses other views from other professional backgrounds. While the recordings of the class do not pick up what Morgan’s group talked about in their internal discussion, Morgan was the only student in this group with military experience. This constitutes an erasure of Morgan’s classmates’ identities and participation in class. By presenting his own experience and perspective as more relevant than other ways of completing the assignment, Morgan is exhibiting control and power over the group. Morgan’s positioning relative to the professor and the program is also relevant. These details about Morgan’s professional life are occasioned by the Professor’s request for Morgan’s group’s verdict on flying versus waiting, and Morgan was given the floor as a regular part of class discussion. However, the fact that when faced with engine difficulties in the work
world Morgan made the decision to fly the planes, diverges from the sequence of events Professor Gardner would like to see: students using data to identify evidence of engine trouble and deciding not to fly.

Morgan approached the assignment by drawing on his professional past. Following Trester (2015), linking events from the past to EELP assignments and class discussions entextualizes aspects of Morgan’s experience and treats the events from his past as “extractable” from one context (his professional life) so that they can be connected to another (a view of how leaders might make decisions) (Bauman & Briggs, 1990). Interestingly, entextualization in this example is a problem. The actual assignment asks students only to evaluate the data they are given. Treating lived experience as a visible resource for completing this assignment is not what the instructor intended. The conflict between Morgan and the professor is not actually about strength of prop shafts. It is a lack of alignment regarding what resources should be used to participate in class. I see Morgan’s use of professional experience as a resource to complete an assignment as an example of Positioning Level 2, which considers how narrators position themselves to audiences. This positioning analysis shows that sharing this experience affords Morgan an opportunity to assert status over other classmates and point to the powerful roles he occupies in the workplace. Using his experiences as a text and reference point for completing the assignment also allows Morgan to position himself (Positioning Level 3) as someone whose experiences are relevant to the EELP, and by extension, to leadership.

3.3.2 Reagan: “So you learn very quickly to nominate a successor.”

In the next example, Example 3.2, a student’s professional experience once again becomes a piece of evidence in a class discussion. In this case the narration is triggered
by a question from Professor Mandel, who teaches a course on change in organizations. In the session Example 3.2 takes place in, the professor is stressing the importance of continuity in leadership. Reagan’s personal experience with leadership continuity enters the discussion when Reagan treats Professor Mandel’s utterances in lines 1–11 in the excerpt below (e.g., *Do you have somebody in place that can step into your um into your shoes*) as a question soliciting information. Instead of responding with a minimal *yes* or *no*, Reagan embeds details from two points in her professional past; Reagan’s contribution or personal experience connects the notion of having a successor first to her past experience as a middle manager in the military, and then to her current work practices. Reagan characterizes herself as a person with power over others in both contexts. Due to its length, I first present Example 3.2 in its entirety and without annotation before analyzing the exchange between Reagan and Dr. Mandel in smaller sections. Arrows in the left margin point to key lines in the smaller excerpts.

**Example 3.2**

1. Prof M.: With you being in leadership positions,
   
2. Do you have somebody in place↑
   
3. That can step into your um
   
4. Into your shoes.
   
5. If something happened.
6. Are you- are you
7. Are you actively working on that.
8. Or you think ah I got enough time,
   
9. I’ll think about that in ten years,
   
10. Or,
12. Reagan: So I’m a military person
13. This is something that we learned painfully↑=
14. = Yeah
15. Prof. M.:           = Yeah
16. Reagan: They would make it,
17. Really hit home for us↑=
18. Prof. M:       = Yeah
19. Reagan: You’re a flight commander,
20. You’re standing in front of your flight and they have
21. to-
22. If you walked away↑
And didn’t bring someone up↑

To be in charge of the flight as you walked to go talk
to the higher commander,
They would put my entire flight in push up position
And start
Making them do pushups if I had walked away and didn’t
elect a successor. =

Prof. M.: = Wow
Reagan: So they taught us that,
Your whole flight is in pushup position while you’re
doing something else not paying attention,
You come back and they hate you.
Because they just did a hundred pushups. =

Prof. M: = Right
Reagan: So you learn very quickly to nominate a successor.
So now that sticks with me
Because when I go on vacation,
I make sure that I have all the files
That I was working on,
Given to someone.
Every project I’m working on has someone that’s in
charge while I’m gone,
So I don’t make it back or if I go {unintelligible}

Class: @@
Reagan: Then life
Then life goes on.
Reagan: [You know?
Prof. M.: [That’s
Reagan: [So:
Prof. M.: [Right
Yeah yeah.
Good Comment Reagan.
Yeah.

Prof. M.: Thank you.

To understand how this excerpt connects multiple points in Reagan’s past to leadership activities, I start this analysis with a focus on how the Reagan’s past enters the real time interaction of the classroom.
In lines 1–9 above, Dr. Mandel asks the class if, as leaders, they have successors in place in their organizations. Dr. Mandel is asking about students’ current practices. Reagan, on the other hand treats Professor Mandel’s interrogative as an invitation to provide information and share examples about the past. In line 11, Dr. Mandel gives Reagan the floor, and in line 12 she identifies herself as a “military person.” This immediately conveys information to the Professor, and to her peers, about her professional background. This disclosure provides additional information to the audience about what kind of professional story will be coming. Establishing an identity as a “military person” provides a setting for the rest of the contribution and prepares the audience to interpret the talk to come in a way that matches their views on what a military person is or does. This move also allows Reagan to justify whatever comes next in this example as “what the military does.”

Line 13 explains the relevance of the coming utterances to the class. “This” can be understood as referring to the lecture topic of having successors to maintain leadership continuity. Reagan says that this is something “we learned,” implying that the military practices this. The pronoun “we” connects Reagan with other military service personnel who have learned this concept. In line 15 Reagan introduces a new character with the pronoun “they” who has some kind of responsibility for Reagan’s actions. “They” are positioned in upcoming utterances (e.g., lines 25–27) as having some power over Reagan
and her colleagues. The evaluative descriptions of the learning Reagan is doing as “painful” and something that “really hit home” serves to evaluate having a successor as an important concept.

In the next section, lines 18–29, Reagan expands on her response to Dr. Mandel’s question about learning to elect successors in lines 12–17. These lines also communicate information about the relationships and actions someone in the military could experience.

18 → Reagan: You’re a flight commander,
19 → You’re standing in front of your flight and they have to-
20 → If you walked away↑
21 → And didn’t bring someone up↑
22 → To be in charge of the flight as you walked to go talk
23 → to the higher commander,
24 → They would put my entire flight in push up position
25 → And start
26 → Making them do pushups if I had walked away and didn’t
27 → elect a successor. =
28 →
29 → Prof. M.: = Wow

In line 18 Reagan shifts to the second person and uses the pronoun “you” to introduce a flight commander as character in a story world. The title “flight commander” confirms for the audience that this is a story about military service. This character is only identified by their title, but the term ‘flight commander’ can signal to an audience familiar with the military that this character has control over a collection of subordinates that compose the “flight.” In lines 19–20, Reagan provides a physical description of this leader, standing a position of power (in front) relative to the amassed flight. In line 19 Reagan continues to use the second person to portray the flight commander standing in front of their subordinates in the “flight.”

In lines 21–24 Reagan describes a flight commander failing to choose a successor during a transition. The transition in this example is walking away to go talk to a higher
commander. Referencing the “higher commander” reinforces the middle management status of the flight commander. This detail also shows that while flight commanders have control over others, they still take direction from more powerful figures in the military.

Line 25 (“They would put my entire flight in push up positions”) presents the negative consequences of leaving the flight without a leader. The auxiliary would allows Reagan to present this event as if it was a regularly occurring, habitual event (Riessman, 1990).

In this portion of the recounting the hypothetical flight commander’s superiors (they) enact their power by directing the flight to do pushups as a consequence of being left without a leader. These lines are also the first place that Reagan is identified as a character in these shared events. This is how the audience comes to understand what Reagan’s position in the military involves. In line 25 the “entire flight” is subject to the Reagan’s commanding officer’s direction, and in 27 the pronoun “I” positions her as the figure who could have walked away without nominating a successor.

30 Reagan: So they taught us that,
31 Your whole flight is in pushup position while you’re doing something else not paying attention,
32 You come back and they hate you.
33 Because they just did a hundred pushups. =
34 = Right
35 Prof. M: =

Lines 30-35 repeat the plot line that has been laid out so far. In line 30 Reagan repeats that the military (“they”) teaches personnel (“us”) to select successors. Lines 31–34 repeat the cause and effect thread of leaving the flight and incurring a punishment, with a few transformations. In lines 31–32 leaving the flight has becoming “doing something else and not paying attention.” The charge of not paying attention is damning. Whereas in the previous section the flight commander left to go speak with a superior, this line 31 and 32 position the flight commander as a poor, inattentive and irresponsible
manager. Line 33 also expands on the negative consequences of not nominating a successor, describing the subordinates as “hating” their flight commander. In these lines we can see that the position of a flight commander or middle manager faces difficulties in controlling others, and in being controlled by others. In this section Reagan’s relationship with subordinates is different than Morgan’s in Example 3.1. While Morgan was only positioned as a director, Reagan is positioned as someone whose activities are evaluated both by her superiors and the people she manages.

35  →Reagan:    So you learn very quickly to nominate a successor.
36  →          So now that sticks with me
37  →          Because when I go on vacation,
38  →          I make sure that I have all the files
39  →          That I was working on,
40  →          Given to someone.
41  →          Every project I’m working on has someone that’s in charge while I’m gone,
42  →          So I don’t make it back or if I go {unintelligible}
43  →          Class:  @
44  →          Reagan: Then life
45  →          Then life goes on.
46  →          [You know?
47  → Prof. M.:  [That’s
48  → Reagan:  [So:
49  → Prof. M.:  [Right
50  →          Yeah yeah.
51  →          Good comment Reagan.
52  →          Yeah.
53  →          Thank you.

The discourse marker so in line 35 presents selecting successors as a result of the events and experiences narrated in the preceding lines. Line 36 shifts away from the military to Reagan’s current professional world, where the lesson of selecting successors has become a practice. So now that sticks with me (line 36) and the emphasis on “now” creates a link between the two points in time. Going on vacation is presented in line 37 as a scenario with a metaphorical relationship to leaving the flight without a leader.
In this new series of events, Reagan is identified as an agentive character with the pronoun *I*. The only other references to other professionals are two instances of the pronoun *someone* in lines 40 and 41. These other actors are not named or described, but Reagan is able to direct their actions somewhat by giving them projects to manage in her absence. In lines 45–46 provide a resolution for the narrated events that is the opposite of what could have happened in the military: life goes on without incident, consequence or physical punishment. The past experiences are bracketed off from the subsequent action in the classroom lines 47 and 48 as Reagan and the Professor overlap each other. Professor Mandel evaluates Reagan’s narration as a “good comment” and thanks her in lines 52–54 before calling on another student.

Reagan visits two points in time in this example. At each point in time she is positioned (Positioning Level 1) relative to other professionals both as a manager, and someone who is managed themselves. In the military Reagan was responsible for a “flight crew”, and while she is less detailed about her role in her current career Reagan does describe working on projects and having the power to delegate responsibilities to others in her absence. Reagan’s status a middle manager is also central to her positioning in this example. Although this example certainly shows Reagan as a leader, she does have to take direction from others (e.g., higher commanders) who have the power to direct the personnel Reagan directly manages. Additionally, Reagan is summarily affected by the actions higher commanders take against her flight crews as she describes incurring blame as a result of their orders (lines 31–34). Reflecting status as a middle manager is a departure from discussions in the EELP classroom that attempt to draw a distinction between *leading* and *managing*. However, the experience Reagan shares about directing
and controlling others exposes the diversity of leadership experiences in her professional life to the rest of the class.

Reagan’s professional experience is introduced into the discussion as a response to a question from Professor Mandel. From a positioning analysis perspective (Positioning Level 2), responding to the Professor’s utterance without switching topics tells the audience that Reagan is engaged in the class discussion. Reagan’s experience is presented as evidential support for Professor Mandel’s point that successors are a necessary part of continuity, and by connecting the Professor’s verbal text to two points in her own experience, Reagan entextualizes her past behavior in the workplace as a practice. When Reagan shows that Professor Mandel’s pedagogical point is something that she learned in her professional life, and subsequently became something that she has paid attention to, Reagans sets this practice up to be something that the rest of the class can do as well. While this prescription is not made explicitly, the contrast between two experiences with leadership continuity positions (Positioning Level 3) Reagan as a responsible manager who has learned from the past.

3.3.3 Cassidy: “They brought in new people to add to our team.”

The next example presents another instance of a student talking about past professional experiences in response to a professor’s question and taking up positions that highlight power in the process. Cassidy’s example of sharing professional experiences in Example 3.3 takes place in a class about leading and working with teams. The theme of the Professor Lewis’s lecture in this class meeting is diversity. Diversity is being considered in a broad sense; teams can be diverse not only in terms of ethnicity, and gender, but also age, religion, professional background, experience and expertise.
Professor Lewis then warns against the potential dangers heterogeneity on teams can pose if employees begin to seek out the other members on the team most similar to them. If this happens, allegiances can eventually become entrenched divisions that the Professor terms ‘fault lines’. The Professor asks in lines 60–63 if anyone has had any experience with fault lines.

**Example 3.3**

60  **Prof. L.:** Have any of you been on a team  
61 Or seen where there’s been a clear fault line?  
62 {Hands raise}  
63 Have you been a part of that.  
64 Cas-  
65 Cassidy would you be willing to share your experience†  
66 Cassidy: Well  
67 I just remember a team where we were midway through um  
68 A half a million dollar implementation,  
69 And  
70 Um  
71 Leadership changed (points up)  
72 So  
73 The leadership  
74 Of the company.  
75 **Prof. L.:** [Oh  
76 Cassidy: [So  
77 They brought in  
78 New people to add to our team,  
79 **Prof. L.:** Ah  
80 Cassidy: And then it was us and them.  
81 The new versus the old.  
82 **Prof. L.:** And what kind of outcome did that lead to.  
83 Cassidy: Oh it was terrible.  
84 **Prof. L.:** Yeah!  
85 Cassidy: First of all they didn’t have context.  
86 For everything else we had a-  
87 Done.  
88 So they spent a long time getting context,  
89 And then they wanted to do it their way.  
90 And put their stamp on it  
91 And for it to be them.  
92 So,  
93 It ended up,  
94 The project had cost overruns and ah deadline,  
95 Delays.  
96 **Prof. L.:** Yeah okay so this is a common thing right,  
97 Fault lines.  
98 And it might be,  
99 Administration versus teachers,
Oh {unintelligible} versus the leadership team,
But there are a million ways we can sort of cut this
However if we don’t manage that well,
It leads to sort of bad outcomes sometimes.

Multiple students raise their hands when Professor Lewis asks if anyone has experienced fault lines (lines 60–61) in the workplace. The professor repeats the question in line 63, calls on Cassidy, and asks if Cassidy “would be willing to share” in line 65. Because of the length of the example, I will analyze the interaction between Cassidy and Professor Lewis in smaller excerpts. The first excerpt below demonstrates how events from Cassidy’s professional past are introduced to the lecture.

60 Prof. L.: Have any of you been on a team
61 Or seen where there’s been a clear fault line?
62 {Hands raise}
63 Have you been a part of that.
64 Cas-
65 Cassidy would you be willing to share your experience↑
66 Cassidy: Well
67 → I just remember a team where we were midway through um
68 A half a million dollar implementation,
69 And
70 Um
71 → Leadership changed (points up)
72 → So
73 → The leadership
74 → Of the company.

In line 67 Cassidy describes “remembering” a team faced with a large “implementation” (line 68). The pronoun “we” in line 67 places Cassidy as a member of the team and a character in this story. Lines 71–74 introduce both a new character (leadership of the company) and a new event (a change in the leadership). The more specific identity of the organization’s leadership is subject to an erasure here; Cassidy does not describe what positions change or how these events have come to pass.
The fault line begins to form in lines 75–81, as the unnamed leaders bring in new personnel. Cassidy describes the new leadership “adding” people to “our team”, which positions Cassidy as a passive experiencer of another’s actions. In lines 80-81 Cassidy describes the division between the team members as “us versus them” and “new versus old.” These characterizations establish the opposition between the teams and match Professor Lewis’s description of how opposing sides form on teams. At this point, Cassidy has satisfactorily used past events in the workplace to provide evidence for Professor Lewis’s claim that divisions in the workplace impact diverse teams. Instead of allowing Cassidy’s telling to end there, Professor Lewis asks Cassidy for more information in line 82.

In line 82 Professor Lewis Cassidy “what kind of outcome” the introduction of new team members led to. This query suggests that there is a specific type of information
that the professor is looking for within student experiences, beyond whether or not ‘fault lines’ exist in the workplace. If Professor Lewis is looking for more information then perhaps she already has an idea of how Cassidy’s story should be connected to the class discussion about fault lines.

Cassidy responds to the request for more information by describing the event as “terrible” in line 83. This earns an enthusiastic response from Professor Lewis in line 84. Lines 85–91 detail the conflict between the teams, as Cassidy describes what “they” did. In line 88, the newer employees spend “a long time” getting up to speed about what Cassidy’s organization (represented here by “we”) had done. In line 89–91 the new leadership is seen wanting to exercise control over the implementation process. In lines 92–95, Cassidy introduces the conclusion of the recounting. The outcome is negative, with cost overruns and delays in completing the project.

96 → Prof. L.: Yeah okay so this is a common thing right, Fault lines.
97 And it might be,
99 → Administration versus teachers,
100 → Oh {unintelligible} versus the leadership team,
101 But there are a million ways we can sort of cut this
102 → However if we don’t manage that well,
103 → It leads to sort of bad outcomes sometimes.

Cassidy’s negative assessment of the project after the arrival of the new leadership demonstrates the problems with divisions on teams. Professor Lewis retakes the floor in line 96 and confirms that this is an example of fault lines. “Yeah okay so this is a common thing” (line 96) points to the evidential quality of the excerpt. Professor Lewis lists additional types of division in lines 99 and 100 using a structure that parallels Cassidy’s description of the fault line as “us versus them” in line 82. In line 102 and 103 Professor Lewis describes fault lines as the outcome of poor management. Here Professor
Lewis connects Cassidy’s experience to management, by saying that any divisions between teams have to be managed successfully to prevent bad outcomes. The professor uses “we” to cast the assessment in lines 102 and 103 as a possible outcome for anyone in the class.

The first level of positioning in this example is concerned with the role students occupy in the story world, or in Cassidy’s personal experience. In this example, Cassidy is positioned as a team member who is subject to the decisions of others. “The leadership” in this example has the ability to direct others by hiring employees and attempting to determine the outcome of projects. Professor Lewis connects the leadership’s actions to bad management in line 102. Positioning on the second level asks how the narrator is interacting with an audience. In this case, having personal experience observing fault lines to share with the class second-level positions Cassidy as having relevant experience with leadership and management. Cassidy joins Morgan and Reagan is using professional experiences as a resource for participation in the EELP program. Unlike Reagan’s example where professional experience is used to promote a practice, Cassidy’s experience with fault lines amplifies the caution about fault lines in the workplace that Professor Lewis is issuing. In this example Professor Lewis not only prompted Cassidy’s disclosure of past experience but also invited Cassidy to confirm the “official” evaluation of fault lines as problematic in line 84. The result is that Cassidy is positioned on Bamberg’s third level as a student whose experience highlights the EELP program’s curriculum.
3.3.4 Cyrene: “I just made small talk.”

The final example in the chapter (Example 3.4) demonstrates how recounted workplace experiences can position a student as a professional with leadership or management practices that others can use. This is a different sort of third level positioning from what was uncovered in Examples 3.2 and 3.3 in that a student’s professional experience is not being tied to a point that a professor is making. Example 3.4 takes place in a course about cultivating and exercising a leader’s personal power and influence. In this particular meeting, the class is discussing how to create relationships that form a network of influence. The professor, Professor Baron, had suggested earlier in the class that tangible and intangible gifts (e.g., holiday gifts, lunches, thanking people for their help) can be used to develop relationships with people whose connections and wider network can be of assistance. In response, students raise the issues of authenticity in offering gifts and reciprocity for gifts that they receive as challenges for leaders. The class moves on to discuss how they can practically approach gaining cooperation from people with status in the workplace. Due to the length of the example I first present the entire excerpt, before analyzing smaller sections.

Example 3.4:

Cyrene: Um, to Janus’s question,

   um, about what do you do, um.

   I was in that situation,

   Where a gentleman was in a very um influential position,

   And it was a lateral relationship,

   So we needed-

   I among many others needed him to approve things in this electronic process.

   If he never went into his queue and approved it,

   That meant it affected several people I was managing.

   And so,

   Everyone talked about him,

   He is so hard to work with he’s been in the government system all these years,
Blah blah blah.
So what I did,
I didn’t ask him to lunch,
I started going to his office which was in the
adjacent building.
So I could access his building without going outside.
So I would make it my point once a week to go down to
his office.
And he was this great big,
I think,
State University football fan.
I didn’t know anything about football,
So I— I always talked about his football team.
I would always start the conversation with his
football team.
I didn’t know their stats,
anything.
I would just start the conversation about his team.
And so after about,
It took about seven months— it took a while
But it got to the point where um,
When my things were in the queue,
Because it tells you who’s put something in the queue,
He would approve them.
And then it got to the point where,
I could go ask him for approval before I put it in the
queue to make sure his people would approve it to him,
And he would approve it verbally.
And so,

um,
And it wasn’t that I was doing anything,

um,
Outside of the—the structure of how it processes,
But he was a clog in a whee- a cog in a wheel,
And if you didn’t have his buy-in y-
It affected so many people.
So,
Outside of taking him to lunch,
Because that might have been a little inappropriate
for me,
To ask a man to lunch in that setting,
I just made small talk in his office just to develop
that relationship.

In this example, events from Cyrene’s past enter the class in response to a
question asked by a student. Cyrene introduces this act of telling the class about her
professional life by creating a link between Janus’s question and her own experience
beginning in line 1 below.
Cyrene: Um, to Janus’s question,
   um, about what do you do, um.
   I was in that situation,
   Where a gentleman was in a very um influential
   position,
   And it was a lateral relationship,
   So we needed-
   I among many others needed him to approve things in
   this electronic process.
   If he never went into his queue and approved it,
   That meant it affected several people I was managing.
   And so,
   Everyone talked about him,
   He is so hard to work with he’s been in the government
   system all these years.
   Blah blah blah.

In line 1, Cyrene takes the floor and presents her contribution as relevant to the
topic at hand by referencing the question that Janus, another student, has asked about
establishing instrumental relationships with gatekeepers in order to gain influence. Line 2
solidifies this connection of reconstructing the question “what do you do.” Cyrene shifts
to the past tense in line 3 to offer her professional life as an example that responds to
Janus’s question. Cyrene’s revelation that she was “in that situation” in line 3 connects
her professional experience to Janus’s problem. In lines 4–5, Cyrene establishes another
character in this series of narrative elements: a male colleague “in a very influential
position.” In line 6, Cyrene adds that the relationship was “lateral,” which places Cyrene
in the position of interacting with influential people. Calling the relationship lateral
implies that Cyrene is in an influential position and indirectly positions her as influential
as well. The pronoun “we” in line 7 briefly places other people in the relationship with
the influential colleague (“so we needed”). In line 8, Cyrene shifts to say that she
specifically needed this person’s cooperation, along with other people. In line 10 she
explains the problem with this person’s work style, and in line 11 she details how it
affected her. In line 11, Cyrene directly positions herself as a manager. Lines 12-16 depict unnamed colleagues in the workplace ridiculing this manager, which solidifies Cyrene’s positioning of him as problematic.

17 Cyrene: So what I did,
18 I didn’t ask him to lunch,
19 I started going to his office which was in the
20 adjacent building.
21 So I could access his building without going outside.  
22 So I would make it my point once a week to go down to
23 his office.

In line 17, Cyrene begins to explain what she did to address this issue of the troublesome manager. The explanation begins in line 18 with what she did not do: ask the manager to lunch. This is a reference to an earlier class discussion about giving tangible and intangible “gifts”; taking people to lunch was an example of a gift that could help build a circle of influence. By connecting the professor’s recommendations to the events being recounted, Cyrene is able to put her personal experience in a relationship with the perspectives on leadership discussed in the EELP courses. Distancing herself from this specific practice of taking people to lunch, which started a vigorous debate about authenticity and reciprocation, allows Cyrene to show that she has her own strategy for developing influence. In line 19, Cyrene begins going to the troublesome colleague’s office. In lines 22–23, she explains that she went regularly. The detail that she “would make it [her] point once a week” shows that she was intentional and deliberate about pursuing this course of action.

24 Cyrene: And he was this great big,
25 I think,
26 State University football fan.
27 I didn’t know anything about football,
28 So I– I always talked about his football team.
29 I would always start the conversation with his
30 football team.
31 I didn’t know their stats,
I would just start the conversation about his team.

In lines 24 and 26, Cyrene discusses the colleague’s support for a college football team. In line 27, she claims not to know anything about football, but this does not stop her from discussing it anyway in lines 28–29. Lines 31–32 reinforce the purported lack of knowledge Cyrene has about football. In line 33, “I would just start the conversation about his team” presents football as a way of opening a line of communication with this person.

And so after about,
It took about seven months– it took a while
But it got to the point where um,
When my things were in the queue,
Because it tells you who’s put something in the queue,
He would approve them.
And then it got to the point where,
I could go ask him for approval before I put it in the queue to make sure his people would approve it to him,
And he would approve it verbally.

In lines 34 and 35 the audience learned that Cyrene pursued this approach for more than half a year. In lines 36–39 Cyrene projects begin to get approved. The implication is that the weekly visits over the course of seven months have contributed to this change. In line 40, Cyrene adds that the relationship with the manager reached and additional stage. In line 41, Cyrene can go and ask for his approval preemptively. When Cyrene does this, she is able to get the manager’s verbal approval (line 43). Cyrene is now able to work outside of the traditional system, which is a powerful position to be in. Cyrene derives additional power from her positioning relative to the manager’s “people,” introduced in line 42.
These unnamed employees have the task of approving items as well. The details give the audience more information about what kind of control and responsibilities the troublesome manager has; as an aspect of his position, he has subordinates who help him carry out this responsibility.

44  Cyrene: And so,
45    um,
46    And it wasn’t that I was doing anything,
47    um,
48    Outside of the-the structure of how it processes,
49    But he was a clog in a whee- a cog in a wheel,
50    And if you didn’t have his buy-in y-
51    It affected so many people.

In this stretch of the example Cyrene is reflective and analytical. “And so” in line 44 introduces Cyrene’s evaluation of the process she has laid out. In line 46 and 48 she describes herself as working within the existing system in her workplace. In line 49 she uses the analogy of a cog in a wheel to characterize her colleague’s function. Her description of the gentleman in these lines makes him seem instrumental and central to the operation of the organization were he and Cyrene work. In line 50 Cyrene frames his cooperation as “buy-in”, which supports his positioning as a gatekeeper. In sum, these lines portray the male colleague as the exact type of person an EELP student might want to have in their sphere of influence.

52  Cyrene: So
53    Outside of taking him to lunch,
54    Because that might have been a little inappropriate
55    for me,
56    To ask a man to lunch in that setting,
57    I just make small talk in his office just to develop
58    that relationship.

In the final lines of the excerpt Cyrene offers an assessment of the events she has talked about. In line 53 she again distances herself from the notion of taking someone to
lunch. She explains in lines 54–56 that developing a relationship by taking the manager out to lunch may be “inappropriate” for a woman. These lines briefly address an awareness of gendered ways of performing management and living out professional relationships. In lines 57 and 58 Cyrene summarizes the approach of developing relationships through small talk. “I just made small talk” in line 57 presents what was a narrated event as a strategy for developing relationships, therefore entextualizing the process Cyrene has presented as a management strategy.

In this excerpt, Cyrene shares an experience of exercising power and influence in the workplace. Relative to other characters (Bamberg’s first level), Cyrene exercises control over other participants in the recounted events, and works closely with other managers. Cyrene also shows herself changing over the course of the events. In the beginning of the example the troublesome colleague was described as a problem that many people shared, but as the event progress Cyrene is the only employee seen making an effort to improve the experience of working with this person. This distances Cyrene from the malaise of her other colleagues who ridiculed the manager in lines 13–16 for spending a long time working for the government. Cyrene connects herself to this colleague in the work place by building a social relationship. Cyrene also describes herself as potentially having limited options for developing relationships at work because of her gender and the potential impropriety of taking a male colleague to lunch.

In relation to the assembled audience of EELP students (Bamberg’s second level) Cyrene positions herself as someone the audience of EELP students should listen to and emulate by presenting her own experience in the workplace as a response to a classmate’s question, and by referencing points made in previous class discussions. In this example
Cyrene shares the goal of growing a circle of influence with her classmates, but on an interactional level telling the class about these past events allows Cyrene to create asymmetries in the classroom and set herself apart from her classmates, if only momentarily, by having a leadership “practice” to offer them. In listening to Cyrene’s contribution the sense the audience may have of Cyrene is that she is able to solve the problem of needing to influence others that many EELP students face. In recounting these experiences to the class and connecting them to another student’s question and past class discussions, Cyrene can claim (Bamberg’s third level) to be a successful and effective manager, and a student with a solution to the shared EELP problem of needing to influence people.

3.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I characterize how students showcase their own professional experiences and create asymmetries between themselves and their classmates by telling stories, or recounting past events from the workplace. Workplace stories (Holmes, 2005b) afford students discursive opportunities to show the relationships, knowledge and activities they engage in in the workplace. Across the four analyzed examples, I explored the positions EELP students take up as they share past experiences relative to the characters in the story world or workplace, the audience of their classmates, and themselves as they claim status to have past experiences and practices connected to power in the workplace. I summarize the positions Morgan, Reagan, Cassidy and Cyrene have taken up in this chapter below, in an effort to highlight how telling classmates about the workplace allows students to enact power and create asymmetrical relationships with cohort members in classroom interactions.
In the four examples I analyze in this chapter, EELP students position themselves as professionals who work on teams both as managers and as colleagues relative to other characters in workplace narratives. On this first level of positioning, their experiences illuminate the details of their management by depicting students in the position to direct the actions of others (e.g., Reagan leading a flight crew and delegating tasks; Cyrene as a manager) and taking direction from others (e.g., Reagan being directed by higher commanders; Cassidy accepting a leadership change in the workplace). The students are in control but also controlled by others. Reagan for example, commanded a flight crew in the military, while simultaneously taking orders from higher-ranking officers. Cyrene had people who reported to her, but she still had to get approval for other activities. As telling classmates about past experiences from the workplace bring these relationships to light, we see that leadership or management is not purely about self-determination, but about balancing connection and control (Tannen, 1994). Students also change and experience growth through the events they share in class. For example, for example Reagan and Cyrene both depict themselves changing their behavior and adopting new, successful strategies for acting powerfully in the workplace.

Positioning Level 2 describes a teller’s positioning relative to their audience. EELP students use their experiences to participate in class; past events entered class discussion in these examples as responses to the questions posed by students and professors. Professional experiences are also a way of signaling what a student knows in the EELP classroom (Trester, Marsters, & Price, 2013). Professors can accept students’ past experiences as verification or corroboration of the relevance of topics discussed in class (e.g., Reagan and Cassidy), but this is not the case with all narrative elements that
reference the workplace (e.g., Morgan). Students’ experiences can be entextualized as practices related to leadership when connections are established between past experiences and the texts of the program. These texts can be case assignments, lecture topics, or class discussions. An interesting observation of this analysis has been that students can entextualize their own experiences as texts that can move forward and be applied to future professional encounters.

Positioning Level 3 answers the question of what claims about themselves narrators hold true (Bamberg, 1997, p. 337). In the examples I analyze, Morgan, Reagan, Cassidy and Cyrene self-identify as successful, agentive, and experienced professionals. By illuminating how their experiences align with the program’s perspective on leadership, students reflexively build their own identities as leaders. Students accomplish this by sharing details about their actions and relationships with other peers, as well as with subordinates. In cases where their experience diverges from the point a professor is making, EELP students still present their own experiences as crucial and relevant to leadership. EELP students arguably want to be seen as professionals who can benefit from the perspective on leadership that the EELP program offers. Putting one’s own professional experiences forward as a resource for participating in class, and especially as examples of “EELP sanctioned leadership practices, allows students to highlight their own status and power.

As an illustration of sociolinguistic inquiry into the world of work and the creation of power in interaction, this chapter demonstrates that being able to share personal experiences as an aspect of their “on task” engagement with courses allows professionals to treat their pasts as resources for participating in class. Past experiences
are evidence of the distributions of power, authority and control in the workplace and when students marshal this evidence in the classroom they are able to show that they serve leadership and managerial functions in the workplace. Students also talk about their professional experiences in order to identify leadership practices discussed in class within their pasts, thus creating links between the EELP program and their individual professional lives. These two ways of pointing to personal status and power through bringing past experiences into the classroom point to the mechanisms students have for revealing what they know about leadership, management and professions in interaction. The next chapter (Chapter 4) continues a discussion of strategies for asserting status, power, and leadership by analyzing how students use evidence to persuade their cohort members. Persuasion is presented as a leadership activity in the EELP curriculum because it is a skill that allows professionals to control others’ actions and enact their power. I will argue that students make use of multiple types of intertextual resources as they attempt to persuade audiences as a part of an in-class exercise. Persuasion through intertextuality as a strategy within professional discourse constructs enacts power for EELP students.
Chapter 4: Creating Power through Voicing

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter discussed recounting events from the workplace as a strategy for students to enact power and focused on the positions students took up as they shared professional experiences from their pasts. Pointing to their professional experience as they participate in class is a mechanism for doing power and asserting status because recounting professional experiences portrays students as experienced individuals in positions of power and authority relative to other professionals. This chapter analyzes another form of talk in interaction from the Executive Education Leadership Program (EELP) context to describe how an in-class presentation assignment becomes an opportunity for students to do power, and draw on their own personal perspectives in the process. In this chapter I analyze the types of evidence that EELP students draw on to support their own perspectives as they get practice using persuasion as a form of leadership discourse in the classroom. Taking on the identity of a leader and adopting the activities associated with leadership are learning processes akin to the Bakhtinian concept of “ideological becoming” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 342) wherein an individual’s consciousness (in this case, a leader’s consciousness) develops by coming into contact with the discourse of others. Participating in the executive education program is an opportunity for students to develop a new consciousness. Coming into contact with other professionals and the EELP’s leadership curriculum facilitates this process. This chapter explores this perspective by searching for the discourses of others in oral texts created by EELP students. In particular, I focus on the types of dialogic voices that students draw on as evidence when trying to persuade an audience of their peers. This analysis presents
persuasion as a discourse tied to leadership. In persuading fellow students using evidence— a behavior that the EELP curriculum explicitly connects to leadership— students create power and asymmetries between themselves and their classmates.

To present this analysis of intertextuality—what Kristieva (1986) and Bazerman (2004) describe as the relationship between texts—in classroom discourse, I analyze excerpts from seven video-recorded oral presentations that were designed to be persuasive. These presentations were created as part of an assignment in the EELP’s leadership communication course. In these presentations, students were instructed to attempt to “convince the audience of the correctness of a particular proposition or course of action” (leadership communication course syllabus) or influence the audience to take an action (e.g., support a charity, buy a product). Students were expected to use persuasive evidence to build a supporting case. I analyze three strategies for providing evidence: animating others’ speech through constructed dialogue, recounting events from the workplace, and invoking “high-status” authority figures, and analyze each practice as an instance of voicing a recognizable character or social type (Agha, 2005).

In this chapter, I establish persuasion as a discourse connected to leadership and management by first defining persuasion in discourse (Section 4.2) and then explaining how the EELP approaches persuasion in Section 4.3. In Section 4.4 I present my analysis of different types of voicing as a way to introduce texts that are external to the classroom as evidence. I describe persuasion through evidence as an intertextual process that links the text created in the classroom to prior texts and the characters that created them. In illuminating these links, I show that intertextuality in persuasive speech functions as a control device, using the relationships between texts to influence the actions of others.
Intertextuality in turn facilitates students’ creation of leadership and power in interaction by giving them a new way of interacting (i.e. persuasion) with their classmates as a leader and an influential actor. My analysis finds that different types of voices allow students to assert status relative to others, to exhibit control, or to display a relationship I have termed instrumental affiliation: the act of forming connections with high-status figures as a way to positively evaluate one’s own ideas. The final section (Section 4.5) discusses leadership as an identity that can be achieved through multiple voicing strategies.

4.2 Persuasion in Discourse

As a form of directive discourse or illocutionary utterance that proposes a course of action or behavior for an addressee (Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Huls & van Wijk, 2012), persuasion is the act of inspiring a voluntary change in an individual’s attitude towards content or a proposition, their beliefs, or their behavior through linguistic “communicative means” (Lakoff, 1981, p. 28). Persuasion moves an audience’s actions by “symbolically constructing a social reality” that guides people’s perception of the world while providing “the way they should act in accordance with those perceptions” (Törrönen, 2000, p. 81).

While persuasive discourse “lays out” future actions for addressees, persuasion does not require compliance from an addressee. As a result, persuasive language can be said to have perlocutionary intent and the potential for, but not a guarantee of, perlocutionary effect (Schmidt & Kess, 1986, p. 16). Persuasion resembles other directives (e.g., commands, requests, granting permission) in that asymmetries of power exist between participants. However, the party being persuaded does not have to recognize the discourse as a directive. The “success” of persuasive discourse is measured
in whether the hearer completes the course of action the speaker prescribes and is not based on what the hearer reports interpreting (Ervin-Tripp, Strage, Lampert, & Bell, 1987). Persuasive discourse is also “nonreciprocal” meaning that not all parties have the same rights and affordances in the interaction, such as holding the floor and selecting topics (Lakoff, 1981, p. 28).

Persuasion has been studied in contexts where speakers are known to want to influence their audiences. Examples include the language of advertisements (Lakoff, 1981; Fuertes-Olivera, Velasco-Sacristán, Arribas-Baño, & Samaniego-Fernández, 2001), religious discourse (Schmidt & Kess, 1986; Keane, 1997), and political speech (Törrönen, 2000; Ferrari, 2007). Linguistic analyses of these texts uncover distinctive speech styles built from features that include the repetition of names, novel lexical items, unique syntactic patterns, and uses of metaphor. Discourse analysts have also explored persuasion in written texts from institutional contexts, including newspaper discourse (Dafouz-Milne, 2003; Dafouz-Milne, 2008), legal contexts (Orts, 2016), or academic discourse (Hyland, 1998). Discursive features (e.g., hedges, markers of certainty, imperatives, attitude markers) have been shown to persuade in these contexts by creating asymmetrical relationships between persuaders and their audiences. Writers, who are in fact institutional representatives in these contexts, rely on these features’ ability to build credible personae that guide future action in their audiences (Dafouz-Milne, 2008). Across analyses in institutional contexts, persuasion is not the singular result of the linguistic structures themselves. Instead, the ability that discourse has to influence actions is guided by the asymmetrical and power relationships between people in interaction. Orts’ (2016) work on persuasion in legal texts demonstrates that even in cases where
persuasive intent and effect are underscored by asymmetries of power (i.e., a legal system), creators of persuasive texts do not rely solely on their authority to persuade. In Orts’ view, the language of a text, like a legal contract that encodes speakers’ messages, also sends messages about the interpersonal proximity of hearers to speakers and lessens the asymmetries between them in order to persuade (Orts 2016, p. 2, 15). Because persuasion is established by credibility, connection, and negotiation rather than by force (Dafouz-Milne, 2008, p. 105), persuasion can be used by managers in professional settings to accomplish a leader’s objects and to form positive working relationships by providing an alternative to more authoritarian discourses (Saito, 2011). In light of these descriptions, the choice to persuade as a type of directive discourse requires speakers to act powerfully by seemingly diffusing their authority and making connections with colleagues and subordinates in the place of claiming authority.

4.3 Persuasion in the Executive Education Leadership Program

The EELP defines persuasion as a “process” that “influences your ability to lead an organization and motivate individuals to action” (leadership communication course syllabus). Assigned readings in the Leadership Communication course echo the conclusions from the previous section that persuasion must be negotiated and is not simply a function of the power and authority of a speaker or writer. While EELP students will be in positions of authority as leaders in their professional and workplace communities, the nature of the workplace will drive them to use types of directives like persuasion that maintain positive relationships. As the workplace changes to involve more “lateral collaboration” (Cialdini, 2013, pg. 25) and interactions, students will be working and potentially leading professionals whose levels of hierarchical authority
match their own. In these environments, as in the institutional contexts discussed in the previous section, inspiring action either through direct commands or by authority alone is not a means of achieving objectives and increasing productivity; “playing the ‘because I’m the boss’ card is out” (Cialdini, 2013, pg. 25). This traditionally authoritarian approach is “demeaning and demoralizing” and “out of place in a world where cross-functional teams, joint ventures and intercompany partnerships have blurred the lines of authority” (Cialdini, 2013, p. 26). Without traditional authority as a resource, professionals looking to influence their colleagues’ behavior do not have access to the entire spectrum of directives. They cannot command, give orders, or make requests with an expectation of compliance. In these scenarios, persuasion can accomplish the same goals as more face threatening (Brown & Levinson, 1987) directives (e.g., commanding) while maintaining positive working relationships (Saito, 2011). Cialdini’s work cited here appears in the EELP-assigned text On Communication, a volume of the Harvard Business Review’s 10 Must Reads series. Cialdini’s chapter is one of four chapters in the book that provide context for the EELP’s view of persuasion. The book defines persuasion as the ability to move an audience to a previously unshared position or course of action. In reading the textbook, I observed that the articles fall into three categories: making the case for persuasion, as Cialdini does; presenting persuasion as styled form of communication; and describing the topics and messages conveyed by successful persuasive language.

The On Communication chapters guide readers towards becoming more effective persuaders by being able to identify with the ideological values and style of the audience. The concept of diverse conversation styles that can be studied and matched to achieve
more successful interactions is introduced with a reprint of Tannen’s (1995) article *The Power of Talk*. One of the texts preceding Tannen’s article in *On Communication* is a chapter by Williams and Miller (2013) that presents five general decision-making styles held by executives as approaches to persuasion. If speakers can match a decision maker’s expectations and address their concerns, they have a better chance of influencing him or her. For example, *skeptics* are audiences that question any data contradicting their worldview, but respond well to people they perceive as similar to themselves. Those looking to persuade skeptics should establish the credibility of their information sources, and seek endorsements from someone skeptics trust (Williams & Miller, 2013, p. 5-17).

A chapter by Conger (2013) reinforces the point that audiences have styles and expectations about language that speakers can meet. Conger also advises readers to prepare for opportunities to persuade; successful and “effective persuasion involves careful preparation, the proper framing of arguments, the presentation of vivid supporting evidence, and the effort to find correct emotional match with your audience” (Conger, 2013, p. 67–68).

At this point, I have discussed what discourse analysts know about persuasion and what the EELP program teaches students about persuasion. These communities are aligned in describing persuasive effect as both a product of relationships between speakers and hearers, and the content of discourse with persuasive intent. This chapter combines these themes to explicitly consider how the language in persuasive presentations builds relationships between students in the EELP cohort. In the coming sections I argue that to persuade in this context, students introduce evidence that they believe will build credibility and authority with the audience of fellow students. Students
use different types of voices to embed prior texts into their presentations. My analysis will show that multiple types of intertextual voicing are present in the EELP classroom. Incorporating voices to be persuasive is itself an attempt to control, which enacts power. In using voices, students can also establish connections with their classmates instead of relying exclusively on asserting their status to enact power.

4.4 Persuasion through Voicing

I use the term ‘voices’ in a heteroglossic (Bakhtin, 1981) sense, to describe the textual material from other sources that is recontextualized (Bauman, 2004) in an interaction. To intentionally integrate voices into discourse is to repeat or recycle a text (Tannen, 2007) previously produced by another. A voice is the quality an utterance has of “indexing typifiable speaking personae” (Agha, 2005, p. 39). Voices are recognizable as belonging to individuals or social speech types (e.g., the voice of an interactional sociolinguist, or the voice of preaching in an African American church as a specific register). Voicing phenomena under consideration in this chapter include animating others voices, giving voice to the self (Tovares, 2010) by recounting professional experiences, and drawing on the voices of “authorities.” Voices are identified within texts based on how they are distinguished from the words around them (e.g., through dialogue introducers, quotative verbs), and by whatever mechanisms (e.g., shifts in register, jargon from an industry, or attributions such as “According to a recent survey”) that allow a stretch of discourse to be understood as another’s voice (Agha, 2005, p. 40). This chapter limits its analysis of voicing to cases where students directly attribute text they are recontextualizing in their presentations to other sources. I analyze three categories of voices: animating the speech of others, narrating experiences from the workplace, and
voicing authority figures. These voices are used to support the reality they are constructing in their speeches. The intertextual process of drawing on voices also allows students to establish connections between their world-view and the sources of voices. Across each type I analyze in this section I will discuss the relationship students form with these sources when they are voiced. Building relationships with the sources, and working to influence the future actions of other audience members are both aspects of a leader’s behavior that arise from these intertextual ties.

Table 4, below, presents the names, topics, directives, and themes of the seven presentations that provided the excerpts I analyze in this chapter, along with the names and backgrounds of the speakers. These examples were chosen to reflect the presentations that I felt had clear directives or prescriptions, in contrast with presentations that took a positive position on an issue without a directive (e.g., a presentation about the benefits of exercise that does not prescribe exercise directly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Industry + Level</th>
<th>Directive Issued</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frankie</td>
<td>Government (Senior Management)</td>
<td>Buy a vintage automobile.</td>
<td>Description of the car’s attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td>Non-profit sector (Senior Management)</td>
<td>Lobby Congress to preserve charitable donation tax exemptions.</td>
<td>Charitable donations are important and in danger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Consumer Products Manufacturing (Executive) /Entrepreneur</td>
<td>Patronize Sam’s new business.</td>
<td>Sam’s company is poised for success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidy</td>
<td>Consulting (Executive)</td>
<td>Make decisions differently.</td>
<td>Your “default” strategy is flawed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reese</td>
<td>Consumer Products Manufacturing (Executive)</td>
<td>Support a corporation.</td>
<td>The corporation does charitable works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In keeping with the instructions and the course’s view of persuasion, each presentation in the sample of presentations I analyzed issues a directive to students in the audience. With the exception of Frankie and Cassidy, the presentations in Table 4 have themes that relate to the presenter’s personal or professional backgrounds. This reflects a pattern seen across the wider set of presentations in which students would attempt to persuade classmates around topics connected to their personal lives. For example, someone in the health and wellness industry might speak about active lifestyles, or a student could ask the audience for support on a social issue pertinent to their experience. Frankie and Cassidy’s presentations, which respectively discuss buying a car and making decisions, reflect a different topic selection strategy than other cohort members. However, I included them in this group of seven presentations because they, like the other five presentations listed in Table 4, make use of multiple types of voices to persuade. In the next section I use an excerpt from Frankie’s presentation to show how multiple intertextual voices can be woven together in a persuasive presentation. While all seven presentations used multiple voices, I discuss each voicing strategy in the remaining sections of this chapter separately, and present a total of twelve excerpts that exemplify different types of voicing. In each type of voicing I describe how intertextual material is embedded into presentations, and how it establishes power or solidarity (Tannen, 1994). Table 5, below, previews the distribution of the twelve examples.
This section lays out the types of voices students call on to provide persuasive evidence and discusses how the use of intertextual material can be interpreted as bids for status. The example I analyze, Example 4.1, is used to demonstrate how one persuasive presentation can contain multiple voices. I use this example to point out how external voices are distinguishable from the surrounding text, and how their use attempts to position the presenter, a student named Frankie, as a credible source of information about the goods that are for sale. In this excerpt Frankie presents several categories of reasons why the audience should want to buy a 1969 Chevrolet Camaro.

Example 4.1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Frankie: Have you ever wondered what it would be like to have three hundred horses of pure American muscle under your fingertips.
Class: @@@@
Frankie: This is an old school classic.
A piece of Americana history.
This car is- This car is always rated one of the ten most desirable cars of all time.
A car that’s an inspiration for the new Camaro you see on the road these days.
If so I have a opportunity for you today.
I present to you Fabiana.
My nineteen sixty-nine Camaro.
This extremely highly documented car,
Matching numbers
Original um plate
Um you’d only be the fourth owner of this vehicle.
The previous owners have kept document- document-
Or documented records of all services.
That’s from May twenty seventh nineteen sixty-nine to current date.
Example 4.1 presents the opening of Frankie’s presentation. Frankie begins by animating a voice asking about the audience’s curiosity about American muscle cars and horsepower. “Have you ever wondered” (line 1) inquires about the audience’s inner thoughts, but stops short of depicting the audience actually asking about the experience of driving this car. The second strategy Frankie uses is invoking people outside of the immediate audience and the texts they produce. In line 8, Frankie describes the car as “always rated as one of the ten most desirable cars of all time.” Discussing the *ratings* the car has received builds a relationship between the local presentation and the content of other texts. Ratings are a collection of others’ views and opinions, and in this example Frankie marshals those opinions to support his own credibility. This move draws a connection between the views of the audience and views of unnamed others who valued the car and articulated those values. Finally, in line 15 and lines 19-20, Frankie describes the car as “documented” and accompanied by “documented records of all services.” These records are an inscribed, assembled history of the car, and by including it in the presentation Frankie is attempting to use a text to influence the audience.

While selling a car may not be typically thought of as representative of leadership, in this example Frankie is using intertextuality in the form of dialogic voices to attempt to influence an audience. The remainder of the chapter presents excerpts from persuasive presentation assignments and explains how intertextual material is integrated into persuasive discourse. Each section ends with a discussion of what kinds of relationships EELP students have built using voices to persuade.
4.4.1 Animating voices through constructed dialogue.

EELP students can weave the discourse of others into their own presentations by animating recognizable voices through constructing dialogue. Constructed dialogue (Tannen, 1989, 2007) as dialogic mechanism allows students to reconstruct the speech and thoughts of the audience, themselves, characters from their professional lives, as well as other unnamed characters. This mechanism animates another character, producing an utterance that expresses ideas or beliefs that originate with a principal, or that has been selected for an interaction by an ‘author’ (Goffman, 1981, p. 145). In this section I will present instances of constructed dialogue, and discuss how they are embedded in presentations as well as their function in individual excerpts, before considering their meaning as an intertextual device.

Constructed dialogue in the EELP presentations is recognizable because it is set off from surrounding text using verbs that suggest speech. In the first group of excerpts, Examples 4.2 through 4.4, speakers use quotative verbs to signal the animation of audience members’ voices. These examples voice EELP cohort members across three points in time: 1) in the present action of the classroom, 2) in the past, recontextualizing past conversations with classmates, and 3) in the future, portraying some speech event that has yet to occur. In each case, attributing speech to the people listening to the presentation in real time portrays the speaker as having a relationship with the audience, wherein they have relationships with audience members, and display knowledge of what they are thinking. The second group of examples of constructed dialogue, which begins with Example 4.6, present speech that is less direct and not attributed to specific people in the way that Examples 4.3-4.5 are.
Example 4.2 below presents an excerpt from Leigh’s presentation. Leigh is attempting to persuade the audience to lobby Congress. Example 4.2 is an example of direct constructed dialogue that can be interpreted as animating the speech of the other students in the audience. In this example the presenter uses the verb *ask* to introduce possible questions the audience has.

**Example 4.2**

39  \( \rightarrow \) Leigh: So you may ask,  
40  \( \rightarrow \) What are the other reasons.  
41  \( \rightarrow \) Why else should {?} ensure that this liberty,  
42  \( \rightarrow \) Is something that we protect.  
43  For nearly a hundred years  
44  The American sense of philanthropy has centered upon  
45  that legislation.

Example 4.2 is from Leigh, who wants the audience to lobby Congress. Tokens of indirect constructed dialogue appear in lines 40–42 in the form of two questions about the topic that Leigh attributes to the audience with the pronoun *you* in line 39: “What are the other reasons?” and “Why else should ensure that this liberty is something we protect?” Introducing two questions creates a space in the presentation for Leigh to provide information in lines 43–45 that create a “reality” for the audience to accept. The position of the information in the sequential unfolding of the presentation presents Leigh’s comments on the “American sense of philanthropy” as if they are a direct response to genuine questions from the audience. Voicing the questions is a strategy for following the instructions in the persuasive presentation assignment sheet; students were told to consider what the audience may know or believe about this topic and Leigh uses constructed dialogue to begin to address those concerns in upcoming utterances.

Examples 4.3 and 4.4 also contain constructed dialogue that animates the audience. Both of excerpts originated in a presentation by Sam, a student who is starting
a technology business and is attempting to persuade the cohort to download the
business’s mobile application. Sam opens the presentation in Example 4.3 (below) by
describing the pressure the new venture is supposedly placing upon him. In lines 5-6, Sam uses constructed dialogue to elaborate on this point.

Example 4.3

```
1 Sam: Alright everybody
2 Um actually
3 I feel a little bit anxious
4 I haven’t been myself over the past couple weeks
5 → A couple of you guys have said to me what’s going on
6 → Sam is everything okay. It’s because, ah, its been emotionally exhausting.
7 I’ve been had a LOT going on in MY life both
8 professionally and personally,
9 And I want to share these things that are going on
10 with me right now.
```

In lines 5 and 6 of Example 4.3 Sam recreates a past interaction with classmates in the audience by claiming to have heard from “a couple of you guys” (line 5). There is not any evidence to suggest whether or not this interaction took place, or if the audience has really noticed a change in Sam’s demeanor. Constructing dialogue gives Sam “cover” to involve the audience in the presentation and to talk about working hard on this new venture (lines 7-11). Sam uses constructed dialogue later in the presentation to ask the audience for their support.

Example 4.4

```
81 Sam: I’m going to come to you at some point and I’m going
to say
82 → Please, download my mobile app
83 → Tell your family to download my mobile ma- my mobile
84 app.
85 And,
86 Lets really do something big.
```

Lines 81-87 in Example 4.4 are found towards the end of Sam’s presentation. At this point in the presentation, Sam has shared information about what makes this venture
unique and poised for success. In line 81 Sam begins to look towards the future to depict himself asking the audience for their patronage. The quotative verb *say* (line 82) introduces the request for the audience to acquire Sam’s product in line 83. Sam asks for patronage again in line 84; but in this case the request has been transformed into a command. The imperative *tell* in line 84 directs the audience’s verbal action and looks ahead to another future interaction involving the audience.

The next example, Example 4.5, also presents an example of constructed dialogue embedded in the later part of the presentation. In the final line of the presentation (Line 81), Cassidy, the presenter, combines direct constructed dialogue with synecdoche between the human brain and humans to depict speech events.

**Example 4.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Cassidy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>And the next time you want to make a change in your life notice when the lizard brain whispers &quot;it’s not safe&quot; in your ear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Pause,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>And override it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>With practice, you can override the lizard brain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>And change your life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In lines 75-76 above Cassidy attributes the utterance “it’s not safe” to the “lizard brain.” Earlier segments of Cassidy’s presentation identify the ‘lizard brain’ as an anatomical area of the human brain, and the instances of “you” and “your” in line 74 show that Cassidy is talking about the audience’s brains. Giving a part of brain an opportunity to *whisper* to another part of the body (i.e., “your ear” in line 76) allows Cassidy to establish conditions for the audiences’ future action in lines 77-79. A summary of the excerpt would read “if the voices in your head (i.e., the ‘lizard brain’) speak to you, do as I suggest.”
The next two examples of constructed dialogue tokens I consider are less direct than Examples 4.2-4.5. In Examples 4.6 and 4.7 verbs of speaking introduce the results of polls as discursive events.

**Example 4.6**

1. Reese: Is {Corporation name} bad for America\textsuperscript{↑}
2. Or is {Corporation name} good for America\textsuperscript{↑}
3. \[→\] If I asked this class and polled you
4. \[→\] Fifteen of you would say “I’m assuming” would say
5. you’d have a strong favor for that they’re good for
6. America.
7. And the other fifteen would oppose with a strong
8. opinion.

Examples 4.6 present another instance of constructed dialogue used in the introduction of a presentation. Reese begins with two questions about an unnamed, somewhat controversial corporation. “Or” in line 2 conjoins these questions. It is not until line 3, where Reese adds “if I asked this class,” that the “forced alternative” (Stivers, 2010, p. 2776) in the preceding lines can be understood as possible speech originating from Reese and directed towards the audience. In line 3 Reese goes on to reposition these questions about the corporation as part of a poll, and situates the “asking” as part of a new kind of discursive event. Lines 1 and 2 actually animate the poll. In line 4 Reese presents the results of this hypothetical poll using the verb say. “You would say” (line 4) depicts the audience participating in this poll, and indicates that the poll reflects their views. Despite the fact that the poll is hypothetical, Reese has the “results”: the audience is evenly divided between viewing the corporation as good or bad for America. Reese may indeed have access to opinion poll data about the corporation’s popularity in the United States that shows an even division between support and opposition. If this is true, then treating the audience as representative of the country transforms that original data into a new “text.” Reese is using quotative verbs and verbs of speaking, structures that
normally introduce dialogue, to link that data to the class and Reese’s local argument in
the presentation that the corporation deserves support.

The next example (Example 4.7) returns to Leigh’s presentation persuading the
audience to lobby Congress to preserve tax exemptions charitable donations.

Example 4.7

Leigh: According to a two thousand and ten Indiana University study.
Two thirds of donors, Reported,
They would reduce their giving if they did not receive a deduction.

The verb report in line 19 introduces the views of potential donors to
philanthropic causes. The verb also connects their position in lines 20-21 of reducing
support if charitable donations are not tax deductible to a study from the University of
Indiana. Reporting in this example signals that Leigh is animating knowledge that
originated elsewhere, calls up images of the survey respondents verbally expressing their
views, and attributes a position on charitable giving legislation to them. This position of
reducing giving reflects the negative consequences of not lobbying Congress to preserve
current tax exemptions. Framing a negative consequence as dialogue allows Leigh to
support the central argument, and introduce a study as evidence.

These six examples (Examples 4.2-4.7) of constructed dialogue reflect students
embedding other parties’ discourse into persuasive presentations using verbs that suggest
speech. In voicing others, we can see the students following the guidance they received
about persuasion: they use constructed dialogue to preview views held by the audience
(Example 4.2 from Leigh), to introduce their presentation’s goals (Sam’s request in
Example 4.4; Cassidy’s command in Example 4.5) and to present negative consequences
of not following their persuasive prescriptions (Leigh in Example 4.7). Constructed
dialogue is also used in the introductions of presentations (e.g., Sam and Reese in Examples 4.3 and 4.6). Examples 4.6 and 4.7 also transform texts like polls and studies into vocalized statements. This transformation links the presenters’ view with “reputable sources” like opinion surveys, and contributes to the student’s credibility by showing that their views are widely held.

These examples of constructed dialogue can be interpreted in multiple ways. Examples 4.2–4.5 show that animating the voices of audience members points to connections between the speakers and their colleagues. In Example 4.2 Leigh suggests an ability to predict what the class may want to know. Sam uses constructed dialogue in Examples 4.3 and 4.4 to reflect past and future interactions with classmates, which suggests social ties between them. However, Sam and Cassidy both produce constructed dialogue that can be seen as strategies for exercising control. In Example 4.4 Sam tells the audience what to say in the future, but this can this be interpreted as a form of connection because Sam needs business and is close enough to want to involve people’s families as customers. Discourses of business ownership are certainly powerful and yet, businesses serve their clientele, who wield economic power. Cassidy’s use of constructed dialogue in Example 4.5 is more complex, in that Cassidy is voicing the audience in order to tell them what to do. Like in Sam’s case, the use of imperatives in this example can be interpreted as efforts to control.

4.4.2 Voicing the self through professional experience.

The examples in the previous section show students using constructed dialogue to animate the perspectives of others. The two examples in this section consider the representation of students’ own texts in persuasive presentations. In keeping with
Tovares’ (2010) discussion of reporting one’s own voice as a prior text, I discuss students harnessing and recontextualizing their own experiences as an intertextual act. Students embed their professional experiences in their presentation by crafting brief reports set in the workplace. These events can be a series of chronological events (as in Example 4.8) or habitual narratives (Example 4.9) reflecting “the way things normally are” in the workplace (Ainsworth-Vaughn, 1998, p. 151). The reports are recognizable as presenters’ own voices because within these narratives, speakers portray themselves as agentive characters in story worlds.

The first example voicing ones’ own past by sharing professional experiences in a persuasive presentation is provided by Jess in Example 4.8 below. Jess is attempting to persuade the audiences to enroll their children in tutoring programs. Jess issues this direction in lines 41–42, telling the audience to “look into tutoring.” At this point in the presentation, Jess needs to support this course of action and uses her own identity and experience as a professional tutor to accomplish this.

**Example 4.8**

41 Jess: I propose that
42 you look into tutoring.
43 The reason being as a tutoring instructor
44 → I have worked with over five hundred students
45 → I’ve tested several students from age three up to high school
46 Thirty
47 Thirty months of tutoring is close to three years
48 And that sets the great foundation for students to be
49 able to be successful.

The opening of lines 4 (“the reason being”) positions the upcoming discourse as an explanation, as if an audience member had asked why they should look into tutoring in response to Jess’s proposal in lines 41 and 42. Line 43 provides the first part of the reason: Jess is a tutoring instructor. In the next line Jess elaborates on this by reporting
activities that confirm this identity and provide an additional reason for considering tutoring. In line 44 Jess reports having worked with a large number of students. Line 45 presents *testing students* as another of Jess’s professional activities. Lines 47-50 explain the insights Jess has collected from her considerable experience. Reporting on these events allows Jess to introduce her own background and identity as evidence.

Example 4.9 begins with Cassidy’s description of the cerebral cortex. Cassidy wants the audience to change the way they make decisions by following a new model connected to neurobiology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cassidy:</th>
<th>Whereas the cerebral cortex is a relatively new development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I see the lizard brain at work everyday in my work with clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We try to show them how to use data to make better business decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And often we can prove categorically how they should do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And they don’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And I’m baffled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So I began to study this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is how I came to see how the Amygdala actually hijacks the cerebral cortex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And I want to see how do we override it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How can we learn to override the lizard brain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The first step is to recognize it notice it when it services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cassidy introduces the workplace as a setting for habitual, ongoing events in lines 46–47 (*I see the lizard brain at work everyday in my work with clients*). These lines also introduce Cassidy and the clients as characters in this world. Cassidy continues to report on regular events in client interactions (e.g., *showing* clients data and *proving* how things should be done) in lines 48–51. In line 52, clients’ actions cause a response from Cassidy
in line 53. The discourse marker *so* in line 54 positions studying decision making as the result of what Cassidy experienced and witnessed in the workplace.

Reporting events from the workplace portrays speakers as agentive and reminds the audience that presenters are experienced professionals. Reports also present students’ professional knowledge as a part of their persuasive prescriptions. In Jess’s case, habitual events help explain the details of Jess’s directive: enroll children in tutoring for at least thirty months in order to help them succeed academically. Cassidy uses personal experience from the workplace as an example of people’s natural failures in decision-making. EELP students treat their own experiences as texts by reporting events in the presentation. The events are meaningful texts that express the same points that speakers are attempting to make in the presentations.

Voicing the self, or drawing on past experiences from the workplace as a text in the classroom, creates asymmetries between students by illuminating the particular kinds of activities each specific EELP student does at work. Pointing out what they experience in their own contexts allows EELP students to show both who they are, and who they are not, relative to their classmates. In a room full of leaders and managers, each student is distinguished from the group because of his or her personal background. Because professional activities are what distinguish EELP students from each other, reporting on activities and events from the workplace is a way to signal a student’s professional identity relative to their classmates. Jess and Cassidy, the students who provide these examples, are both also narrating events that took place in businesses that they have ownership (Jess) or executive (Cassidy) roles in. Making the choice to use personal experience from one’s business in this type of presentation makes professionalism a piece
of persuasive evidence. The implication of each example is that the audience should follow the presenter’s directive, because the presenter has positively evaluated that action through their own experience.

4.4.3 Invoking authority figures.

Up to this point I have covered students using voices that they have immediate access to; students animate the voices of their classmates, or they report relevant activities from their own professional lives. I now turn my attention to students’ selection of voices from outside of the EELP community. Throughout the EELP program, I observed students invoking the names, perspectives, and work of “high-status” figures like university researchers, notable authors, or business world “celebrities” (e.g., Jack Welch of General Electric). The credibility of these voices seems to be a function of their status; by voicing them, students’ reflect a high-status figure’s prestige onto themselves. My use of “high-status” here refers to the fact that students take care to mention the credentials of these characters, for example, referencing how many books they’ve sold, what kind of research they’ve done, or what successful corporation they run. Students repeat this strategy completing the persuasive presentation assignment, students look to persuade audiences by embedding the voices of authorities into their presentations. EELP students incorporate the voices of business leaders, notable authors, and researchers into presentations. Embedding these authoritative voices establishes connections between EELP students and the sources’ identities. I describe this relationship between students and authoritative figures as one of instrumental affiliation; in order to meet the objective of being credible and persuasive, students affiliate themselves with high-status figures, whose high-status is reflected back on EELP students.
The first two examples of this type of voicing, Example 4.10 and 4.11, display students embedding the authoritative voices of specific people and institutions. In these examples both students use voices to connect their presentation topics and themselves to highly valued sources. In Example 4.10, Riley is persuading the audience to support reading as a critical content area in primary education.

**Example 4.10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Riley: Dan Wellingham is a researcher down at the University of Virginia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>And he studies thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>He studies reading and critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>And what he notes (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Is that to think well (.) requires facts (.) and factual knowledge,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Deeply embedded within our long-term memory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line 26, Riley invokes a character named Dan Wellingham, who Riley then reveals is a researcher at the University of Virginia. Lines 30-33 embed what Riley presents as a conclusion from Wellingham’s research, marked in line 30 with the utterance “and he notes.” University research is often invoked in classroom action as a source of information and practices (Trester, Marsters & Price, 2013). Voiced through his research, Wellingham is used to show the Riley’s perspective is shared by powerful voices. Additionally, voicing a researcher points to Riley’s own research on the topic and demonstrates that Riley has access to critical information.

Example 4.11 also uses university research to be persuasive. The excerpt begins in line 14 with the revelation that tax exemptions for charitable donations may cease. Leigh’s objective in the presentation is to incite the audience to action by making the case that these exemptions are in danger.

**Example 4.11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Leigh: Congress is considering eliminating or reducing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to a two thousand and ten Indiana University study. Two thirds of donors reported they would reduce their giving if they did not receive a deduction. Individual giving represents seventy five percent of the source by which charities bring in income. If donors don’t give back, we cannot move our missions forward.

In line 16, Leigh begins to preview information that confirms the tenuous status of charitable donations, before providing addition information to support this point. “According to” in line 16 signals that intertextual material is coming. As an evidential marker “according to” depicts Leigh as reporting or animating information from another source, which lines 16 and 17 reveal is a study from Indiana University.

Taking this analysis a step further, two facts point to the power of universities as credible sources and studies as texts. First, Leigh only says that the source of the statistics about charitable giving is a ‘study’. Secondly, the audience only hears that the study came from Indiana University. Compare Leigh’s description with how an academic might present this same information; an academic would cite an author or funding source, an academic department, and, perhaps, more information about the research questions, methodology, respondent pool, or analysis. This approach reflects the academic community’s professional vision, or ways of seeing and categorizing events (Goodwin, 1994, p. 606). This view of research may not match the EELP students’ view; I see the style of description in Example 4.10 as a possible reflection of another professional community’s practices for displaying knowledge, creating credibility, and indexing status as a community member. Contrasted with Examples 4.10 and 4.11, it takes considerably
less information to reliably discuss university research in the EELP program. In these EELP students’ presentations, university research as a voice is recognized by the label “research,” association with an institution, and a statement of findings. By placing texts from this category of sources in their own discourse, students show that authoritative figures have perspectives that align with their own knowledge and goals.

Example 4.12 provides another case of an EELP student treating third party research as a text to be woven into their own discourse. Here, Cassidy invokes the voice of two best-selling authors to build a case for why the audience should change the way they make decisions.

**Example 4.12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cassidy: These are examples of the left and right brain the emotional and the amygdala side at war with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>One part of your brain is logical the cerebral cortex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>the thinking part of your brain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>And it’s the part that makes rational decisions based on evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Another part is much stronger and it’s the emotional side the amygdala.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>In fact it’s the original reptilian part of our brain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>It’s the part that helps us do the fight of flight reflex when we’re confronted with danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>And it was responsible for keeping us alive when we were cavemen,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>And had to avoid the sabertooth tigers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Seth [unintelligible] calls this the lizard brain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>in his best sell Linchpin [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>And this has been documented extensively in thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fast and g- slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>As well as Blink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The book by Malcolm Gladwell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 4.12 opens as Cassidy outlines the “conflict” between the left and right hemispheres of the human brain, and introduces amygdalae as constituent parts of the human brain in lines 8-15. Cassidy’s explanation of brain anatomy and function in these
lines is populated by the unidentified voice of an authoritative institution like neurobiology or anatomy. These institutions represent a type of voice that is not easily questioned. This description stands out in part through uncommon lexical items like “amygdala” (lines 9, 15) and “cerebral cortex” (line 10).

Lines 16-22 offer a more detailed description of what amygdalae do. In line 23 Cassidy connects this information to the nonfiction author Seth Godin, who has his own term for “this” (line 23) assessment Cassidy has provided. It is not clear how far back the anaphora of “this” extends without having read Godin’s book, but attributing something to a source signals to the audience that a text has been added to the presentation. Cassidy upgrades the status of this text by identifying Godin’s book as a “best seller” in line 24. The implication is that the popularity of this book supports the validity of Godin’s claims about amygdalae and decision-making. Lines 25-28 introduce the author Malcolm Gladwell as an additional source for the same information. Gladwell, through two of his popular texts Thinking Fast and Slow and Blink, is portrayed as having “extensively” (line 25) documented information about the human brain.

Examples 4.10, 4.11, and 4.12 are examples of EELP students connecting their opinions with the “right” people. Researchers and authors as producers of texts serve as subject matter experts in these presentations and allow EELP students to imply the that audience should listen to them because their prescriptions are aligned with what people like Wellingham, Godin, Gladwell, and other scholars know. The connection or affiliation between EELP students and these authoritative figures is instrumental; students connect themselves in order to achieve a particular outcome. Because the outcome is persuasion, EELP students affiliating themselves with authority figures are making
connections in order to control. What is interesting about voicing prestigious figures is that EELP students using this strategy are not creating connections with and exhibiting control over the same populations. While the connections are being built with authority figures, EELP students are invoking this type of voice to control their classmates. As a result, voicing authority figures is a maneuver that enacts power and control in the EELP classroom.

4.5 Conclusion

The examples presented in this chapter offer a picture of the choices EELP students make as they select texts to add to persuasive presentations, in hopes of influencing the future actions of their fellow students. As a form of directive discourse, persuasion is an opportunity to assert power and control in the EELP classroom. In my analysis, students use three strategies to persuade and act powerfully. The first strategy discussed, animating others’ voices, allows students to co-opt others’ texts and voices for their own use. The second strategy, using personal workplace experiences in persuasive presentations, allows students to offer their own experience as evidence to support the realities their persuasive presentations are working to construct. These examples, much like the ones seen in Chapter 3, portray EELP students as agentive and highlight their unique professional identities. Finally, EELP students embed the discourse of prestigious figures into their presentations as a means of aligning the directive they are trying to issue with the activities and worldview of an influential figure. The relationship between EELP students and prestigious figures they voice is one of what I call “instrumental affiliation.” I use the term to describe the connections that EELP students draw in conversational interaction between themselves and “high-status” entity (e.g., a successful and well-
known figure in the business world or a well-known and profitable company). I hypothesize that affiliating oneself with a prestigious figure like this allows students claim some of this prestige for themselves, making the connection instrumental in building a students’ identity as a professional. In the context of persuasive presentations, EELP students connect themselves with these figures through voicing in order to achieve their own objectives in their relationships with the audience they want to persuade.

EELP students use the strategies in this chapter to influence the future actions of their audience, making intertextuality a means of “doing power” in classroom interactions. However, intertextuality and persuasion may function differently in students’ workplaces. The EELP curriculum establishes persuasion a discourse of leadership well suited for work environments where professionals need to have influence, even if they cannot rely on authority. The EELP’s persuasive presentation assignment also gives student an opportunity to practice interacting with other professionals as a leader. As a rehearsal, these presentations may have allowed students to develop competencies that may be helpful when they are in the workplace and the key of persuasive events shifts to “real life” (Goffman, 1974). In particular, workplace and professional communities have organization and institutional identities that determine the voices that could be relevant to persuasion. For example, the types of narrated experience could shift in an interaction with a professional colleague. The option to animate the voice of the person you are trying to influence may not be available in an interaction with an EELP student’s subordinate or manager. In these interactions students will also likely have more discourses (e.g., commands, requests) at their disposal to facilitate transactions in the workplace.
While this chapter focused on voicing strategies as a mechanism for persuasion and control, the next chapter uses frame analysis to explore how asymmetry is created between students. Asymmetry is an acknowledged dimension of leader’s relationships with their followers. Chapter 5 analyzes student discourse connected to another presentation assignment. In this set of interactions, EELP students are participating in question and answer sessions that follow capstone presentations. Students use the opportunity to ask questions to exchange information, and to give each other advice about entrepreneurship and management. Like participation in class by sharing professional experiences and persuasive presentations, these events are an opportunity for students to display the knowledge they have access to. These displays enact power by creating asymmetries between students.
Chapter 5: Creating Power through Advice-Giving

5.1 Introduction

The previous two chapters in this study profile class discussions and a persuasive presentation assignment as two opportunities for students to act powerfully and create asymmetries between themselves and their classmates in the executive education classroom. Sharing past experiences and the intertextual act of drawing on dialogic voices both allow students to connect their professional knowledge, experiences, relationships and activities with leadership, and to bring them into the action of the Executive Education classroom. Sharing past experiences and intertextuality are linguistic strategies for participating in class, enacting power, and asserting status relative to others. In this chapter I use Goffman’s notion of frames (1974) to connect personal experiences and knowledge to leadership. Here, I explore questioning and advice-giving as emergent activities, or frames, during question and answer sessions following student presentations; these activities allow students to highlight their knowledge about professional practices and entrepreneurship. In analyzing the structure and impact of information-seeking and advice-giving frames on classroom discourse, I show that in taking the floor to ask questions, students enact leadership and power as they use these opportunities to lay claim to knowledge about successful business practices.

Questions are a useful unit of analysis for the study of power in interaction because the EELP program brings together two institutional dynamics: education and professional workplaces. Questions have a role to play in managing relationships between students and teachers in classrooms (Koshik, 2010), and have been well analyzed as control devices and opportunities to assert power in other institutional and professional
settings (e.g., Ehrlich & Freed, 2010). As leaders and managers in their workplaces, EELP students presumably are accustomed to questioning subordinates to elicit and share information, and to carry out the activities of managing a team. In addition, they have likely experienced being questioned by their leaders or managers as well as having subordinates question them to gain information or to challenge the authority structure of the workplace (Holmes & Chiles, 2010). For example, Ford (2010) examines questions posed during meetings as an interactional resource that allows professionals to enact interactional power through claiming speakers’ rights. Questions also enact power by influencing the topic of subsequent turns with the introduction of new themes that are relevant to the speaker’s expertise or interest. I argue that this practice of creating authority and challenging power through questioning carries over into the EELP classroom where a cohort of professionals comes together as students. Questioning in academic settings falls into what Konzett (2012) describes as “doing being an expert”: academics are called upon to share their subject matter expertise at events like academic presentations, but frequently find that it is challenged or is used as a backdrop for a colleague sharing his or her own expertise in order to index membership in a wider community of experts. In what follows, I show that EELP students also use the opportunity to question each other to cite their own professional knowledge as they hold the floor during questioning turns. This act of displaying their own expertise not only enacts power but also creates asymmetries of knowledge and experience between students. As Heritage (2011) describes, questions serve several interactional functions, including exchanging information, conveying knowledge, forging relationships, and asserting, validating, or rebuffing identities (p. 51). Questions posed to fellow cohort
members allow EELP students assert, validate, rebuff and otherwise comment on each other’s status as expert professionals.

One opportunity that EELP students have to question each other and “do” being an expert comes in the program’s final semester. As a graduation requirement for the program, all EELP students are expected to design and complete an original capstone research project related to leadership. Students share their research through oral presentations at a capstone project showcase and field questions during mandatory question and answer (Q&A) sessions. The presentations are organized into thematic sessions, and I attended the session for students planning new businesses. Seven students in the cohort of thirty-two used the capstone project assignment as an opportunity to work on their own entrepreneurial endeavors, and the video-recorded Q&A sessions following their presentations of business plans are the data set in this chapter. But before I explain how I arrived at framing as an analytical approach for these data, I should explain why the interactions surrounding these presentations and project showcase are relevant to the study of power in interaction.

Konzett’s (2012) introduces the notion of “doing being an expert” in academic settings, being an expert is both a local and a non-local identity. This local identity is available during questioning in the form of one party having more or less knowledge about a topic. An expert is also a broader identity that can index a professional role or a status in a community (Konzett, 2012:137–138). Students presenting business plans to their peers during the project showcase want to be seen as experts locally in their presentations, but also more broadly outside of the EELP context. Presentations on business plans can be seen as the first turn in an interactional sequence about expertise.
The Q&A sessions that follow presentations give the audience members a chance to respond to the display of expertise they have witnessed. Questioning is an opportunity for the presenter’s asserted expertise to be either confirmed or challenged by the audience of questioners. Questioners are also looking for opportunities to assert their own expertise in classroom interactions. Seeking information and giving advice are a part of the process of doing power by asserting expertise about entrepreneurship and referencing professional experiences.

My primary focus in this chapter is describing how advice-giving emerges and unfolds sequentially during turns at talk in Q&A sessions. I argue that advice-giving is a frame, or interactional activity, that can be distinguished from seeking information based on the metamessages about access to knowledge that advice-giving sends. While seeking information positions the questioner as having less knowledge than the question recipient, advice-giving positions recipients as having less knowledge rather than more. I draw on Goffman’s (1974) notion of frames and Tannen & Wallat’s (1993) application of the concept to describe how a sustained interaction can be composed of multiple activities that each have an impact on how participants use language in interactions. Frames are identifiable activities that participants engage in over the course of an interaction (Tannen & Wallat, 1993). The orienting power of frames to identify what is happening in an interaction also guides participants’ interpretation of frames. I pay specific attention to advice-giving as a frame because, as I will show in my analysis, this activity gives students an opportunity to capitalize on the asymmetries of knowledge that identify the frame. As a result giving advice is an opportunity to create power that emerges during the Q&A sessions.
As noted above, seeking information and advice-giving as frames are distinguished from one another by disparities in levels of knowledge participants have. Table 6 below reflects the levels of knowledge, or epistemic status positions, that seeking information and giving advice assume towards a particular domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Questioner</th>
<th>Question Recipient/Addressee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeking information</td>
<td>Less knowledge</td>
<td>More knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Advice</td>
<td>More knowledge</td>
<td>Less knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Epistemic status is a relative and relational concept, described as a state of knowing more (K+) or knowing less (K-) on a stratified continuum (Heritage, 2012). The K- position of seeking information in a question can be a fleeting, temporary position (Ford, 2010). Epistemic status encompasses a person’s “rights, responsibilities and obligations to know” (Mondada 2013, p. 599). Gauging audiences’ epistemic positions is something speakers attempt when forming contributions to conversational interactions (Mondada 2013, p. 598). This feature of interaction is underlies behavior like upgrading or downgrading epistemic authority (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, 2006) or using discourse markers to reflect the new-ness of information (Heritage 2002; Schiffrin 1987).

Epistemic status is distinct from epistemic stance, in that while status describes a speaker’s relationship with knowledge relative to a topic, epistemic stance describes the expression, or encoding, of relationships to information in talk in interaction (Heritage, 2013).

The epistemic status positions in Table 6 are communicated through metamessages (Bateson, 1972) conveyed through contextualization cues (Gumperz, 1982). Metamessages are signals that identify types of meaningful behavior that allow
communicators to interpret the intended messages sent (Bateson, 1972). Metamessages are similar to what Goffman calls a system of signs that distinguish different frames (Goffman 1974; p. 210). Metamessages are conveyed through contextualization cues. Contextualization cues are linguistic features (e.g., prosodic, phonological or lexical) that signal or initiate interpretive processes (Gumperz, 1982). Contextualization cues let people express what they are doing in a stretch of interaction. In this analysis I will describe the specific features of language that allow questions to be heard and interpreted as tokens of advice. Identifying the contextualization cues that send metamessages about asymmetrical distributions of knowledge will allow me to discuss seeking information, challenging and advice-giving frames as strategies for claiming a leadership and power through experience.

The interactional sociolinguistics community has used frame analysis and the reality that multiple frames are in play in interaction to characterize various kinds of social relationships. Examples include relationships between parents and children (Gordon 2002, 2008), institutional roles (Tannen & Wallat, 1993; Watanabe 1993) and online and offline identities (Aarsand 2008). This chapter is aligned with this body of work in seeing the movement between frames as an opportunity to construct an identity in relation to other social actors. To explain the effect of frames on expressing an expert identity, I reference positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990) to describe the positions students occupy relative to each other within a frame. My analysis of the organization of frames themselves is based on Goffman’s (1974, 1981) point that multiple experiences can be present in one stretch of talk. These frames can laminate and embed within each other. I take Gordon’s (2002, 2008, 2009) work on overlapping and embedded frames as
a guide for understanding how multiple activities can be cued across multiple turns, or within one utterance. In demonstrating that multiple frames are present in questioning turns-at-talk, I intend to point to which frames individual utterances “belong to” or for which they provide “architecture” and structure.

The remainder of the chapter is organized as follows. The next two sections provide a background for the theoretical concepts relevant to this chapter and introduce the research project showcase as the context for the data. I then present data that reflect the organization of frames in questioning turns, and describe how one turn can contain multiple frames within its boundaries. I then discuss how an information-seeking frame is triggered in questioning turns. In Section 5.7 I analyze how advice is introduced in Q&A session discourse as a strategy for creating power by asserting expertise. I conclude the chapter in Section 5.8 with a discussion of the importance advice-giving for enacting power in the EELP classroom.

5.2 Questions in Institutional Discourse

I am investigating questioning as a resource for enacting power in interaction. Questioning is often explored through two themes, both of which connect directly to relationships of power and dominance: information exchange and asymmetrical roles. Consider the examples of history taking in medical encounters (Heritage 2011), journalistic interviews (Clayman 2010) or court testimony (Atkinson and Drew, 1979; Sidnell 2010); in institutional contexts like this questions are often the prerogative of institutional representatives, who by virtue of the asymmetrical positions relative to lay people in institutions (Agar 1985), are in the position to direct and constrain the actions of others. In these cases “constraint” applies to both the information and the social
aspects of questioning. Questions can be used to set agendas for upcoming talk, to constrain the types of acceptable responses, or even to select future speakers in interactions (Ford, 2010).

Workplace studies of questioning connect the themes of information exchange and asymmetry to explain how professionals in leadership positions use questions to enact their power over others. For managers, this power comes in the use of questions to conduct the activities of leadership in group settings like evaluating others, running meetings, setting agendas or making decisions (Halvorsen 2015, Ford 2010). Authority also has some effect on question design; Holmes & Chiles (2010) describe managers’ slight preference for asking questions using declarative structures, which they analyze as a sign of greater confidence or using authority (p. 197). At the same time, they report that managers use slightly using fewer utterances with rising intonation than professionals who are not in management positions (p.197). Questions also display knowledge about activities underway, and can be used to construct expert identities for both questioners and responders (Ford 2010, Konzett 2012).

5.3 Advice in Institutional Discourse

Previous sociolinguistic exploration of advice has mainly taken a conversation analytic approach to data collected in institutional contexts—including call-in radio (Hutchby 1995), online counseling forums (Morrow 2006) and telephone crisis lines (Butler, Potter, Danby, & Emmison 2010)—where the nature of the institutional relationship positions advisors as experts with solutions to an advice recipient’s problems. This scholarship takes Heritage & Sefi’s (1992) foundational work on the components of advice in institutional talk as a starting point. In institutional contexts the
relationship between the advice giver and the advice recipient is defined by the bodies of knowledge to which each party has access. Those who offer advice define themselves as a “knowledgeable and authoritatively expert vis-à-vis and advice recipient” (Heritage & Sefi, 1992, p. 389). Advisors’ discursive actions are tied to their institutional roles as authoritative professionals, directing the actions of others as institutional practice (e.g., guidance counselors [Vehviläinen, 2003] and teachers [Park, 2012]).

Advice can be introduced into discourse through multiple strategies, including with information (Silverman, 1997), in conjunction with epistemic downgrades (Park, 2012) or, as is the case is in the EELP Q&A sessions, through questions asked by the advisor (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013; Shaw et al., 2015). These questions are called advice implicative interrogative (AII) questions. Advice implicative discourse can also be calibrated to lessen the knowledge asymmetry created by giving advice (Butler et al. 2010). Imperatives and assertions (e.g., ‘Do X’; ‘You need to do X’) are comparatively strong forms of introducing advice, in contrast with downgraded imperatives (e.g., ‘Maybe you should do X’) or assertions that remove recipients from focus (e.g., ‘I would do X’). ‘Have you thought about X’ functions more like that later category of introductory forms of advice implicative discourse. In these weaker constructions, the knowledge asymmetry that advice creates is less exposed. Instead, it is shielded by the difference in epistemic status that information seeking questions display: the party asking the question has less knowledge, or a K- epistemic status (Heritage, 2010) relative to the party who will respond (Butler et al., 2010). The ability of interrogative forms like ‘have you thought about X’ to “disguise” advice can be used in institutional settings to relax
in institutional controls and create client-centered interactions (Butler et al., 2010) or in everyday encounters to maintain face in relationships (Shaw et al., 2015).

Giving advice has largely been considered as a part of talking about trouble or problems (Pudlinski, 2002; Harisson & Barlow, 2009). Heritage & Sefi’s (1992) foundational survey of advice offered to mothers by home health care visitors defined advising as an activity—putting forth a “preferred course of action” that is beneficial to the “advised” party (p. 368)—and discussed how advice was received by patients. The act of advice-giving in this work is tied to institutional contexts that position one party as seeking assistance, information or services from an institution (e.g., customer help lines, online counseling forums [Morrow, 2006] of call-in radio [Hutchby, 1995]). The EELP context differs from this work in that advice is not tied to “troubles talk,” as advice-giving often is in other analyses. The EELP context resembles this work however in that advice giving highlights the same type of asymmetries of power seen in these institutional contexts. Shaw, Potter & Hepburn (2015) connect asymmetries of access to information to advice through their description of the “knowledge asymmetry” that can be “heightened or softened” (p. 322) against a recipient. This resembles Heritage’s (2012a) discussion of epistemic gradients as a measure of the distance between the interactants’ positions in terms of who has more or less knowledge. Different questions can create gradients of different lengths, just as forms of advice can point to different levels of expertise on a topic.

5.4 Question & Answer Sessions over Showcase Weekend

The interactions between EELP students analyzed in this chapter were recorded over the course of the research project showcase weekend. EELP students gave
presentations about their research projects in groups that were organized by theme. The seven students whose Q&A sessions were under review for this analysis comprised the “entrepreneurs” group. Each student used the research project as an opportunity to work on an aspect of a business they had started or were moving towards launching.

The “entrepreneur’s flight” of seven presentations was moderated by Professor Gardner, a professor whose research focuses on decision-making and risk management. As the moderator, Professor Gardner’s duties were keeping time, opening and closing presentations and Q&A sessions, and selecting the first questioner during the Q&A sessions. Professor Gardner occasionally assigned turns to questioners beyond the initial turn. If the professor did not fill this role, presenters assigned turns to audience members themselves.

Table 7 provides information about the businesses presented during the project showcase. The table also previews which examples in the coming analysis discuss each project.

**Table 7**

*Entrepreneurship Topics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Industry/Type of Business Planned</th>
<th>Business’s Status</th>
<th>Past Industry Experience</th>
<th>Participant Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Mobile App</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Questioner (Example 3.1, 3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>Digital Media Services</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Questioner (Example 3.2) Respondent (Example 3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>Concierge Service</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Respondent (Example 3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Product expansion at consumer products firm</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Respondent (Example 3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reese</td>
<td>Consulting Firm</td>
<td>Limited operations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Questioner (Example 3.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The businesses described in Table 7 were either related to the presenter’s earlier professional experience, or the presenter was working in the business as one of his or her current professional activities. Business planning is not a topic that the EELP curriculum covers, nor is it taught at the university. As a result, the presentations did not share a uniform format or set of topics. Generally, students explained their professional connections and motivations for starting the business. Marketing strategies, potential consumer markets, financial analytics and descriptions of the products offered supplemented the “background” information about starting the business. All seven of the students were planning a chief leadership role in these organizations, even if they were working with business partners. As I have explained earlier, using their entrepreneurial activities as the basis for a class assignment is one way for students to weave their professional lives and knowledge into their participation in program. The Q&A sessions about these business plans that follow the presentations also facilitated this, by creating a interactions where students have the opportunity to make their knowledge about entrepreneurship visible.

The upcoming analysis has three sections. In the next section I begin the analysis by demonstrating that other activities beyond requesting information unfold within questioning turns at talk. The first example illustrates this by outlining which utterances in a questioning turn seek information, and which utterances point to other activities. I then briefly discuss challenging a speaker as an additional activity that emerges within a
questioning, and focus on how this interactional activity creates a space for students to introduce their own expertise into a “question.” After establishing that more than a single activity can exist in one turn, and that seeking information is a frame found within questions, I present advice-giving as an additional frame within questioning turns. Giving advice in these EELP data follows a pattern across examples: introductory markers create a slot in discourse for advice and are followed by hypothetical narratives that support advice. These narratives are also an opportunity for students giving advice to point to their own knowledge and position themselves as successful entrepreneurs. My final goal is to argue for questioning and giving advice as strategies for claiming a powerful position because these frames allow students to inject their knowledge and professional perspectives into classroom interaction.

5.5 Activities within Questioning Turns

Questioning turns in this data set are turns in which an audience member has the floor to request information before the floor is returned to the student presenter to respond. In this section I explain how a questioning frame (a frame that requests information) is established in Q&A sessions by identifying contextualization cues that signal “seeking information” as the goal over a strip of activity. The contextualization cues that guide participants to interpret seeking information as the interactional activity underway send metamessages that define the frame. In cases of “seeking information,” one participant has less knowledge and addresses a participant who is understood to have more knowledge. In the EELP Q&A sessions this frame can be signaled by multiple contextualization cues, as Example 5.1 shows.
Example 5.1 presents an interaction between Professor Gardener (the faculty moderator), Sam (a student asking questions), and Ariel (the presenter). Ariel’s entrepreneurial venture is a digital media company and Sam is the first person to question Ariel after the presentation concludes. As in the other Q&A sessions, Professor Gardner acts as the moderator for the event by signaling the transitions between the presentation and the Q&A session and by assigning turns to questioners. All three participants contribute utterances to the exchange that build a questioning frame; I describe these utterances as the “architecture” for the frame. In Example 5.1, I use arrows in to identify the questioning frame’s architecture. As you read through Example 5.1, you may refer to Table 7 to see a collection of the highlighted utterances that uphold the questioning frame. After discussing how the questioning frame unfolds across the entire exchange between Professor Gardner, Sam and Ariel, I present a more focused analysis of an excerpt from Example 5.1 in Example 5.1.2 in order to identify other activities within the boundaries of the questioning frame established in Example 5.1.

Professor Gardner is the first participant to contribute to the questioning frame in line 1 of Example 5.1. The professor signals the beginning of the Q&A session after the applause for Ariel’s presentation dies down by selecting Sam to ask the first question. Sam takes floor and begins by praising Ariel’s work on the digital media business and commenting on how much Ariel’s business has grown. Sam’s turn also includes several requests for information about Ariel’s business.

Example 5.1
Context: Ariel’s presentation concludes and the audience applauds. Professor Gardner is the next person to speak.

1→ Prof. G: Are you asking the first question↑
2→ Sam: Yeah!
3 Um, wow Ariel first-
4 Great job and I think I speak for everybody when
I say that we’re really proud of what you done and where you’ve come in just one year of knowing you because um You’ve shared a lot with us throughout this year And just to see how That puppy has developed and now is Is a Rottweiler right? You kinda know Where you’re makin’ money {claps} What’s gonna happen so Huge kudos on that and I love what you’re doing I wish you all the best of luck and I think you’ll do great. Um One of the questions that I had in mind And I I love that you had The screen of This how we make money. Right? Cause that’s vital when you’re starting a new business Ariel: mmhmm Sam: And ah Um Right now, You know the big guys The the Googles and you know Facebooks you know with their reach They get a lot of money for advertising, And they do a good job. And they go through the The privacy issues as well and they’re always fighting that battle so prepare for that but I was wondering if you Who’s filtering the advertising. Because you With that much of a reach and those different types of pockets, You could have conflicting interests right? Where somebody’s offering you great money, But it could totally go against a client who you’re consulting for in the right end of your business model So will that be something that you personally do? Or will there be kind of a metrics of You know we believe in this, These are our values and unless your advertising meets the SO I- I guess if you just speak a little bit more on Uh maybe walk us through an example on, Somebody trying to advertise with you. What their reason would be and- and um
In line 1, Professor Gardner’s interrogative selects Sam as the next speaker and identifies Sam’s turn as a “questioning” piece of discourse. Sam’s affirmative response in line 2 confirms Professor Gardner’s preview of the upcoming discourse. While the professor’s turn in line 1 established a position for an interrogative, that slot is not filled for several more lines. Sam purports to have a question in line 20 (One of the questions that I had in mind), but Sam’s first utterance containing interrogative syntax occurs in line 39 (Who’s filtering the advertising). This utterance however does not turn the floor over to Ariel for a reply or response. Rather Sam continues through line 57, after which Ariel takes the floor. Overall Sam’s talk in this exchange contains multiple cues signaling requests for information, confirmation or action, including alternative questions (Stivers 2010) in lines 49–50 (So will that be something that you personally do/ Or will there be kind of a metrics of…) and a hedging command in line 52–54 (So I- I guess if you just speak a little bit more on /Uh maybe walk us through an example on/Somebody trying to advertise with you). As a reader I hope you are asking, “In the 57 lines of dialogue in Example 5.1, what has Sam asked? What information has Sam requested?” In my view, this turn that has been identified as a question contains a great deal of talk that needs to be accounted for in terms of the frames contained within it. The issue that the rest of this section addresses has two parts:

1. What are the elements that identify Sam’s extended turn as request for information and/or action?
2. What other activities or speech acts are underway in the other utterances in this turn?

Table 8 presents the utterances in Example 5.1 containing linguistic markers that identify Sam’s turn as a turn that requests information. My objective in collecting these utterances in this table is to catalogue the multiple mechanisms through which Sam requests information from Ariel. I analyze these utterances in detail to explain how they point to requesting information. At the same time, I also use Table 8 to show that not all utterances in Example 5.1 are related to questioning. I will argue that the utterance left off of this table contribute to other activities that unfold during the exchange and are discussed later in the section.

**Table 8**
Utterances that Structure the Questioning Frame in Example 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Line 1</td>
<td>Prof. G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Line 2</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Line 20</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Line 38</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Line 39</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Line 47</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>Line 48</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>Line 52–54</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>Line 55</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j)</td>
<td>Line 56–57</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>Line 58</td>
<td>Ariel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The only adjacency pair (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) involved in establishing the question frame occurs between items (a) and (b) in Table 8. Sam signals that a question will be asked in item (c) or line 20. Item (d) *I was wondering if you* (Line 38) positions Sam as seeking information and lacking knowledge and line 39 (*Who’s filtering the advertising*) contains the turns’ first example of familiar question syntax. The two-part alternative question in items (f) and (g) use yes/no interrogative-type (YNI) syntax. Items (h) – (i) contain a “request” that beings with the preface *If guess if you just speak a little bit more on* (line 52) that provides details that Sam expects Ariel to include in a response. In item (j) expands on the request. Item (k) reflects Ariel’s confirmation in line 58 that Sam has successfully asked a question. Line 58 also brackets the question frame off from the subsequent frames and utterances.

By listing the utterances that provide the architecture of the questioning frame, the items in Table 8 show that this frame is established sequentially; the questioning unfolds line-by-line, utterance-by-utterance. The questioning frame is continually supported by contextualization cues that send metamessages about Sam’s lack of knowledge relative to Ariel. For example, in item (d) (line 38), “I was wondering” serves as a contextualization cue by pointing to Sam’s lack of knowledge, as does item (g) where Sam requests information about metrics that only Ariel has access to. It is important to note that not all of the utterances and lines in Example 5.1 are reflected in Table 8. This is because not all of the lines in Example 5.1 contain cues that identify the utterance as part of request for information. The lines that are not listed in Table 8 fall into gaps between utterances that structure the questioning frame. Instead of holding up the questioning frame, the utterances in these gaps reflect the placement of other activities or speech acts within the
boundaries of the questioning frame. Figures 1–3 below are graphic representations of
the utterances in Example 5.1. I use these three graphics to explain how the lines related
to questioning and gaps between questioning utterances are organized in Example 5.1.

The first graphic, Figure 1 below, reflects the utterances in the exchange between
Professor Gardner, Sam and Ariel (Example 5.1) as sequential positions on a linear plane.
The solid vertical lines represent each of the 58 lines in the exchange. This figure offers a
complete view of Example 5.1. The second graphic, Figure 2, is a graphic representation
of Table 8 that listed all of the utterances contributing to the seeking information frame in
Example 5.1. In this graphic, the vertical marks representing the utterances related to
questioning are labeled as they were in Table 8. The lines unrelated to questioning, that
do not contain contextualization cues pointing to seeking information, have been
removed.

**Figure 1**
*A Linear View of Example 5.1*
In Figure 2, the vertical marks that represent utterances lacking questioning contextualization cues have been removed from the graphic, in order to illuminate the gaps between the elements of the seeking information frame. The utterances that fall within these gaps (or the negative space between the labeled vertical lines) represent other activities that emerge in the exchange between Professor Gardner, Sam and Ariel. The next graphic, Figure 3, is a final representation of the exchange in Example 5.1. I use this graphic to identify where activities beyond seeking information (e.g., praise, giving commands, making comparisons) are situated relative to utterances that signal an information-seeking frame.
Figure 3
A New Linear View of Example 5.1

Figure 3 above fills in the gaps in the questioning frame architecture that Figure 2 reflected. Utterances in the gaps also send metamessage through contextualization cues that allow audiences to interpret a relevant frame. Figure 3 identifies some of these frames: praise (lines 3-19, and 21-25), comparing a situation to a successful firm (lines 27-38) and giving directions (line 39). To demonstrate how another activity, in this case praise, can emerge in the interaction between Professor Gardner, Sam and Ariel, Example 5.1.2 below presents the small excerpt from the exchange in Example 5.1.

Example 5.1.2
Context: Professor Gardner assigns the floor to Sam and identifies Sam’s turn as a question
Sam: Yeah!
2
3 Um, wow Ariel first-
4 Great job and I think I speak for everybody when
5 I say that we’re really proud of what you done and
6 where you’ve come in just one year of knowing you
7 because um
8 You’ve shared a lot with us throughout this year
9 And just to see how
10 That puppy has developed and now is
Is a Rottweiler right?
You kinda know
Where you’re makin’ money {claps}
What’s gonna happen so
Huge kudos on that and
I love what you’re doing
I wish you all the best of luck and
I think you’ll do great.
Um

Sam praises both Ariel’s presentation and overall success in Example 5.1.2. These lines are examples of *praise* as an interactional activity because of the laudatory language serving as contextualization cues: exclamations (*Wow*, Line 3), positive descriptive language (*great job*- line 4, *really proud*– line 5), and congratulatory language (*kudos*– line 15). After opening his turn at talk by praising Ariel’s work, Sam states that the entire cohort shares in this glowing assessment, and describes the business as having grown in lines 10 and 11 through the metaphor of a puppy turned intimidating dog. In lines 12–14 Sam references Ariel’s discussion of revenue sources during the presentation. Sam congratulates Ariel on having this type of knowledge in line 15 (*Huge kudos on that*). Lines 16-18 continue the positive evaluation. In each of these lines Sam’s views and opinions are offered as indicators of Ariel’s success. This positive acknowledgement of Ariel’s success and business authority reciprocally positions Sam as a credible evaluator of good business practice. In the final line of praise, *I think you’ll do great* (Line 18), Sam looks towards the future. This forward-looking moment is capped with a transition marker “um” in line 19. Sam’s next utterance in line 20 (*One of the question I that I had in mind*) revisits and reinforces the questioning frame. In this line, Sam is reintroduced as lacking knowledge that Ariel has access to, about Ariel’s business planning.

---

1 This evaluation is strengthened by Sam’s repeated use of the I + VERB construction in these lines: *I love...*, *I wish...* and *I think...*. Tannen (2010) finds that the repetition of this structure places emphasis on the contents of each clause.
Praise is distinguished from an information seeking frame because of the alignments it enforces; when Sam praises Ariel both students are shown to be knowledgeable whereas in a question frame only one student has access to information. My aim in this section has been to show how activities can be present within turns at talk, and I did this by showing the metaphorical space available between elements of the questioning frame. In the next section I present challenges as an example of an activity that facilitates the creation of powerful identities based on asymmetries of knowledge.

5.6 Challenges within a Questioning Frame

Challenging presenters is another activity that takes place in EELP Q&A sessions. In this data set, questioners challenge presenters’ status as knowledgeable experts. When a student is challenged through questioning, the questioner asks a question that disagrees with, or does not align with, an aspect of the presenter’s reality. As a type of social action, disagreements are propositions or assessments that are the converse of a statement made by one participant in an interaction (Pomerantz 1984, p. 74; Clayman 2002). When students challenge one another, they use questioning turns to put forward propositions that are the converse of assertions made during a presentation. Like seeking information, voicing disagreements during Q&A sessions reflects asymmetries of knowledge. Because challenges contradict elements of the world the presenter originally created, these types of utterances challenge the presenter’s epistemic authority and send metamessages about the distribution of knowledge that favor the questioner as more the knowledgeable party. Challenging presenters is an opportunity to act power because it allows questioners to show their knowledge about entrepreneurship and attempt to downgrade the presenter’s
knowledge. These two actions in turn, create asymmetries between speakers and presenters.

Example 5.2 presents a challenge from one student to another. Here, Ariel has the floor to ask Sydney a question. Sydney’s presentation is different from the others because it argues for a strategic brand expansion in Sydney’s family business, which manufactures consumer products. Before Ariel gets the floor, other students have asked questions that highlight Sydney’s knowledge about the business’s operations, history, and general plans for growth.

Example 5.2

Context: Sydney’s Capstone presents ideas for a brand expansion.
After a Q&A sequence between Professor Gardner and Sydney, Professor Gardner assigns the floor to Ariel.

299 Prof. G.: Ariel↑
300 Ariel: Sydney this is-
301 This is a an excellent thing.
302 We’ve been following your ah your story from
303 Sydney: @@
304 Ariel: Basically the first day. (0.6)
305 → Question that occurred to me (0.5)
306 You’ve done a lot of work on this
307 Obviously,
308 Acquired a lot of insight into not only (0.5)
309 The (0.9)
310 Their overall business model but the {{δ∧}} the {{δί}}
311 The geographic (1.8)
312 Target(.) market, right↑ (1.6)
313 → Is there another
314 → Company (0.5)
315 → Where (0.9)
316 → Uh that would be interested in your insights↑
317 → If {COMPANY NAME} does not- is not interested↑
318 (2.4)
319 Sydney: Good question.
320 (3.0)
321 Ariel: This- it’s a valid proposal, (0.4)
322 Just because {COMPANY NAME} says ah we’ll pass doesn’t
323 mean (0.9)
324 You put it to the- in the- in
325 Sydney: =
326 Ariel: = In the filing cabinet.
Example 5.2 begins with Professor Gardner assigning the right to speak to a student, calling on Ariel in line 299. Ariel begins by praising Sydney’s idea in line 300 and introduces the rest of the cohort as fellow observers and well-wishers in lines 302 and 304. Ariel confirms that this turn is designed for questioning and gaining information in line 305 (*Question that occurred to me*). Lines 306-312 add more praise by explicitly acknowledging the amount of work Sydney has done and Sydney’s knowledge about the industry and target market.

Lines 313–317 break from supporting to challenging. At this point Ariel begins to ask a question (*Is there another company...that would be interested in your insights? If {company name}...is not interested?*). This utterance is a challenge because it disagrees with the basis of Sydney’s presentation: Sydney’s employer will agree to implement the plan because a product expansion is needed to reach an underserved market. After a few seconds of silence, Sydney provides the rejoinder “Good question” (line 318). Three additional seconds of silence ensue.

In lines 321–326 Ariel points out, perhaps in response to Sydney’s silences and withholding of a response to the original question, that rejection does not mean that Sydney’s plan is a bad plan. In lines 321 Ariel describes the proposal as valid (*This- It’s a valid proposal*). Line 322 again raises Sydney’s company “passing” on the plan as a possibility by voicing the company in a possible world: *Just because {Company Name} says ah we’ll pass*. Lines 322–326 are once again supportive. (*...doesn’t mean/ You put it to the, in the in the filing cabinet*).

These utterances send multiple metamessages about the distribution of knowledge between Ariel and Sydney. The interrogative requests information from Sydney and
positions Ariel as having less knowledge relative to Sydney. However, the possibility that Sydney’s employer may not be interested challenges Sydney’s epistemic authority about this topic. Because the same utterances keep multiple interactional activities or senses of “what is going on here” in play at once, seeking information and challenging in this example could be characterized as overlapping frames (Gordon, 2004). For the purposes of this analysis however, I focus on Ariel’s ability to disrupt Sydney’s claim to authority on this business’s product expansion.

Ariel’s turn in this example simultaneously supports and questions different aspects of the product expansion; while the proposal may be a good idea, the company can reject it. By presenting the possibility that Sydney’s employer may not be interested in the proposal, Ariel takes up the position of a forward-thinking authority, who perhaps, can imagine a possible outcome that Sydney cannot. This move to downgrade Sydney’s position creates an asymmetry between of two students. In addition to requesting information, this question also forces Sydney to plan and look forward. By forcing Sydney’s hand Ariel has exerted some control (an expression of power) over Sydney’s thinking and actions relative to this proposal. At the same time, Ariel’s question about the existence of another firm with similar goals allows Sydney to recoup authority by displaying knowledge about the manufacturing industry and which firms may be looking to expand their product lines.

Up to this point, I have analyzed two examples from Capstone Weekend interactions to reveal the activity-laden nature of turns at talk during Q&A sessions. This analysis has shown that seeking information is introduced into interaction during these events alongside other activities like praise or challenges. All of these activities have
implications on the questioner and speaker’s expression of knowledge and authority about entrepreneurship. In fact, activities like praise and challenges that emerge within the boundaries of a questioning frame are used in these sessions to construct asymmetrical relationships between students by allowing questioners to cite their own perspectives about presenters’ new businesses. In the case of challenges, these perspectives conflict distribution of knowledge between students participating in each exchange. In the next section I discuss giving advice emerges as a frame in questioning turns. In particular I discuss the linguistic devices used to introduce advice into discourse and create asymmetry. I will then show that advice is supported and normalized using hypothetical narratives about entrepreneurship that further position advice givers as knowledgeable professionals.

5.7 Giving Advice as a Frame

Giving advice was never discussed in the lead up to the research project showcase as a feature of the presentations, and yet some aspect of discourse allowed me, and the presenters, to interpret questions as offering direction for future action. Reviewing the transcripts showed that advice was introduced using a single device: the advice implicative interrogative “have you thought about x” (Shaw et al., 2015). This device creates a space in discourse for prescribing future action that is then normalized by advisors to seem beneficial. EELP students normalize their advice by using features of narrative discourse to create hypothetical worlds (Polyani, 1982) wherein they are positively evaluated as knowledgeable, authoritative figures. Presenting examples of advice-giving allows me to show how another strategy EELP students use to assert their
own expertise and knowledge as professionals classroom, in so doing, create power by distinguishing themselves from their classmates.

Advice as a type of discourse is future oriented and prescriptive talk (Heritage & Sefi 1992), which in the context of Capstone presentations about entrepreneurial endeavors is related to achieving professional success. An additional feature of advice is the implication that the advice recipient is less knowledgeable, competent or expert than the person offering advice. The ability of advice to create asymmetries based on knowledge between participants in interaction makes giving advice a potential strategy for creating a leader’s identity in the EELP. Advice can be introduced into discourse through multiple devices, including with information (Silverman, 1997), in conjunction with epistemic downgrades like ‘I don’t know if’ (Park, 2012) or through questions asked by the advisor (Shaw & Hepburn, 2013; Shaw et al., 2015).

Linguistic devices that mark advice in discourse are advice implicative markers; advice implicative interrogative (AII) questions as introductory markers can take multiple forms, which are differentiated based on the strength of the knowledge asymmetry they create between advisors and advice recipients. Imperatives and assertions (e.g., ‘Do x’; ‘You need to do x’) as introductory features are comparatively strong forms, in contrast with downgraded imperatives (e.g., ‘Maybe you should do x’) or assertions that remove recipients of advice from focus (e.g., ‘I would do x’) (Butler et. al. 2010). ‘Have you thought about’ is a weaker feature of advice implicative discourse (Butler et. al. 2010) because the interrogative question through which the advisor requests information from the advice recipient disguises the asymmetry that places the advice recipient in a one down position from the advisor. The ability of interrogative forms like ‘have you thought
about X’ to shield that asymmetry of advice can be used in institutional settings to relax institutional controls and create client-centered interactions (Butler et al., 2010) or in everyday encounters to maintain face in relationships (Shaw et al., 2015).

In the Q&A session data students give advice on a variety of topics relevant to the Capstone presentations: strategies for managing employees, finding new clients and developing revenue sources are the main themes. The examples of advice in the Q&A sessions follow a pattern. First, the marker ‘have you thought about’ created a space for prescribing a future action that could lead to success. Then, advisors/questioners would support the prescription by creating hypothetical narratives. In these narratives, irrealis pragmatic markers (i.e. modal verbs like could, would, may) move from the present action of the class to a possible world where the questioner’s advice is likely to come to pass. Irrealized utterances (Gaik 1995; Givón, 1984) extend the prescription by laying out series of actions the recipient can follow. Irrealis also moves the activity from the requesting information frame inherent in the question ‘have you thought about x’ to a directing frame where the advisor suggests possession of the knowledge about what action is needed.

In Example 5.3 below, ‘have you thought about’ is used twice to introduce new activities into a questioner’s turn at talk. Both instances contribute to the speaker’s display of power and authority through knowledge. In this example Reese is questioning Jess, a student who plans to start a concierge business. Reese’s knowledge is highlighted first by offering advice and by using narrative discourse to normalize that advice. Jess’s business plan presentation reviews the service’s profit structure and strategies for building a customer base. During the Q&A session Jess fields questions about the
Reese advises Jess to plan a sales pitch for apartment management companies that may patronize the concierge service. Jess first introduced apartment buildings as a topic and potential revenue source when responding to an earlier question about the business model.

Example 5.3

Context: Jess’s presentation mentions apartment management companies as potential clients for a concierge service. After fielding a question about equipment costs, Jess gives the Reese the floor in response to Reese’s raised hand.

Reese first introduces advising discourse into the Q&A session in line 241 by asking if Jess has “thought about” a specific course of action. Reese does not complete the question, but moves to normalize the advice by referencing his own actions and experience, and laying out series of hypothetical events. In line 242 Reese characterizes his advice as something he would personally do, a move that points to his own authority and judgment and distinguishes his actions from Jess’s. This move immediately creates
asymmetries between them. In lines 243–244 Reese creates a possible world with a conditional utterance: “if you had a service with a contract with that particular building as a unit.” Lines 245-246 expand on this hypothetical series of events by depicting Jess doing what Reese would do: approaching “that next building and that next building” (line 245) until she has secured three clients.

By constructing this world, Reese demonstrates his ability to identify useful entrepreneurial processes. Reese positively evaluates these processes by connecting them to his hypothetical actions in this possible world. In lines 247–249 Reese redeploy ‘have you thought about X’ in a completed interrogative question: “Have you ever thought about that sales pitch to just that particular building?” This question is heard as advice on the basis of the implication that if Jess has not taken the step Reese is asking about, it may be a future course of action relevant to her business. This style of advice-giving differs from other forms of advice implicative interrogative questions that ask about the advice recipient’s capacity or willingness to take a course of action (e.g., “Can you plan a sales pitch?”). These types of questions, which Butler et al. (2010) call advice relevant interrogatives, allow advisors to defer to recipients’ knowledge about themselves and their situation. Despite asking Jess to report on her own experience, Reese’s question still constructs asymmetry between them by (1) prompting Jess to account for her past actions and (2) establishing his ability to problem solve. In this case, Jess’s knowledge of her own actions and abilities establishes the preconditions for Reese’s prescription; if Jess has thought about this, then Reese has successfully identified an activity relevant to Jess’s business planning. This progression towards advice-giving by involving the advice
recipient is an epistemic management technique because Reese is using Jess’s knowledge as a resource for displaying his own knowledge about successful business development.

Reese’s question prefaces a hypothetical narrative that further evaluates this advice. The connective discourse marker (Schiffrin, 1987) “And uh, you know” in line 254 signals a transition a new type of discourse. Jess is introduced in line 255 as a “business leader” and character in this story world. Jess’s favorable positioning also reflects back on Reese, showing that he can outline courses of action that leaders take. Lines 258 and 259 provide the linear events of the hypothetical narrative: meeting a business, providing a contract, and offering the business a discounted rate. Putting together this narrative highlights Reese’s ability to plan, and allows him to show that he has been paying attention: the final detail about pricing per volume (line 258) is taken directly from Jess’s presentation.

This example speaks to the value of hypothetical worlds in advice-giving discourse and managing knowledge. In a few lines Reese is able to both look forward and to provide additional details about how Jess can go about following his advice. Thus, narrative and advice-giving are two strategies that jointly position Reese as a knowledgeable entrepreneur.

The next example, Example 5.4, provides another instance of students constructing hypothetical narratives to support advice. This example occurs in the Q&A session following a presentation by Taylor, a student operating a travel agency. Taylor’s business has been operating for a year and has plans to expand. His presentation shares these plans and discusses how the business advertises and serves its clientele. To further contextualize his plans, Taylor gives examples of positive interactions between current
and past customers, and comments that he would like to enter new markets. Sam, a fellow student entrepreneur in the audience, picks up on this theme in questioning Taylor.

**Example 5.4**

Context: Taylor’s business plan discusses advertising the travel concierge service. Sam is the first student to ask questions in the Q&A session.

23 → Sam: Have you thought about (2.7)
24   Like jewelry stores↑
25   Because, I know that (0.9)
26   When people make big purchases like engagement rings
27   and things like that,
28   That’s when—
29   Guaranteed {SNAPS FINGERS} there’s going to be a trip
30   coming.
31   Right↑
32   So um
33   And that’s something where a husband or a wife doesn’t
34   want to go through the agony.
35   It’s like hey you know what we’re just gonna have
36   somebody
37   Or a— a new newlywed
38   Just gonna have somebody take care of it.

In lines 23 and 24 Sam asks a question using the advice implicative interrogative form ‘have you thought about X’ to introduce advertising in jewelry stores as a strategy for developing new business. Sam follows the pattern shown in line 242 in Example 5.3 by referencing his own knowledge in line 25 (*Because, I know that*) to normalize the advice. Line 26 builds on this introduction, and moves Sam’s turn from the present to another world in which potential customers want to book trips with Taylor’s firm. Sam upgrades this scenario to a “guarantee” in line 29. Lines 33–38 continue to build a hypothetical world to support Sam’s advice, in which vacationing couples are looking for service and convenience in planning. In line 35 Sam begins to voice hypothetical customers who are looking to “just have somebody take care of it,” which is what Taylor’s service aims to do. Taking care of details so that customers are spared the inconvenience is a hallmark of Taylor’s business mentioned in the presentation. Sam
recycles these themes as support for the advice to think about jewelry stores. Creating a scenario where customers need Taylor’s service, Sam’s advice creates a possible revenue stream for Taylor’s new business. This act speaks to Sam’s status as a knowledgeable entrepreneur, who can speculate about how successful businesses are built.

Examples 5.3 and 5.4 both demonstrate that students in the Executive Education Leadership Program give each other advice on entrepreneurial ventures during Q&A sessions. When students take the floor to ask a question, they have the opportunity to comment on the knowledge of their addressee as well as their own. Advice implicative interrogative questions that take the form ‘have you thought about X’ comment on addressee knowledge by calling EELP entrepreneurs to account for what work they’ve done in the past. These questions also create asymmetry by allowing students giving advice to claim access to knowledge about successful entrepreneurial practices. Across examples, these questions and tokens of advice also preface hypothetical narratives about entrepreneurship. When students support their advice through narratives, they cast their addressees as successful actors (e.g., Reese supporting Jess in seeking out apartment buildings) or use their own opinions and beliefs as evaluation for the narratives (e.g., Sam explaining the needs of newlyweds). Because advisors can claim knowledge and evaluate the knowledge and actions of others through these interactional moves, giving advice becomes a way to comment on the expertise of both parties in an advising interaction.

5.8 Conclusion

My goal in this chapter was to use the notion of fames to explain how the questions that EELP students ask one another become resources for creating power in
interaction. Q&A sessions following presentations by EELP entrepreneurs constituted the data for this analysis, and I chose to analyze them because they explicitly allowed students to weave their expertise as professionals into their participation in the EELP program and thereby build powerful identities. Presenting business plans as the deliverable for an academic research project assignment is itself an expression of power in the executive education classroom; the student entrepreneurs who took this route to completing the capstone assignment treated their thinking, plans and goals as a product that would satisfy the institutional requirements of the program, instead of engaging with specific investigative questions as would be expected for a traditional academic project.

To seemingly bend the rules of the institution to suite their own needs, was to take up an agentive position relative to the executive education program that was not naturally available to students. In interviews with EELP students conducted during the larger ethnography of which my study was a part, students who developed business plans described the project showcase as an opportunity to solicit feedback and develop instrumental contacts. By affording these opportunities, participating in the event helped this group of seven students present themselves as business leaders. The act of presenting to an audience also allowed students to present themselves as experts on the basis of their knowledge, and relative to the assembled audience.

Asking questions was an entry point to discussing students’ assertion of power and asymmetry in this chapter, because the frames that do questioning send metamessages about asymmetrical distributions of knowledge and information between questioners and recipients. Seeking information and advice-giving display access to knowledge that were shown to be present within questions asked during Q&A sessions.
Seeking information is a frame that positions the questioner as less knowledgeable than the question recipient, who in these interactions recently held the floor as a presenter. The questioning frame also creates a space for praise and challenges as two activities that allow EELP students to project their own perspectives on entrepreneurship and, in the case of challenges, downgrade presenters’ epistemic authority regarding their own industry. Questions that challenge presenters position questioners as having more information than recipients by presenting events in *irrealis* that differ from the presenter’s point of view, while supporting a reality constructed by the questioner. Giving advice is another frame present in Q&A sessions that allows questioners to position themselves as more knowledgeable than presenters. This asymmetry is created in these data using the advice implicative interrogative (AII) marker “have you thought about x.” Advice is normalized and hypothetical narratives that favorably position questioners relative to their addressees support asymmetry. By considering how questioning allows multiple frames related to asymmetries of status inhabit EELP student talk, I have been able to show that questioning is a strategy for pursuing a leader’s identity in the executive education classroom. Knowledge about professional life, successful business practices and entrepreneurship is brought into the action of the classroom to create asymmetries through frames. The opportunity to ask questions is an opportunity to invoke multiple frames that create asymmetry, and, as a result, aid EELP students’ construction of powerful identities in interaction.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1 Overview

This study has discussed how recounting past professional experiences, incorporating “foreign” texts or voices into persuasive presentations, and advice-giving contribute to Executive Education Leadership Program (EELP) students’ construction of power as they interact with other students and professors in executive education classrooms. Driven by an interest in how professionals-as-students interact with each other and live out power relations in the liminal interactions that touch their social lives both in the workplace and in the classroom, I situated my study in a setting that intentionally brings together a diverse group of professionals within a context of higher education. I took an interactional sociolinguistic approach to analyzing recorded classroom interactions, which allowed me to support the detailed analysis of talk in interaction with contextual knowledge of the EELP curriculum, goals, and other details relevant to this setting. Each analysis of EELP students’ participation in classroom activities illuminates how students build relationships that are characterized by status, control, and asymmetry within the classroom itself. In this final chapter I summarize my approach to these interactions (Section 6.1), revisit my original research questions (Section 6.2), and reflect on this study’s contributions to the sociolinguistic exploration of professional discourse (Section 6.3).

6.2 Summary of Chapters

I opened this study in Chapters 1 and 2 by explaining how the executive education classroom can examined as a site of professional interactions. My specific interest in executive education students grew from (as I described above) an interest in how
institutional professionals interact with one another and build relationships within those interactions. I was drawn to the EELP context because it brings professionals from various communities into sustained interaction within a new institution that has its own practices and institutional order: the higher education classroom. The EELP also sets out to respond to shifting dynamics in the workplace that necessitate, first, a wider array of leadership capacities (Conger & Xin, 2000) and second, the delivery of management education products that respond to pressure for more practically relevant learning or scholarship (Clinebell, 2008; Harrison & Leitch, 2007). In addition to describing executive education as a learning context, Chapter 1 also characterized past sociolinguistic approaches to studying interactions between professionals. I specifically limited my discussion of professional interaction to workplace studies that take in interest in leadership and how it is enacted through language. Workplace studies of leadership (e.g., Holmes & Stubbe, 2003; Schnurr & Chan, 2011) provided an understanding of how power relationships are expressed in interaction and how they can be analyzed. Inspired by this discussion, I took an interest in power and alignments between professionals in interaction and carried that forward into the study of executive education. Chapter 2 provided relevant background about the EELP and my involvement with the program by explaining how the program is organized, providing information about the students’ backgrounds, and detailing the process of video-recording, reviewing, transcribing, and analyzing interactions among students and between students and professors in the classroom.

In Chapter 3, I discussed positioning within four extended excerpts of EELP students recounting their past professional experiences as they participated in class
discussions. Bringing forward personal experiences from the workplace in the classroom was identified as a key mechanism for enacting power because, by sharing these experiences, students were able to take up powerful positions relative to other professionals depicted in their stories and to their classmates. These examples of recounting past events were, by Holmes (2005b) definition, working stories: on-task narrations that recount past experiences and accomplish the goals of an interaction (e.g., opening topics in a meeting). I used Bamberg’s (1997) framework for analyzing narrators’ displays of personal identity in personal narratives to discuss three levels of positioning and the opportunities for expressing power that this way of participating in class affords. At Positioning Level 1 students positioned themselves as powerful actors in past interactions by incorporating details about their professional activities and their relationships with other characters. For example, working stories in the EELP that depicted students working on teams as managers in control of other professionals’ actions revealed the powerful positions students occupied in their work. The second level of positioning asks how students construct themselves relative to their audience by sharing past experiences. My analysis considered how EELP students positioned themselves in the classroom relative to their classmates and the program itself by recounting details about the responsibilities, roles, and power relations they experienced in the workplace. I found that students used their professional experiences in their class participation to present themselves as professionals whose experiences reflected or diverged from points being made by EELP professors. Three examples I analyzed (Example 3.2 from Reagan, Example 3.3 from Cassidy, and Example 3.4 from Cyrene) displayed students connecting their professional experiences and practices to instructional points being made by EELP
professors. These three examples also showed students using their professional experiences to align themselves with discussions about leadership and management that were taking place in class (Positioning Level 3).

The remaining example, produced by Morgan, showed a student sharing professional experiences in a way that pointed to a disconnect between the professor’s teaching goals and this student’s professional experiences. By using his own experience as a resource for completing a class assignment rather than relying on a text provided by the instructor, Morgan took up a position as a professional with management experience (Positioning Level 1), presented his own experience as a resource for participating in class (Positioning Level 2), and constructed an identity as someone with professional experiences that should be used to guide action in the classroom (Positioning Level 3). In all four examples students presented their experiences as relevant to leadership by sharing details about their actions in the workplace and relationships with their colleagues and subordinates in those workplaces. The details of these relationships included asymmetries of status between EELP students-as-professionals and colleagues, experiences being managed by others, and experiences exercising control over the actions of other professionals. Analyzing the positions students took up in the working stories students told was a method for exploring recounting professional experiences as a strategy for creating power relationships in the classroom.

Chapter 4 offered an analysis of a set of student presentations, occasioned by the EELP’s persuasive presentation assignment. This chapter investigated how students enacted power and made use of professional experience as they incorporated dialogic voices (Bakhtin, 1986; Tovares, 2010) into persuasive
presentations. I began by discussing persuasion as a form of directive discourse and as a leadership skill necessitated by a changing American workplace where the ability to control other workers’ actions is no longer entirely dependent on authority or hierarchical positions in an organization (Cialdini, 2013). I introduced: 1) animating voices through constructed dialogue (Tannen, 2007), 2) bringing forward students’ own experiences as evidence, and 3) invoking authoritative voices as types of repetition of prior texts (Tannen, 2007) and as techniques for representing those texts (Bazerman, 2004) in a new discourse. I argued that animating others’ voices was a way for students to present their own views as widely held and connected to others’ ideas. Citing events from their own professions was a strategy for positively evaluating students’ own professional experiences and signaling a professional identity to the audience in the classroom. I also introduced an idea I called instrumental affiliation to describe EELP students’ use of authoritative, high-status voices in attempts to persuade others. Students affiliated, or connected themselves to these authoritative figures by citing and invoking their voices when expressing their own ideas. I argue that citing high-status figures is an “instrumental” act because students used these voices to signal that they were in alignment with high-status figures. My analysis found that intertextuality in the form of voicing others and texts they create allowed EELP students to enact power by selecting and reshaping texts to persuade, which is a type of discourse that the EELP itself connects to leadership through its curriculum. Students used their own experiences as texts that could be shaped and represented in persuasive presentations that were designed to attempt to direct audience members’ future actions. By investigating persuasion as a form of directive discourse that the EELP purposefully includes in its curriculum, I was
able to explore how intertextuality can be used to enact power in relationships between students in the EELP classroom.

Chapter 5 presented a frame analysis (Goffman, 1974) of the questions posed by students during question and answer (Q&A) sessions that followed seven students’ capstone presentations about their burgeoning entrepreneurship. I discussed how the questions that EELP students asked each other during these Q&A sessions used information-seeking and advice-giving as frames that created opportunities to highlight a questioner’s own knowledge and hypothetical future actions. These two interactional activities were identified by metamessages about which participants in the interaction had access to knowledge about successful business practices. Information-seeking is a frame where the questioner typically has less knowledge than the recipient or presenter. When advice-giving emerged within questions that sought information, students asking questions shifted to a frame within which the questioner had more knowledge about a topic than the presenter who is being questioned. My discussion of advice-giving identified “have you thought about x” as an advice implicative interrogative (Shaw et al., 2015) that signaled opening the of an advising frame in the analyzed data. I also showed that students giving advice introduced with “have you thought about x,” followed their prescriptions hypothetical narratives that reinforced the asymmetries of knowledge between the questioner and the recipient. In this chapter, frame analysis uncovered interactional activities that introduced upgrades and downgrades in epistemic authority, a type of self and other positioning that enacted power relations.
6.3 Discussion of Research Questions

My analyses in this project investigated EELP students’ enactment of power across three institutionally sanctioned classroom events: contributing to class discussions, persuasive presentations, and Q&A sessions following presentations of student capstone projects. The research questions driving this study asked how students enacted power through their classroom discourse and how professional experiences were used in the classroom as resources for displaying power. In this section I summarize the responses to these questions that were generated by my analysis.

*What linguistic strategies are used to enact power in the EELP classroom?*

I began this study with the sense that power was connected to EELP students’ acquisition and learning about leadership through the program’s activities and courses. Power is an element of definitions of leadership—the ability to execute one’s plans (Fairhurst, 2007) and influence others (Holmes, 2005a)—offered by scholars who take a discursive approach to analyzing relationships between professionals in the workplace. Power relations are relevant to workplaces as hierarchical organizations, where the amount of power or influence a professional has relative to other workers can shape how they interact with others in the workplace by distributing different rights, roles, and responsibilities across organizations. As the literature that characterizes business school programs as responding to the needs of a changing workplace (Conger & Xin, 2000) suggests, programs like the EELP are opportunities for students to prepare for relationships and interactions in organizations. This project investigated ways of using language in the very EELP classroom interactions that prepare students for the workplace. Power, or the asymmetrical distribution of status and control in a relationship
between parties in interaction, is relevant to the EELP program precisely because the interactions in this context can prepare students for future interactions in the workplace. I used power, and the ways of using language that enact power relations by drawing asymmetries (e.g., of knowledge, hierarchical status, or control) into view, in my analysis as an entry point into examining the discursive construction of relationships between professionals within the executive education context.

My exploration of power relations between professionals-as-students focused on three modes of student participation in the EELP program—contributing to class discussions, completing a persuasive presentation assignment, and asking questions within Q&A sessions—that reflect the breadth of students’ time in the program. My central findings are that students share details about their workplaces and relevant workplace experiences that connect to topics that are underway in the EELP classroom, incorporate recycled and reshaped texts into persuasive presentations, and trigger frames that send metamessages about professional knowledge within questions they pose to other students. In examining these processes I found that recounting past experiences, voicing as a form of intertextuality, and giving advice are strategies that students use to position themselves as leaders by enacting power within the classroom. The power that students displayed is in relation both to fellow EELP students in the classroom and to other professionals in their workplaces who appeared as “characters” in the past events that students referenced in class. The persuasive presentations and Q&A sessions were also spaces for students to prepare for future expressions of power, like persuading future colleagues or planning new businesses. These findings speak to the EELP’s hybrid nature
as an institutional encounter that is designed to respond to students’ past as well as shape the trajectory of students’ future professional lives.

Sharing details about the workplace through ‘working stories’ (Holmes, 2005b) in my data, provided opportunities for students to construct story lines and take up positions that upheld asymmetries in their favor. Students enacted power by positioning themselves through talking about past experiences as leaders with control over others in their workplaces, and as professionals whose backgrounds either aligned with topics covered in the EELP or whose backgrounds should be taken into account in the completion of class assignments. These positions reflected asymmetrical relationships of status and power between EELP students and their colleagues in the workplace as well as among EELP students themselves.

The persuasive presentation assignment data presented an opportunity to analyze a type of discourse that the EELP’s leadership communication course connects to leadership. EELP students attempted to prescribe hypothetical future actions to their audiences and, in accordance with the assignment, incorporated evidence that, in their view, would enhance the likelihood these prescriptions would be followed. Because animating other voices, referencing their own experiences, and invoking high-status authority figures were all strategies for voicing others and appropriating their texts into directive discourse, these three strategies were also ways to enact power relations through an exercise of control.

Advice-giving in a space created for the institutional practice of Q &A sessions following capstone presentations was a strategy for enacting power because giving advice creates asymmetries of knowledge between students by allowing students to take up
positions as being more knowledgeable than their cohort members. Creating asymmetries in the relationships between is an expression of power that shifting from an information seeking frame facilitates. The asymmetrical relationships that advice-giving creates are created when EELP students take up the position of a knowledgeable professional as an expression of power. In the interactions that I analyzed, students giving advice supported their perspectives with hypothetical narratives that positively evaluated advice. In particular, students giving advice evaluated their prescriptions through narrative by portraying the action item as something they would do themselves in a hypothetical future and by making reference to their own experiences in the industry the business was being started in. The finding that tokens of advice in classroom data are accompanied by references to hypothetical future professional practices suggests that advice-giving itself can be seen as an attempt to exercise control over someone’s future actions and accomplish a leaders’ objectives (Saito, 2011). My analysis also answered Tannen & Kendall’s (1997) recommendation to consider framing as an approach to understanding multiple activities underway within professional interactions and to consider how establishing alignments can become a way of reflecting hierarchical relationships in the workplace (Kendall & Tannen, 1997, p. 102).

Overall, my discussion of linguistic strategies for enacting power relationships and taking up an alignment relative to fellow students and professionals “back” in the workplace supports Petriglieri & Petriglieri’s (2010) position that executive education contexts are spaces for creating identities needed for the workplace. Students engage in power relations as they participate in classroom experiences that are meant to build their capacity for leadership, management, and acting powerfully in the workplace by
influencing others. As a result, their use of language that enacts power within the executive education institutional setting helps them rehearse and prepare for future interactions with other professionals in the workplace.

As they interact in the classroom, how do EELP students reference their professional knowledge and experience? How are these professional pasts used as resources in classroom interactions?

Students’ personal experiences have a large role to play in classroom interactions and in students’ enactment of power. References to personal experiences during class were one of the central aspects of my observations of the program when I was present in the EELP classroom making recordings. Students’ professional experiences and background were particularly visible to me in the events they recounted about the workplace. As I discussed in the previous section, Chapter 3’s positioning analysis found that bringing past events into the classroom in response to the topics being discussed in class allowed students to reveal details about the powerful roles they occupied in the workplaces, and to take up positions relative to their classmates. Recounting past professional experiences returned as themes in Chapters 4 and 5 as elements of persuasion and giving advice. In these settings past professional experiences were resources for enacting power and status because they became a tool for influencing a classmate’s future actions by helping an EELP student suggest and normalize a course of action to another student.

My discussion of the in-class “visibility” of professional experiences is also connected to students’ ways of seeing, as the incorporation of details from students’ lives through recounting past experience provides some insight into how they see the activities of the classroom. For example, referencing past events from the workplace in Morgan’s
class participation in Chapter 3 (Example 3.1) helped identify that his professional vision (Goodwin, 1994) constrained how he saw an in-class assignment. In this example, students had been tasked with reviewing data about military aircraft engine performance and weather forecasts as an element of weighing the risk of flying a mission in response to a natural disaster. The assignment described an engine part as at-risk for failure in certain inclement weather conditions and Morgan (a student with a military aviation background) used examples of addressing engine problems in his professional life to explain how he completed the assignment. In my transcript and analysis of this episode we see Morgan asking if fictional planes in the case were either experiencing seeps or leaks because these two diagnoses mean different things in the aviation industry. However, the assignment only mentioned engine failure and was about interpreting the provided data that Morgan seemingly ignored in favor of his own experience. This example of questioning terminology and the validity of an assignment suggests that professional practices for coding and highlighting (Goodwin, 1994, p. 606) are brought into the EELP classroom as resources for participation. I take this to mean that students see their professional vision as directly relevant to the EELP classroom.

My data also presented work experience as a way to positively evaluate the actions EELP students recommend to each other in Chapter 4’s persuasive presentations. In this data, students recycled events from their professional pasts as evidence that may build credibility with their audience. The use of personal experience to build credibility suggests that professional experiences might be resources for both speakers and audiences; speakers may draw on their own experience to recommend a course of action and listeners can evaluate that experience when making decisions. Knowing how the
EELP professors and administrators view students’ professional experiences and the extent to which they acknowledge them as a resource for class participation or acting as an effective leader is an area for future study in executive education and management pedagogy.

6.4 Final Reflections

In this section, I will revisit the three main contributions my work in the EELP context provides. First, I widened the lens that analysts use to study professionals in interaction by situating my study in a context outside of a traditional workplace. Executive education is a setting that draws a diverse group of professionals together in a context that, as my work has shown, responds to the needs of the workplace. This approach allowed me to illustrate the complex nature of interactions between professionals that other scholars (e.g., Koester [2010]) have identified as an area of workplace discourse that needs more exploration. For example, Koester describes understanding the interplay between talk that is focused on tasks of the workplace and off-task talk (e.g., small talk) as equally important parts of professional life. If the field needs more studies that explore what kinds of interactions constitute professional discourse, I have contributed by demonstrating how strategies that create power are in operation in a new context. My study looks at a context that is more liminal and “in between” regions, than it is easily identifiable as a part of the front or back regions of professional life (Goffman, 1959). My analyses specifically discuss students’ professional lives as texts that are incorporated into the EELP classroom, which speaks to the blended nature of this context. It is possible to see the EELP classroom as a back region relative to the professional organizations to which students belong. However, the
classroom as a site of performance for the institution of higher education can also be thought of as a front region in relation to interactions like office hours with professors, small group conversations, or working on projects outside of class. In attempting to talk about the workplace by watching people prepare for a (possibly) changing workplace, I have introduced the type of complexity that analysts have suggested scholars pursue (Sarangi & Roberts, 1999).

Moving my study to an unconventional context for interactions between professionals also allows me to contribute to both sides of the main approaches for conceptualizing whose discourse we can locate leadership and power within. As I described in the introduction, studies tend to focus on how people in hierarchical positions enact power relations with people whom they are above in institutional hierarchies, or how a powerful identity is claimed by professionals in the workplace more generally. The executive education classroom invites people who are in senior positions into interaction with one another (and with EELP faculty), making it a complex context for studying power. Additionally, studying professionals of similarly high status in interaction is a new way to consider Tannen’s (1994a) multi-dimensional approach to power, solidarity, status, and connection in the workplace. First, the multi-dimensional approach is a way to address the changing nature of the workplace that the executive education context is said to respond to. The breaking down of traditional hierarchies between managers and the people they manage may readjust the American workplace’s position on a closeness/distance axis. There is space for a multi-dimensional approach in future analyses of EELP classroom data as I have given it a light touch in this analysis. My work has complicated a discursive leadership approach to power (e.g., Fairhurst
that sees it as centrally involving control. My work starts with Tannen’s view that relationships between professionals involve asymmetry. However, I have not explicitly discussed how power and status are balanced in interactions between professionals in the EELP context with solidarity and connection. The persuasive presentation assignment data is one opportunity to consider this further. Recycling another’s text may be interpreted as a bid for connection and the concept of instrumental affiliation that I discuss in Chapter 4 also shows EELP students establishing connections. My analysis of advice-giving in Chapter 5 can additionally be reconsidered through the lens of power and solidarity given that this form of directive discourse is less directly face threatening than other forms of discourse.

My second area of contribution is bringing the interactional sociolinguistic approach to discourse to the executive education classroom as an institutional context. My project joins a small number of studies that have done this (i.e., Trester, 2015; Trester et al., 2013). Interactional sociolinguistics in this institutional context helps broaden our understanding of how leadership and power are accomplished within the institutional order of classrooms. The interactional sociolinguistic approach to leadership discourse focuses on how leadership is done through everyday interaction. This is an approach that the leadership and management scholarship communities may pursue in an effort to work together and support management practitioners (Vine, Holmes, Marra, Pfeifer, & Jackson, 2008). This approach may provide a way forward for addressing the relevance question in executive education, which asks how management research and teaching can align with professional’s experiences in order to create a more practically relevant educational experience (Burke & Rau, 2010; Kieser, Nicolai, & Seidl, 2013).
My third area of contribution is bringing interactional sociolinguistics to management scholarship. One of the main contributions in this area is complicating the notion of leadership by divorcing it from the conventional understanding that leaders exist in reciprocal relationships with followers or subordinates. My work shows that leaders assert influence, have their desires met, and set the “reality” of what is happening in a given situation (Gameson, 1992; Fairhurst, 2011) for the people around them. However, my work also shows that professionals can interact this way with professionals of a similar status, and not solely with people of “lesser” status. Finally, I can also argue that my contributions to management scholarship, interactional sociolinguistics in institutional contexts, and workplace discourse bring a variety of analytical tools for fine-grained understanding of interactions—positioning, intertextuality, and framing—together to study power, asymmetry and alignments in a way that I have not seen in previous work with similar goals.

This study brings an interactional sociolinguistic approach to business schools’ executive education classrooms and asks how language builds relationships among students and between students and professors. In my work the executive education classroom is a workspace for positioning oneself in power relationships with other professionals. The analysis speaks to the interconnected nature of power, authority, status, and control in the workplace and in interaction more broadly. My work in this context is important because both management scholars and linguists interested in professionals’ discourse have commented on the changing natures of work, workplaces, and relationships among professionals. These observed and predicted changes call for new discursive skills and practices. For example, professionals are advised to master or
blend new ways of communicating (Koester, 2010; Cialdini, 2013) or to move away from relying on hierarchies to manage people who are their peers rather than their subordinates (Conger & Xin, 2000). A framework for discourse analysis that begins with contextual knowledge and analyzes actual interactions between professionals is an important tool for understanding how these changes are affecting workplaces and institutions. My three analyses all reflect bottom-up approaches to discourse analysis. By relying on a deep understanding of the executive education classroom context to track power as an element of professionals’ relationships with other professionals, I have illuminated the complexities of professional and workplace interactions, the complexities of alignments between professionals that build the workplaces, and the role of language in structuring power relationships.
Appendix: Transcription Conventions

The following transcription conventions were used in this study. These conventions are adaptations of Schegloff (2007), Schiffrin (1994), and my own work.

→ Right arrows highlight key lines of transcription.
. A period indicates falling or sentence final intonation.
, A comma indicates continuing intonation.
↓ A downward arrow indicates falling intonation.
↑ An upward arrow represents question and rising intonation.
°text° Degree symbols indicate words spoken at a lower volume.
:.text.: Therefore symbols indicate speech that is faster than surrounding discourse.
≤text≥ Text in between at a higher volume than surrounding text
@@@ A series of @ symbols indicate laughter.
= Equal signs indicate a latch or contiguous utterances by the same speaker.
Text Bolded text highlights pitch changes to indicate emphasis.
(.) A period in parentheses indicates silence, or a pause, lasting less than 0.4 seconds.
(#.#) This convention indicates the number of seconds paused, rounded to the nearest tenth.
{text} This convention indicates a gesture, overlapping with talk.
↑↑ Two upward arrows indicate rising, surprised intonation.
- A hyphen indicates a cut-off, self-interruption, or a false start.
{text} Curled brackets surround the transcribers notes or comments
: Colons mark the prolonging or stretching of the sound preceding them.
[ Brackets indicate overlapping speech.
↑↓ Up and down arrows mark sharp pitch rises or falls.
WORD Small caps indicate stress or emphasis by loudness and/or higher pitch.
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