ABSTRACT

Establishing Leadership Identity in a Small Group Among Peers

Soraya Naqvi

Director: Clay Butler, Ph.D

This thesis focuses on the discourse strategies used by a leader in a small group meeting in order to maintain interpersonal relationships and give task-oriented direction. The leadership discourse strategies identified in this paper accomplish relational and transactional goals, such as promoting participation, softening criticism, and delegating tasks. Fulfillment of relational and transactional goals allows the speaker to establish a leadership identity in discourse. Examples are taken from a one-hour video-recorded meeting of members of a student organization in order to demonstrate how the leader fulfills relational and transactional goals. Additional factors contributing to the specific leadership style in the study are considered in relation to the discourse strategies used to establish a leadership identity.

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS:

_____

Dr. Clay Butler, Department of English

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM:

_____

Dr. Elizabeth Corey, Director

DATE: _____

ESTABLISHING A LEADERSHIP IDENTITY IN A SMALL GROUP AMONG

PEERS

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Baylor University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Honors Program

By

Soraya Naqvi

Waco, Texas

May 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Everyone has experienced an instance in which he or she had to answer to a superior, whether that superior was a parent, a teacher, or a boss. Many of these individuals in charge may have been perceived to have an unquestionable, institutional authority that led one to submit to them without a second thought. As individuals ascend through the hierarchical pyramid, whether in the work force, in the university, or in a family environment, there arise situations in which the distinctions of people's roles, who is the boss of who, are not inherent or readily apparent. One relevant way in which peers on a common level have to distinguish and justify themselves as leaders is through their communication.

An important factor to consider is that leaders come in different shapes and sizes. A leader must adjust his or her leadership style to the particular context in order to be considered a good leader. Key characteristics for a leader to be considered effective in one environment may vary from leaders in another environment. A college football coach will communicate differently with his players than a teacher will communicate with her first grade students. A trauma surgeon will communicate differently with his surgical team than a pediatrician will communicate with young patients. The research for leadership communication may establish a foundation which most leaders adhere to, but how they adhere to it can be highly variable and, again, very dependent on the context.

When considering the traits of good leadership, many may picture a confident figure who can tell people what to do in order to accomplish the goals of the team. This

1

image of leadership, charged with the communicative action of delegating tasks, is an essential aspect of leadership, but it is only one part. Leaders are also known to be good communicators with the ability to make sure that team members are working together and that no dispute goes unresolved. These are all traits that most people think of when one thinks about effective leaders. It just so happens that all of these traits describing leaders have something in common: communication. "Leadership identity" is created and maintained through communication in conversation.

A leader has to work effectively on both sides of interaction among members. That is, the leader must be able to effectively get his or her point across and perform certain leadership actions with verbal and nonverbal communication. On the other hand, a leader must also be able to listen to members and understand their concerns and take into account their ideas.

So how is it that a leader uses communication to fulfill leadership traits, thus justifying and distinguishing him or herself as a leader? One place to look for this answer is in a microanalysis of the discourse of an effective leader, honing in on the minute aspects of discourse that come naturally (or perhaps not so naturally) to the leaders that exemplify the role. This study is therefore in the field of pragmatics, a field which studies how humans communicate to accomplish goals in a context. The following chapters will focus on the particular strategies that a leader uses in conversation in a small group of peers in order to fulfill and claim the identity of "leader" by analyzing the nuances in his or her communication style. More specifically, the data analysis searches for the effective ways in which leaders use discourse strategies in particular contexts (Wodak, Kwon, & Clarkes, 2011).

As one might expect, since communication is such an essential part of leadership, there is a large amount of research currently going on concerning leadership discourse. The theories that have been studied and that have consistently held up will be used as a foundation for the evaluation of the leader in the data analysis chapter. This data analysis will not search to accept or deny these theories, but rather to use these theories to determine the effectiveness of the leader, the leadership style used, and the contributions of factors such as context, gender, and provability of statements (whether a statement is a fact or opinion) that expand on these theories.

CHAPTER TWO

Methodology

Background

Conversation analysis (CA) is a method of studying conversation developed and

expanded upon by Harvey Sacks, Harold Garfinkel, Erving Goffman, and Emanuel

Schegloff. The main goal of conversation analysis is to describe the ordered set of

procedures used by conversationalists when taking part in social interaction when

producing their own behavior and when understanding and reacting to the behavior of

others (Heritage and Atkinson, 1984). Liddicoat provides a succinct definition of CA:

> Conversation analysis studies the organization and orderliness of social
> interaction [. . .] talk is presented and understood as meaningful because
> participants share the same procedures for designing and interpreting talk.
> Conversation analysis seeks to understand these shared procedures which
> participants in an interaction use to produce and recognize meaningful action
> (Liddicoat, 2007, p. 6-7).

Essentially, CA attempts to identify the patterns and inherent rules in talk. Paul Ten

Have (1999) delineates three studies that were key to the development of CA. First was

Harvey Sacks' first use of the research process of conversation analysis. When analyzing

recorded phone calls to a suicide prevention center, he took note of and studied subtle

ways in which callers avoided giving their name and the subtle ways the professionals

obtained their names. His research led to the development of the idea of sequential

organization that refers to an utterance's actions and meanings that depend on its

sequential position. The research also led to his idea of the phenomena of repair and

4

openings. The second significant study was performed by Schegloff, who analyzed

openings of telephone calls to a disaster center. Through this study, Schegloff develops

the summons-answer sequence theory, lending support to the fact that there are inherent,

organized procedures in talk. The last study, performed by both Sacks and Schegloff,

involved the analysis of how the closings of conversation were brought about, an analysis

started via the observation that conversations do not simply close but are instead brought

to a close by interlocutors. This study helped develop the ideas of preclosings, adjacency

pairs, and turn-taking procedures, intrinsic to conversation. While Schegloff and Sack's

studies were important for the development of conversation analysis, Erving Goffman's

ethnomethodological studies, a field of sociological study dealing with resources of

common sense and procedures used by members of a society to recognize mutually

intelligible objects, events, and action, was another launching point for the further

development of CA (Liddicoat, 2007).

CA vs. DA

Ten Have (1999) distinguishes two branches of conversation analysis: pure

conversational analysis and applied conversational analysis. Pure conversational analysis

focuses solely on the analysis of the procedures of talk-in-interaction without

consideration for the context of the interaction. This type of analysis focuses more on the

systematic organization of conversation. On the other hand, applied conversational

analysis, also known as discourse analysis (DA), focuses on the analysis of a

conversation in a particular setting, thus taking into account psychological reasoning,

cultural knowledge, etc. In other words, discourse analysis incorporates a focus on the

participants' culture and membership, entailing that the participants are familiar with a

particular system and mutual knowledge of how it functions in a way that is specific to a

subgroup of people versus a universal rule to all interaction. An example to further

illustrate the difference between the two methods, discourse analysis might take into

consideration that shaking someone's hand upon meeting might be conceived as

courteous and the gesture would be returned or might be conceived as rude and the victim

would take offense. If one is using pure conversation analysis to determine the rules of

shaking hands using these two different examples without considering cultural contexts,

the researcher would not be able to reach an adequate conclusion.

Process of Conversation Analysis

According to Ten Have, the CA research design consists of four elements: getting

recordings, transcribing the talk, analyzing the selected portion, and reposting the

research.

Recordings

Ten Have makes a case for the use of recordings to obtain data. Recording allows

for a boundless and unbiased complexity of details that can be examined over and over

again for a refined analysis (1999). One of the prerequisites for conversation analysis is

that the researcher must be able to use an audio or video recording of naturally occurring

interactions as the fundamental source of data (Ten Have, 1999). The recording should be

as natural as one can record while still recognizing the importance of having legal

consent to take and use recordings for research. Heritage and Atkinson (1984) in

particular emphasize the importance of obtaining naturally occurring interactions. This is

because conversation analysis is based on an empirical emphasis, which refers to the fact

that one is looking at the rules and procedures that are indubitably present in naturally occurring conversation and that merely require one to search for them (1984).

One factor to consider when choosing the participants to record is the setting; however, the importance of the setting will also be dependent upon whether the research will focus on pure conversation analysis, in which one does not want exposure to the context, or discourse analysis, in which the context could make a significant difference. Another factor that may be considered is whether or not the analyst would like to interview the participants. Ten Have warns that caution should be taken if the researcher decides to question the participants on the motivation for the actions in the recordings, for the participants may not be able to accurately recognize their reason for the utterances they make or may be subconsciously justifying their behavior incorrectly. That being said, in some situations the background of the participant and some participant input where clarification may be needed could be helpful in analyzing sequences on a more psychological level.

Transcription

Transcribing records is a valuable method for analyzing data of conversation analysis. The most commonly used system for transcribing data was developed by Gail Jefferson. The researcher must keep in mind that transcribed data is inevitably incomplete data. Ten Have states that a transcription cannot account for *what* was said and *how* it was said to the same degree as the original recording would allow one to examine (1999). However, the transcription still allows one to visualize the sequence in different formats.

There are two big reasons why a researcher should make his or her own transcript. First, as a "noticing" device, the researcher will spend sufficient time with the data to

catch subtle nuances that may peak an interest within the unmotivated observation. Second, the transcripts are subjective to what the researcher finds significant. One way in which the transcription process helps the researcher is that it forces the researcher to repeatedly listen to the recordings and to write down the interaction in great detail. This allows the researcher to catch subtle nuances that will not be readily observed in real-time interaction. These nuances can be key elements contributing to the data analysis (Ten Have, 1999).

This tedious process of transcribing the interaction does not simply consist of writing down words but instead is a visual representation of the interaction that notes information such as time, words, sounds, silences, overlapping speech, stretches, stresses, volume etc. (Ten Have, 1999). In fact, one of the major problems the analyst is faced with when transcribing data is deciding how much he or she should transcribe about *how* something was said versus *what* was said (Ten Have, 1999). Therefore, the focus and the information in the transcription will be dependent upon what the analyst felt was significant for his or her analysis. For this reason, each transcription is personal and slightly subjective. If every single inflection, crescendo, or pointed gaze were noted, the transcript would be illegible.

Analysis

Ten Have states that CA should be pursued in a way that does not mirror traditional scientific research in that it does not start a project with a theory in mind, but instead starts with unmotivated observation of data. It is from the images formed during the unmotivated observation that the researcher will produce an analytical framework. Ten Have states that conversation analysis is skeptical of existing abstract and general

ideas that a researcher may carry with him or herself before starting his or her observation of the data because the ideas could be misleading in what one hopes to be an unmotivated analysis of the data (1999).

Concerning how to begin the process of analysis, Ten Have (1999) suggests finding a pattern through unmotivated observation and explaining the logic of the pattern. Another suggestion from Ten Have (1999) is to work through the transcript with a small set of four organizational tools in mind: turn-taking organization, which recognizes that one person speaks at a time; sequence organization, which recognizes that one thing leads to another; repair organization, which acknowledges the organized way of dealing with trouble in an interaction; and the organization of turn-construction design, which allows for alternative ways of designing utterances that could shed light on the speaker's meaning. The idea is that the researcher should be able to order all of the utterances in terms of these organizations, thus analyzing the fundamental levels of organization that can be analyzed. Abounding off of the four basic organizational tools, the researcher may find a novel pattern that he or she can pursue.

Beyond initial findings, a researcher can elaborate on his or her findings by looking at similar cases or cases that deviate from the findings either in the same context or in different contexts. Elaboration with other examples is important because, essentially, like in all research, having a larger sample size would increase the statistical significance of findings. On the opposite spectrum, the analyst can try to apply established concepts of conversation analysis to the specific data at hand to confirm or deny the occurrence of the concept. This would also give a chance for the analyst to elaborate on what past conversation analysts have said.

Criticism of Conversation Analysis

While CA is a helpful method for analyzing conversation, there are some drawbacks. For one, because the interactions are recorded and because the researcher is obligated to obtain consent before filming, the participants may not have a natural interaction due to the knowledge that they are being recorded. However, participants seem to forget that they are being recorded after a few minutes, as evidenced by the surprised recollection that they are being recorded throughout the recording.

One of the limitations during the analysis is that the researcher may not be privy to certain procedures that are common in a certain membership category that the analyst may not be a part of and that may be needed to understand the reason for certain actions in the interaction. An analyst must depend on his or her own common sense and his or her own knowledge of different membership categories, which will never be universally encompassing, preventing the analyst from being able to ascertain with total accuracy the exact reasoning behind every action or procedure in an interaction. This is more of an issue during discourse analysis versus conversation analysis.

Unlike basic science research, CA does not require the analyst to have a hypothesis prior to collecting data. Instead, formulating a hypothesis is necessarily the last stage of conversation analysis. This research method, which contrasts with the scientific method requires a shift of mindset that traditional researchers may be hesitant to adopt.

Beta Beta Beta

The data analyzed in my thesis is from a one-hour recording of a small-group meeting of nine members. Each participant is given a pseudonym in the data analysis

chapter. The researcher was not in the room while the recording was going on. The meeting was between the organization officers and faculty mentor of an academic student organization, Beta Beta Beta National Biological Honor Society, as they try to schedule events, troubleshoot, and brainstorm ideas in relation to the organization. The officers are all college students (peers) with different roles in the organization, possibly with hierarchical acknowledgement (e.g., President, Vice President, etc). Consent was obtained from all participants prior to recording.

CHAPTER THREE

Review of the Literature

As previously stated in the introduction, there are different types of leaders and different leadership characteristics appropriate in a specific context. However, there is a relational and transactional element that must be fulfilled by effective leaders to some degree. This study will focus on the discourse strategies that the leader used in order to fulfill these elements. Before beginning the discussion on these elements, it is important to discuss the foundational ideas of *discourse strategies*, *face*, and *identity* in order to fully understand analysis of the leadership identity.

Discourse Strategies

Speech acts, an idea originated by Austin (1962) in his Speech Act Theory, refers to the actions that speech is capable of performing (e.g., questioning, responding, demanding, creating identities). In other words, by saying something, one is simultaneously doing something. Discourse strategies are essentially an interlocutors speech acts made with "socio-cultural assumptions concerning role" (Gumperz, 1982, p. 153), such as the role of leadership identity, and "status relationships as well as social values associated with various message components" (Gumperz, 1982, p. 153) in mind.

A distinction was made in the previous chapter between pure conversation analysis and discourse analysis (a.k.a. applied conversation analysis). The following analysis will be a discourse analysis rather than a pure conversation analysis, two very

similar strategies with slightly different implications. As discussed, pure conversation

analysis is an analysis of the tacit rules present in all levels of conversation. According to

Gumperz (1982), the "speaker-listener coordination can be studied empirically by

examining recurrent strategies, the responses they elicit, and the ways in which they are

modified as a result of those responses" (p. 159). Discourse analysis takes pure

conversation analysis one step further by taking into account "the cognitive functioning

of contextual and [. . .] extralinguistic knowledge, reflected in cognitive or social

structures that exist independently apart from communication" (p. 156-157). In other

words, discourse analysis focuses on people's knowledge and outside cultural and

societal foundation to determine what is happening at the linguistic level in conjunction

with the psychological level.

Face/Facework/FTAs

Face, facework, and face-threatening acts are linguistic terms that play a

significant part in discourse analysis. Goffman defines face as, "the positive social value

a person effectively claims for himself" because of the beliefs or views that he or she has

claimed in interactions through verbal and nonverbal acts (1967/2014, p. 287).

Ultimately, face is a public self-image that the speakers have and that others have of them

based on speakers' professions of beliefs and views. According to Brown and Levinson

(1987/2014), there are two kinds of face. First, there is negative face, which involves a

person's "basic claim to territories" (p. 299), otherwise interpreted as one's wish to not be

imposed upon and to not have one's freedom impinged upon by others. Second, there is

positive face, which is "the positive consistent self-image or personality [. . .] claimed by

interactants" (p. 299). This positive self-image is built by claiming those positive social

13

attributes that one desires others to attribute to oneself, such as being moral, and the wish that one desires be desirable to others as well. Next, Goffman (1967/2014) defines facework as, "the actions taken by a person to make whatever he is doing consistent with face" (p. 290), that is, the actions a speaker must take in order for other interlocutors to accept the self-image that the speaker wants others to attribute to oneself. According to Brown and Levinson, a person's face involves an emotional investment and must be maintained constantly throughout an interaction (p. 299). Usually the interactants cooperate with each other to maintain each other's face since the vulnerability involved with the possibility of "losing" face is mutual (p. 299). Facework helps to ameliorate threats to a person's face, known as face-threatening acts (FTAs), events that would threaten a person's face. Simplistically, one can think of FTAs as acts that will embarrass or humiliate a person.

FTAs in particular are capable of threatening a person's face when they go against the wants of the interactant being addressed (Brown & Levinson, 1987/2014). For example, FTA's can threaten *negative face* when the act imposes upon the interlocutor's time or freedom and can threaten *positive face* when it questions the person's positive characteristics that the interlocutor desires others to see in him or herself or implies that the person's wants are not important. FTA's can be directed at the addressee, the speaker, or both. Brown and Levinson (1987/2014) delineate the concept of redressive action. Redressive action, also known as facework, is an action that is taken to counteract the potential face-threat and that lets the interlocutor know that no harm was intended toward the interlocutor's face (p. 305). An example of redressive action would be the speech act of mitigating that will be discussed later.

Identity

In discourse analysis, identity is something not inherent to the individual (Widdicombe, 1998) but obtained in discourse, which is defined as talk-in-interaction, a social activity pursued through the use of linguistic and gestural resources (Zimmerman, 1998/2014) and is dependent upon the context of an interaction. Identity is something that one cannot create for oneself but rather is constructed by all interlocutors and the speaker's use of language (e.g., linguistic resources) to construct identities. Interactants are actively constructing these identities throughout the length of the interaction. The identities that people pursue are placed into categories that have associated characteristics (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). In other words, there are certain discourse criteria that must be fulfilled for interlocutors to claim a certain identity. For example, to claim a maternal identity in conversation, the speaker must fulfill the following culturally accepted criteria: requesting information about their child, providing details, making assessments, and accounting for a child's behavior (Gordon, 2007). For example, a person who describes the event of a child taking its first steps in extensive detail would take on a maternal identity among certain cultures. Some of the necessities for effectively holding a discourse identity in interaction include whether a speaker and the other interlocutors share cultural and linguistic conventions for constructing particular identities (Gordon, 2007). A speaker claims a leadership identity in the conversation when the speaker fulfills the associated characteristics of the identity of transactional and relational goals of conversation.

Zimmerman (1998/2014) makes the following three identity distinctions: discourse identities, which are formed moment by moment in interaction (e.g.,

15

questioner/answerer); situated identities, which are specific to a particular situation and which require alignment of activities to that particular identity (e.g., doctor/patient); and transportable identities, which are readily visible (e.g., race, age, and gender). Because of the strong interconnection of discourse and situated identity, when *identity* or *discourse identity* are mentioned, both discourse and situated identity are implied.

Leadership Identity

Jurma (1979) states that the success of different types of leaders depends on the context in which they are working. One should remember that discourse identities are created between all interlocutors, not just through the speakers themselves. Overall, a group with lower levels of task orientation will need a leader who is more task-oriented to give the group direction in order for the group to perform tasks well (Jurma, 1979). In this situation, a directive, task-oriented leader can be considered an effective leader. On the other hand, groups with high levels of task-orientation, meaning they are skilled at solving problems, do not require a leader to provide direction; in fact, in this group, a directive leader may be considered more oppressive than effective. In another scenario, interpersonally-oriented leaders are successful in groups with moderate levels of task-orientation (Jurma, 1979). Jurma (1979) notes that taking on the identity of an effective leader is contingent upon the task-orientation/type, that is, the context of group that one is in. The group analyzed in the data for this study is a moderately task-oriented group that favors a balance of interpersonally-oriented and high task-oriented leader.

Many groups that fall into a moderately task-oriented category, including the small group analyzed in this study, consider the "structural leader" (Jurma, 1979) to be the most effective and most satisfying type of leader. This type of leader, as seen in the

data analysis, will endeavor to organize and manage interaction among group members by such things as creating goals and steps, providing constructive criticism, encouraging participation, ensuring that task problems are understood, helping set group goals, reminding the group about deadlines, motivating self-direction among members (e.g., encouraging participation), and maintaining egalitarian behavior (i.e., interpersonal relationships) (Jurma, 1979). Essentially, the structuring leader falls between the interpersonally-oriented leader and the high task-oriented leader, providing a balance between politeness and power. Leadership is defined as a discursive "performance in which an effective leader successfully integrates the achievement of transactional objectives with relational aspect of workplace interaction" (Holmes et al., 2003, p. 32), and thus, discourse that allows a speaker to attain this leadership identity must balance the fulfillment of relational goals and transactional goals. Ultimately, carrying out the transactional and relational behaviors is called "doing leadership" (i.e., creating a leadership identity) (Schnurr & Chan, 2009). The structural leader will be the focus of the data analysis, and from this point forward, mention of "leader" will refer to the structural leader.

Transactional Goals

According to Schnurr and Chan (2009), leadership roles in activities requiring communication include transactional and relational behaviors. Transactional goals/behaviors are those centered on completing tasks and problem-solving, including communicating criticism of a failure to perform an activity (Schnurr, 2009; Schnurr & Chan, 2009). Relational goals, on the other hand, focus on maintaining interpersonal relationships.

Mayfield and Mayfield (2012) look at how leadership language fulfills transactional (task-oriented) goals. According to Mayfield and Mayfield (2012), direction-giving language is a task-oriented behavioral management style in which the leader sets goals and issues performance expectations, that is, directives, that will assist in the fulfillment of those goals. As it works toward the fulfillment of team-goals, direction-giving fulfills what is referred to as the transactional goal of leadership. In a more indirect way, discourse that increases team-member outcomes such as self-efficacy, "trust, attendance, performance, motivation, and job satisfaction," encourages the fulfillment of team tasks, and which, therefore, can be classified as task-oriented language. Mayfield and Mayfield (2012) find that there is a positive relationship between motivating language and team-member self-efficacy and performance outcomes. When a leader is delegating work and issuing directives in order to fulfill the transactional role of leadership, the leader appears to be in an elevated position of power. Depending on factors such as the macrocontext of culture and the microcontext of the particular community, creating power distance between the leader and the other team members may create discord whenever the leader is seen as autocratic (Schnurr & Chan, 2009). In a community that is more egalitarian, it may be beneficial for a leader to issue commands with lower power distance when the leader is viewed as more of a "resourceful democrat" (Schnurr & Chan, 2009). Minimizing power differences places members at a more similar level. In this way, the leader can fulfill transactional goals while still catering to relational goals.

Relational Goals

Relational goals involve the actions in communication that are concerned with building rapport, maintaining interpersonal relationships, and creating a harmonious environment (Schnurr, 2009). When *face*, or self-image, is protected, relational goals are fulfilled.

As an example of the balancing of goals, when a leader wants the group members to take action, the leader may give direct orders and expect demands to be completed without question or hesitation from anyone, thus showcasing the power distance between the leader and the members. While making headway toward completing tasks, that is, fulfilling transactional goals, the leader will have created a social barrier between himself or herself and the members, detracting from the relational goals. Conversely, as mentioned in the discussion of transactional goals, when the leader tries to minimize the power distance, he or she effectively puts the members on a more similar level, which helps foster the interpersonal relationships in the same way that upholding the power distance would create detachment (Schnurr & Chan, 2009). In this example, as in most cases, the way in which a leader acts and reacts to situations should have some balance between fulfilling the transactional and the relational characteristic of an effective leader. This balance is seen when, still wanting to display some power in accordance with the general view of power as a trait of the leadership identity, the leader tries to subtly display power by dominating the amount of talk, opening and closing, summarizing progress, and controlling topics discussed (Schnurr, 2009). The idea of balance is key; as noted by Schnurr (2009), an effective leader will influence the team members to advance in the goals of the organization while maintaining harmony within the group.

Balance of Relational and Transactional Goals

When considering how an effective leader will balance the achievement of

relational and transactional goals, one must consider the context of the situation and

problems that the group must address. How the leader uses discursive strategies could

change in different contexts. One of the components of context to consider is the urgency

of the issue at hand (Wodak et al., 2011). Sometimes an effective leader has to sacrifice

one goal in favor of the other. If the goal of the group has a rapidly approaching deadline,

the leader tends to favor the fulfillment of transactional goals. Certain teams that work

continually with deadlines and high-risk outcomes have a work culture that does not cater

to relational goals (which would be perceived as an unnecessary expenditure of energy),

and therefore, transactional goals can be fulfilled with minimal offense to the members.

A dramatic example would be of a surgical team trying to save the life of a patient whose

blood pressure suddenly falls dangerously low while in surgery. While it is important for

the surgical team not to fall apart, the head surgeon has to issue commands left and right

and issue potentially face-threatening reprimands to his or her team members in order to

save the patient without taking the time to hedge "harsh" statements with, "If you don't

mind…" or, "I understand where you're coming from, but I don't think that's a good idea

because… Maybe we could try doing this instead…" versus a direct "Do not cut that

artery!" or "Hand me the scalpel!" Saving the patient takes a higher prerogative than

saving face. By the time the head surgeon saves the team members' face with such

mitigated statements, the team will have lost the patient. Even while favoring

transactional goals, a good surgeon will probably offset doing transactional work by

doing relational work outside of the ER, perhaps by reassuring his team members that

they had done a good job in a particularly stressful situation. In situations where the transactional goals do not carry as high of a risk, the relational goals may be favored in order to maintain the interpersonal relationships, especially in situations where the leader may carry an equal social standing with his or her team members. Even when maintaining egalitarian behavior, the leader must still keep balance. If a team member is not staying on task and a leader does not admonish the team member or find a way to get him or her back on task in fear of hurting the member's face, the leader has failed to fulfill the transactional goals of leadership in favor of the relational goals. In this instance, unless the team member's tasks are negligible, the leader will be considered ineffective.

Encouragement

Wodak et al. (2011) speak about the importance of encouragement in group-contexts. Encouragement stimulates others to pursue new ideas, enhance the speaker's sense of participation by justifying ideas, and indirectly move the group toward consensus, which is another important aspect of leadership. Encouragement is accomplished by soliciting opinion with open questions, agreement cues, requests for expert advice, and questioning/supporting existing propositions via the discourse strategies of repetition, positive backchanneling, and explicit praise. *Positive backchannels* are encouraging interjections that can be verbal, such as *mhm*, or nonverbal cues such as nodding. Indirect speech acts (e.g., question vs. orders, appeals vs. accusations) are also used for encouragement (Wodak et al., 2011). As a leader, facilitating participation among group members fosters autonomy and makes certain that all feel accounted for and that no one feels left out (Wodak et al., 2011). Encouragement

can serve as a minimizer of power distance since the leader is essentially relinquishing power. The increase in members' positive face and the creation of a more egalitarian environment contribute to the fulfillment of the relational goal of leadership.

As mentioned, an increased sense of self-efficacy can improve team-member task-fulfillment outcomes, which means that language that increases self-efficacy can be considered transactional. Self-efficacy is defined as a person's "judgment of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performance" (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2012). One of the ways through which self-efficacy manifests itself is through social persuasion, which involves feedback from others, especially leaders, such as through verbal encouragement. A leader's use of verbal encouragement can therefore fulfill the transactional goals of leadership by increasing the members' sense of self-efficacy.

<center>Mitigation</center>

Another trait of leadership is the use of mitigation, a device used in order to save face. The three discourse strategies that Holmes et al. (2003) say are employed by leaders in order to mitigate are humor, hedging, and the recounting of anecdotes. Holmes' uses the example of a manager who must instruct an employee to write a letter, something that the employee is reluctant to do. Instead of bluntly commanding the employee to write a letter, the employer uses humor to save face while simultaneously instructing the employee. In the second example, an employee has written a letter that is below the organization's standards, and the employer has to address the employee's poor writing style, a face-threatening topic since it questions the employee's competence. In order to save the employee's face, the employer uses hedging, minimizers, and approximators in

order to minimize the illocutionary force (think bluntness) of face threats that are implicit in criticism. (Holmes et al., 2003). *Hedging* is a discourse strategy used to take off the edge of potentially harsh, face-threatening statements. For example, when a speaker is "beating around the bush," a type of hedging, the speaker is going out of his or her way to soothe the harshness of the issue at hand, an issue that the speaker assumes will bring discontentment to the listener, possibly by threatening the listener's face. When fulfilling transactional tasks, mitigating devices can be used to soften negative face, which would serve to cater to the fulfillment of relational tasks as well (Schnurr & Chan, 2009).

Turn-Holding

Turns are a fundamental unit of organization in a conversation. In a conversation, speakers take *turns* when talking. Schegloff and Sacks (1973/2014) delineate two properties of conversation. First, one person, and one person only, can be speaking at a time in a conversation. Second, switching from one speaker to the next is recurring, a pattern that occurs over and over again (p. 240). After each utterance by a speaker, it is possible for another speaker to take up the next utterance; in other words, there is a possible transition point created. This procedure is turn-taking. In instances where the speaker reaches what appears to be a transition point, there is a potential for the same speaker to take up the next turn. When the same speaker takes up the next turn, the person is said to be *turn-holding*. Turn-holding refers to the turn-taking sequence where the speaker holds his or her turn instead of allowing another interlocutor to transition into a different turn. The speaker holds the floor and no one else speaks up because the speaker is eliminating the possible turn transitioning points.

Verbal dominance, in other words, holding a high proportion of turns in a conversation is representative of a leader identity, generally by creating power distance. However, as will be observed from the data analysis, one way to minimize power distance while giving direction is by holding one's turn. Therefore, verbal dominance, an action generally serving to fulfill discourse criteria for a leadership identity, appears to also fulfill the transactional goal (by issuing directives) in a relational manner (by decreasing power distance).

Feminine versus masculine leadership styles

According to Garcia-Retamero and Lopez-Zafra (2009), in certain cultures, the characteristics associated with men are agentic (e.g., self assertion, dominance), as opposed to communal characteristics associated with women (e.g., kindness, supportiveness). In relation to the vocabulary previously used, men's conversation style is associated with transactional goals and women's conversation style is associated with relational goals. Generally, the transactional goals are more obviously associated with effective leadership than relational goals. This generalization supports the finding in the article that women are expected to have communal characteristics in society while agentic characteristics are the ones associated with managerial positions. According to Holmes, Marra, & Vine (2011), much research claims that it is necessary to be both a leader and a manager, which helps explain the bias toward male leaders in comparison with female leaders in cultures that view the "masculine" characteristics as directly associated with managerial positions.

Conclusion

This chapter describes the leadership identity and the one obtains a leadership identity in discourse through the fulfillment of relational and transactional goals. The background information is essential in understanding discourse strategies such as positive backchanneling, hedging, and turn-holding. An understanding of these strategies is necessary in order to recognize how leaders use these strategies. Finally, the literature on discourse analysis discussed in this chapter will be used as a foundation for analyzing the psychological aspect of the unique leadership discourse style presented in the data analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR

Data Analysis

This chapter discusses the discursive strategies by which leaders in small groups maintain interpersonal relationships and give task-oriented direction toward group goals. The leadership discourse strategies accomplish a number of social goals, such as to promote participation, to soften criticism while simultaneously moving to action, and to establish authoritative dominance of the conversation in order to specify goals and delegate tasks. In this chapter, the discourse strategies relevant to establishing a leadership identity are discussed, and five examples from a video-recorded meeting are used to demonstrate how leaders maintain interpersonal relationships and indirectly enforce communicative authority.

As discussed in chapter three, there are many discourse actions relevant to the establishment of small-group leadership identity. This section will discuss three: positive back-channeling, hedging, and turn-holding. First, positive back-channeling is the utilization of positive-affirmation cues by the listener to show affirmation and encouragement (Wodak et al., 2011). Examples of positive affirmation cues include the use of words like "mhm," "ok," and "right" or gestures such as head nodding while another participant is speaking. Second, hedging is a mitigating device used to lessen the severity of a face-threatening act and to decrease the illocutionary force of an utterance (Brown & Levinson, 1987/2014). Leaders can use hedging to conserve the interlocutors' faces in the process of providing direction (Holmes et al., 2003). One way to interpret hedging is to think of expressions that decrease bluntness and directness of statements,

such as when starting a phrase with "maybe" and the exclusion of the use of "you," a direct pronoun. Third, turn-holding involves the discourse strategies used by the speaker to minimize the moments when a change in turn is possible. Turn-holding is used to prolong the speaker's own turn (Raymond & Sidnell, 1973/2014). These three linguistic concepts are pivotal in establishing leadership identity in the data analyzed for this project.

The following theories first presented in the literature review make up the foundation for the data analysis. Antaki and Widdicombe (1998) describe identity as something used in talk and created in talk. The identity that an interlocutor establishes aligns the speaker with a particular membership category with two main features: the relational dimension of leadership, which caters to the maintenance of relationships, and the translational dimension of leadership, which caters to the fulfillment of goals and objectives through problem-solving, direction-giving, decision-making, etc. (Holmes et al., 2011). The relational and transactional features must be fulfilled in order to establish a leadership identity. These linguistic concepts will be identified within the video recording and will be analyzed.

The data analyzed in this paper includes three examples of establishing a leadership identity by the president of a small group. The examples are from a video-recorded meeting of a student organization, Beta Beta Beta (BBB), the Biology Honors Society on a university campus. The meeting occurs among the student officers of the organization in the presence of the organization's faculty director, Dr. Vinn. Pseudonyms are used for all participants.

Backchanneling for Encouragement

The analysis starts by examining how Ken, the BBB president, promotes

participation among group members. The first example illustrates how Ken uses positive

back-channeling devices during Jeff's long turn, which serves to encourage Jeff's

participation, thus promoting the interpersonal relationships. In Extract 1, upon Ken's

suggestion, Jeff explains the content of a separate meeting concerning a change to a

commonly used software system and how it pertains to BBB, while Ken uses verbal cues

to encourage him to continue speaking. Notes on the symbols used in the transcripts can

be found in the appendix.

Extract 1: *Positive back-channeling* (2015BBB, 18:25)

```
 1  Jeff          So, Canvas does not have any u:m anything for organizations
 2                who are- all  [organizations]=
 3  Ken    →                   [((nods))       ]
 4  Jeff          =are being moved onto (1.0) oh, what is it called? (1.0) I don't
 5                know, you guys probably got the email.
 6  Ken    →      ((nods)) Mhmm=
 7  Jeff          =Um, we are being moved onto this new system, and it pretty
 8                much works the same way.
 9  Ken    →      ((nods)) [Okay]
10  Jeff                   [U:m ], there's just more, um fi- forms=
11  Ken    →      ((nods))
12  Jeff          =and um, they aspire to like um be able to do everything
13                online [eventually]=
14  Ken    →             [((nods))   ]
15  Jeff          =but right now, it's pretty much just transferring everything
16                from Blackboard (0.5) onto this new system.
17  Ken    →      Okay=
18  Jeff          =U:m they went over, like, how to use it, but I think you guys
19                are smart enough you can figure [out]
20  Ken    →                                      [Ok]ay.
21  Jeff          You can just, I mean
```

During Jeff's turn, Ken adds positive back-channeling devices such as nodding

his head in lines 3, 6, 11, 14, 17, and 20. Second, Ken adds positive back-channeling

devices such as *Mhmm* in line 6 and *okay* in lines 9, 17, and 20. As previously mentioned, positive back-channeling devices can encourage people to participate and continue speaking (Wodak et al., 2011). Here, positive back-channeling devices serve to affirm that it is Jeff's turn and that his contributions are warranted. The speaker, in this way, is encouraged because he feels that he can openly divulge his information without a face-threatening interruption or unwelcome criticism. In accordance with this theory that positive back-channeling devices encourage participation and continuation of speech, Ken's use of positive back-channeling during Jeff's turn is followed by Jeff's continuation of his turn. By encouraging participation of members with positive back-channeling devices, Ken is maintaining interpersonal relationships, a process that is characteristic of a leadership identity (Holmes et al., 2003). The encouragement maintains interpersonal relationships by promoting positive face, or the values one has that one wants others to value (Brown & Levinson, 1987/2014); in other words, encouraging team members indicates that the opinion of other members and the knowledge the members have in their respective team roles is valuable to the team. As previously mentioned, the characteristic of maintaining interpersonal relationships fulfills the relational dimension of leadership. By utilizing leadership discourse strategies, Ken is establishing a leadership identity by fulfilling the relational dimension.

Backchanneling a Counter-Argument

The second example illustrates how Ken uses positive back-channeling devices during Carly's turn, and this example will be compared to Ken's use of back-channeling devices in the previous example. In Extract 2, Carly has just made an unpopular suggestion that the members of the organization volunteer to be tutors. Even though she

made the suggestion, she lists precautionary reasons for not going through with the idea of having the members as tutors.

Extract 2: *Back-channeling an unpopular suggestion* (2015BBB, 32:38)

```
 1  Carly            I personally would like to do that, but I don't want to push that
 2                   on anybody. Cause like I just want to make sure we have
 3                   people who are like really wanting to do it and
 4                   I know (.)=
 5  Ken      →            =Okay=
 6  Carly            =everybody can't go every week [so we ]
 7  Ken      →                                      [right   ]
 8  Carly            Make kind of a group of people that would rotate(0.5)
 9  Ken      →       Mhm
10  Carly            Out (.)
```

As Carly is elaborating on the argument against her original proposal, Ken uses positive back-channeling devices such as *Okay*, *right*, and *Mhm* (lines 5, 7, and 9 respectively). In this extract, these devices serve to encourage Carly to continue explaining her reasons for and against her ideas of volunteer service. She realizes that the idea is not popular and is aware of the pros and cons. Since Carly is bringing up an idea that has already been rejected, the threat to Carly's face is greater because the repetition of her idea could be viewed that she may be imposing her ideas on others. In light of the greater threat to her face, Carly uses hedges such as *I don't want* (line 1), *Cause like I just* (line 2), and *kind of* (line 8) to decrease the force of her suggestion, and thus decrease the threat to her face.

Because she feels that she is suggesting something that she knows others may not agree with, Carly proceeds to list the contra arguments herself in an effort to save her own face. Ken's back-channeling devices maintain the interpersonal relationships by

acknowledging the contributions of the team members and encouraging participation. Since the suggested idea seems to be an impractical and generally disfavored idea in achieving the team's goal, the back-channeling devices might be seen as only secondarily functioning to further the organization goal of creating more service opportunities that will have an overall positive effect on the members. In this instance of encouraging Carly's participation, Ken fulfills the relational goal of leadership, thus claiming the leadership identity within the dialogue.

When examining Ken's positive back-channeling devices, one should also analyze the type of contribution that the members are making to the meeting. In Extract 1, Jeff is presenting relatively factual information, that is, changes that are happening with the software system outside of his control and that the organization has no choice but to acknowledge. Jeff's use of the plural pronoun *we* in line 7 instead of the singular *I* further illustrates that he is not merely stating a personal opinion but is talking about a subject that affects all of the members. By using the inclusive *we* instead of the more personal *I* pronoun, Jeff indicates that he is not worried about his utterance being a potential face-threatening act because he does not perceive the dissemination of factual information to be face-threatening. He is essentially a messenger of information, not the creator of a novel idea. Stating a fact may be seen as less face-threatening than stating an opinion. The reason behind this is that a fact is not connected with an individual's faculties whereas an opinion is more personal as it involves an individual's own reasoning and creativity.

In Extract 2, the information that Carly is presenting is more subjective than objective. She is presenting a suggestion, which, by nature of being a suggestion, is not

an unchangeable fact but a proposal of an idea that can be accepted or rejected. Carly separates herself from the group by saying *I personally* in line 1 and the singular pronoun *I* in lines 1, 2, and 4 to show that what she is saying is a personal opinion. Besides stating a mere suggestion, Carly already knows her suggestion is unfavorable due to the negative reaction of the members when she had previously brought up her service event suggestion. When Carly says *I don't want to push* in line 1 and *I just* in line 2, she is distancing herself from her suggestion by finding the limitations in her ideas before anyone else has the chance to criticize her. This is a way of defending against criticism, insinuating that her suggestion could be face-threatening. The suggestion is her own personal creation, which can in turn make her contribution more face-threatening in comparison with Jeff's since it is a reflection of her creativity and reasoning abilities. Therefore, it appears that in these extracts, the presentation of a fact carries a lower threat to a speaker's face than presenting a personal opinion.

The overall observation is that Jeff's contributions are factual, and thus, perceived by the speaker as having a minimal threat to face, and Carly's contributions are personal opinions, and thus, perceived by the speaker as having a greater threat to face. Considering the differences in Jeff and Carly's contributions, Ken's intentions behind using positive back-channeling devices during Jeff and Carly's turns can be further analyzed beyond their role of encouraging participation. In the turn-taking sequence with Jeff, Ken is a passive listener and his positive back-channeling devices serve mostly to guide Jeff's contributions forward. In the turn-taking sequence with Carly, Ken is required to accept or reject a personal suggestion (adjacency pair, i.e., two types of utterances that are normally paired together in a conversation, such as question-answer or

32

offer-acceptance/refusal), a rejection being face-threatening to Carly. Overall, Ken's positive back-channeling devices serve to encourage Carly to continue and in this way maintaining interpersonal relationships by acknowledging that her opinion matters. However, Ken's placement of positive back-channeling may be serving a secondary purpose of bringing the face-threatening topic in Extract 2 to a close, and in this way, indirectly acknowledge that Carly's suggestion has already been decidedly rejected. Ken's first positive back-channeling device, *Okay* in line 5, occurs after 4 lines of Carly's turn, which is double the amount of lines in Jeff's turn before Ken inserted a positive back-channeling device. The last positive back-channeling device, *Mhm* in line 9, occurs after a pause. The length of pause between the positive back-channeling devices in comparison with the length of pauses in Extract 1 may insinuate that Ken is not actually encouraging Carly to continue. Instead, he may be discouraging her from continuing by letting her state an opinion to the members that she already knows is unpopular, making it already face-threatening, and still neglecting to insert more positive back-channeling devices under these conditions, only inserting the minimal amount to maintain interpersonal relationships during a face-threatening turn. To state the rejection directly would hurt Carly's face as it may be perceived as a direct criticism to Carly's reasoning and creativity. A strategic placement of positive back-channeling devices in order to reject a suggestion with minimal damage to the speaker's face is an indirect way that Ken fulfills the team goal of selecting viable volunteering activities. The achievement of the organization's goals fulfills the transactional aspect of the leadership identity. In his rejection, Ken also caters to the relational aspect of leadership by being indirect in order to generate minimal damage to Carly's face. With the relational and transactional aspect

of leadership fulfilled via positive back-channeling devices, Ken claims a leadership identity.

Hedging Criticism of Failure

The next example shows how Ken uses hedging to diffuse the critical threat to Ella's face. In Extract 3, Ken tries to bring up the subject of the failure to advertise. As the public relations chair, Ella is responsible for advertising, a duty which she failed to fulfill. Since Ken is aware that the subject matter involving her failure is face-threatening, he attempts to mitigate his approach to the subject.

Extract 3: *Hedging criticism of failure* (2015BBB, 5:18)

```
 1   Ken    →    So, did you happen to get an email earlier this week (.) from
 2          →    me about (.) a bunch of (.) advertising things: an: stuff like
 3               that=
 4   Ella        =Yeah, u:m (.) I don't have access to very much printing, I
 5               don't have pawprints this semester=
 6   Matt        =Oh=
 7   Ella        =I couldn't do=
 8   Matt        =U:m you should (.) just send that to (all of us) so that I could
 9               uh print it
10               (1.5)
11               I mean (we get) free prints at Outpost
12   Ella        [°That's nice°    ]
13   Ken    →    [u:m, the thing is], so we only
14               had one application so
15          →    [we're going to extend]
16   Ella        [That's   crazy     cus] I've emailed it to (.)
17   Ken            [A lot of people]
18   Ella            [Maybe twelve  ] people h:ave asked for it (so like I-) (I've
19               given it to them).
20               [They]'ve said, "I'm interested"
21   Ken         [Okay]
22   Ella        And may [I have one (and I've given it to them )]
23   Bri                 [And      people,   like,      have ] asked me,
24               [so ]
25   Ella        [So ] I don't understand the=
26   Ken    →    =is it, so, did we get a date mixed up maybe? Or:
```

In this extract, Ken uses the following hedges: *happen to* in line 1, *stuff like that* in line 2, and *maybe* in line 26. These hedges decrease the illocutionary force of the threat to Ella's face; *happen to* and *stuff like that* are filler words that do not provide content and are nondescript, while *maybe* decreases the directness of the question asked in line 26. Ken is hedging a topic of importance to the organization that, as the president, he must bring up in order to solve the problem. In line 26, Ken is hedging the directness of the criticism by using the plural pronoun *we* when referring to the person at fault for the mistake instead of using the singular you. Ken makes the problem everyone's problem instead of singling out Ella. Therefore, instead of just putting one person in the one-down position for a failure, Ken puts everyone in the one-down position, which maintains everyone on the same level, and thus he is catering to interpersonal relationships while acknowledging the failure.

In lines 1-3, Ken asks the question, "So, did you happen to get an email earlier this week from me about a bunch of advertising things and stuff like that?" Even though Ken did not actually ask a direct question about why Ella did not do her assigned job, Ella responds to his question with a reason for why she did not print advertisements. Schegloff's proof procedure allows one to analyze the actual meaning of Ken's question based on the response from Ella (Schegloff, 1988). Because Ella's response to the question was to state excuses for not fulfilling a duty, one can assume that Ken indirectly asked a face-threatening question of why she neglected her responsibility, merely mitigating the threat by hedging the direct question with the use of a seemingly different question on the same topic, that is, advertisements for the organization. If Ken had not mitigated the threat to Ella's face by asking directly why she did not do her job, his

question may be perceived as more accusatory and threatening to Ella's positive face. Besides mitigating the threat by hedging, Ken's question also leaves a possibility open that she could use her turn to place the blame on him. For example, she could have answered that she did not receive the email that he was supposed to have sent her regarding the advertisements, which would make the error his fault. By leaving this possibility open, Ken willingly allows for himself to be put in the one down position that only Ella can elevate him from and hedges any sense of direct accusation to Ella. By doing this, Ken maintains the interpersonal relationships while bringing up a sensitive topic that has to be addressed.

Another example of Ken hedging criticism occurs when he restarts his turns twice in line 13 and twice more in line 26. Restarting turns allows Ken to add more words to his turn unnecessarily, which also distances him from a direct criticism of Ella's actions. Therefore, restarting the turn multiple times is a form of hedging the face-threatening act of criticizing Ella's actions. Restarting turns again and again could also allude to the fact that Ken may be taking time to think of the most tactful way to save Ella's face while approaching the topic of importance to the organization (i.e., dealing with the repercussions of the failure to advertise). However, many times, corrections in speech can serve the function of aligning rather than correcting genuine speech errors (Kangasharu, 2002). The possibility that Ken is also showing alignment by restarting his turns could indicate that he is also using alignment to hedge the criticism of Ella's failure.

Addressing the topic itself in order to solve the problem and progress with the goals of the organization fulfills the transactional dimension of a leadership identity. However, the reason for hedging the topic has to do with the relational dimension of

leadership. Bringing up the topic of the advertising-failure is potentially face-threatening

to Ella's positive face because it showcases that she failed in her duties (Brown &

Levinson, 1987/2014). A face-threatening utterance may put the listener in a one-down

position or otherwise make the listener feel excluded from the team by creating an

alignment against the listener. By mitigating the face-threatening utterance, Ken is

promoting interpersonal relationships. The intent is for Ella not to feel that she is being

attacked, and instead the team can move forward toward solving the problem. In sum,

this example shows how Ken uses hedging to maintain interpersonal relationships, an

action characteristic of a leadership identity (Holmes et al., 2003). Again, the action of

maintaining interpersonal relationships with the use of hedging is able to fulfill the

relational dimension of the leadership identity. By fulfilling the relational dimension with

the use of mitigating devices on top of addressing the transactional dimension by

directing the conversation toward addressing problems, Ken establishes a successful

leadership identity.

Hedging Criticism of Ideas

The next example shows how Ken uses hedging to mitigate a threat to Carly's

face while at the same time disagreeing with her and highlighting a problem with her

suggestion. In Extract 4, Carly has a suggestion for a volunteer activity, tutoring, that the

members of the organization could be involved in. Ken mitigates his criticism of the

suggestion so as to not threaten Carly's face.

Extract 4: *Hedging criticism of ideas* (2015BBB, 31:04)

| 1 | Carly | What do you think about trying to get us involved in kind of a |
| 2 | | tutoring thing because I've been considering that for a while, I |

```
 3                     just don't kno:[w, what the interest in that was
 5    Ken      →                    [yeah, so (.) so right now [(.) we
 6    Matt                          [there's not really many tutoring requests
 7    Ken            [[Right
 8    Carly          [[Yeah, I mean we are, not, I'm not talking about Baylor, I'm
 9                   thinking [elsewhere
10    Ken      →              [O::h, ok
11    Matt                    [O:h
12    Jeff                    [Oh
13    Carly          ((inaudible)) trying to-because I know [a lot of=
14    Matt                                                  [alright
15    Carly          =elementary schools have programs to try to help  students (.)
16                   [with math sciences
17    Ken            [mhm
18    Matt           That'd be really cool for a weekly thing
19    Carly          Ye::ah, I mean I could try to get in contact with some people
20                   [(.) b:ut, I just (.) before we make a=
21    Ken      →     [yeah, that'd be great
22    Carly          =commitment to that I want to make sure that we are going to
23                   have people that are actually willing to [(.) do this
24    Ken                                                     [mhm, mhm (.)
25                   and, you-so it would be like a weekly
26             →     [commitment
27    Carly          [I'm pretty sure, yeah [(.) When I've=
28    Kara                                  [probably
29    Carly          =looked into any kind of after school program in the past, it's
30                   been a weekly (.) commitment
31    Ken            Right, because they don't want just (.) sporadic (.) [yeah
32    Carly                                                               [yeah
```

In line 5, Ken starts his response with the affirmative *yeah*. To start a criticism

with *yes, but* allows one to hedge the criticism by showing alignment with the speaker. In

line 7, by merely aligning with Matt's criticism in line 6 versus directly stating the

criticism, and therefore, being indirect about the criticism, Ken is hedging his criticism of

Carly's suggestion. In line 26, Ken highlights the negative aspect of Carly's suggestion, *a*

weekly commitment, without directly stating that the commitment would be an obstacle

large enough to make the suggestion ineffectual. In the beginning, Carly's suggestion is

misunderstood by Ken, and before the clarification of Carly's suggestion, Ken disagrees

with Carly and attempts to hedge his criticism by first aligning with Carly in order to

avoid threatening her face. After Carly clarifies, Ken still disagrees. However, while he brings up some potential problems in Carly's suggestion, such as the constant time commitment, his disagreeing opinion is not as obvious due to the use of positive back-channeling devices encouraging Carly's participation and his indirectness when highlighting the flaws in Carly's suggestion. The hedging of the criticism accomplished through indirectness serves to soften the threat to Carly's face. This attention to protecting Carly's face helps to maintain the interpersonal relationships, which fulfills the relational goal of leadership thus establishing Ken's leadership identity.

In line 25, Ken singles out Carly with the second person pronoun *you*, but restarts his turn to correct his speech error, and instead decides to use the more vague pronoun *it*. By using the pronoun *it*, Ken is being indirect in order to, again, mitigate the threat to Carly's face. Instead of criticizing an idea directly associated with Carly, the abstract *it* insinuates that he is criticizing an idea unassociated with an owner.

In line 10, Ken uses an alignment, *Oh, ok*, and in line 21 Ken aligns with Carly again with *yeah, that'd be great* even as he presents criticism of her ideas. He is not truly aligning with Carly's ideas, but by seeming to use affirmative alignment devices, decreases the illocutionary force of the criticism; in other words, he is hedging the criticism of Carly's ideas to mitigate the threat to her face. In line 31, Ken's hedges, *Right* and *yeah* show alignment to Carly's admittance of the fault in her suggestion. Even though he first presented the criticism of the disadvantage of the time commitment, he hedges his criticism of Carly's suggestion by making it appear that Carly brought up the criticism on her own accord and that he is merely aligning with it versus taking responsibility for being the person who pointed out the flaws in the first place. In this

way, Ken lessens the threat to Carly's face while still performing the roles expected from a leadership identity of dispensing ideas that do not help the team reach their goals. Besides the hedging of criticism with the use of indirectness as analyzed in the previous paragraph, the hedging of the criticism accomplished through alignment serves to mitigate the threat to Carly's face.

In this extract, Ken places more importance on fulfilling the transactional goal of the organization. Instead of aligning himself completely with Carly and affirming her suggestion, Ken disagrees with her in favor of doing what he believes best for the organization. Though he makes great effort to save Carly's face, the act of disagreeing negatively affects the relational goals in favor of effectively addressing the task at hand, that is, brainstorming community service ideas.

There is another factor for why Ken attempted to save Carly's face that has to do more with the egalitarian context and the natural want for others to view one in a positive light instead of having to do with claiming a leadership identity. While the priority for Ken is to disagree, Ken still makes great effort to save Carly's face in order to save his own as well. It is possible that the other members would think less of him if he embarrassed Carly. By protecting her face, he also saves his own.

After analyzing Ken's use of hedges to mitigate the threat to Carly's face, one can analyze the part of Carly's dialogue that prompted this response from Ken in the first place. In line 1, Carly uses the singular pronoun *I've* and *I* versus the inclusive *we* to indicate that the suggestion is a personal idea. In line 8, Carly starts to say *we*, a correction that can be perceived as a correction of a speech error as opposed to a method of alignment as discussed in the analysis of Extract 3, but then restarts her turn with the

singular pronoun contraction *I'm*, which she repeats three times. The singular pronoun is proof that the suggestion is her own novel idea. Carly is stating a personal suggestion, which, as mentioned in the analysis of Extract 2, is more face-threatening than addressing an unchangeable fact. Claiming responsibility for the suggestion would make the face-threatening act of refusing the suggestion higher for herself and create a disparity of the positive face levels among the members instead of having the face-threatening act apply to the whole group. In line 2-3, Carly is distancing herself from her suggestion with *I just don't know*, using the general *I don't know* phrase as a method of defending herself against criticism and expressing uncertainty so as not to impose (Klauber, 2015; Caffi, 1999). These two justifications for the use of *I just don't know* reflect the potential threat to Carly's positive face that her ideas present. Altogether, Carly's use of pronouns and her distancing statements characterize her turn as a personal opinion with a high potential of threatening Carly's positive face. Careful pronoun usage throughout this extract serves in distancing oneself, in including others, in identifying facts versus opinions, in taking responsibility, and in lessening or increasing the threat to one's face.

In a normal turn-taking sequence, the adjacency pair started by Carly in line 1 would consist of a rejection or an acceptance following the proposal; therefore, Ken is expected to give a reply in the form of an acceptance or a rejection. Since Ken believes that Carly's suggestion for a service opportunity is not an optimal idea for the organization, he refuses and states his critical reasons in accordance with the transactional aspect of leadership identity, that is, ensuring the fulfillment of team goals. Taking into account the threat to Carly's face, Ken hedges his criticism to conserve the interpersonal relationships as was already discussed.

This conversation occurs before the conversation in Extract 2 where Carly reintroduces the suggestion of tutoring service opportunities. In this extract, Carly finds out that her suggestions are unfavorable to the other members whereas in Extract 2, she starts her turn knowing that her suggestion is unfavorable. In both cases, the risk of hurting her positive face is high because her suggestion, as part of an adjacency pair, has to be followed by an acceptance or a rejection, either choice insinuating a possible reflection of her abilities to think of a good service opportunity. The difference in Ken's responses in each respective extract is that in Extract 4, where Carly first presents the idea, Ken has to either reject or accept the suggestion, and by rejection, has to mitigate the threat to Carly's face to maintain interpersonal relationships. By the time that the dialogue in Extract 2 comes to pass, Ken has already made the necessary rejection, and therefore, concerns himself more with the relational aspect of leadership in maintaining the interpersonal relationships versus fulfilling the transactional aspect of leadership.

Even though in this extract Ken places more importance on fulfilling the transactional goals of the organization, Ken still hedges his criticism of Carly's ideas just as he hedged his criticism of Ella's failure in Extract 3, despite the different levels of threat to the speakers' positive faces. The two extracts demonstrate that Ken uses hedges as mitigating devices when encountering danger to the members' faces in order to maintain the interpersonal relationships as much as possible while working to fulfill team goals. Ken's maintenance of interpersonal relationships fulfills the relational aspect of leadership even while Ken's main objective is the fulfillment of the transactional dimension of leadership (by fulfilling the team's goals), thus allowing Ken to claim a leadership identity.

Turn-Holding for Verbal Dominance

The last example shows the discourse strategies that Ken uses to hold his turn. In this extract, Ken is trying to decide how to solve the problem of having to extend the deadline for applications and having to, therefore, reschedule the dates for pledge meetings in order for new members to reach the pledge meeting attendance requirements. Throughout his turn, he is contemplating the possible solutions, an internal contemplation being the likely reason for the subsequent pauses.

Extract 5: *Turn-holding* (2015BBB, 4:18)

```
 1   Ken              And then on those days that will be up to whenever um you
 2                    guys are available, right, during the week (.) to have that sort
 3                    of meeting (.) um (2.0) but we could have (2.5) next Monday
 4        →           be the deadline, the new deadline (.) u:h fo:r (.) applications
 5                    °um° and then that week eithe:r, you know, whatever day you
 6        →           guys are free to hold the meeting u:h we could have (.) um
 7                    that first pledge meeting that week and then get them in
 8        →           (4.5) to:
 9        →           (7.0)  ((Ken clicks pen during pause.))
10                    Okay, yeah, so next week
```

First, in line 4, the extension of the vowels in the word *uh* and the word *for* in between pauses serves the purpose of holding the turn. Second, in line 6, the use and extension of the filler word *uh* and the use of the filler word *um* serve the purpose of holding the turn. Not only does Ken use nondescript filler words, but he also uses affirmative filler words that, beyond holding the turn, appear to align himself with himself. The filler word in line 2, *right*, and in line 10, the words *Okay* and *yeah*, show alignment. In this case, not only is Ken using filler words to hold his turn, but also he uses them as alignment devices to further justify that his long turn is warranted. Third, in

line 8, the extension of the word *to* between long pauses serves the purpose of holding the turn while Ken contemplates a solution. Next, in line 9, the multiple pen-clicks during the long pause serve the purpose of holding the turn. Lastly, in line 2, the idea *to have that sort of meeting* is almost replicated in line 5, *whatever day you guys are free to hold the meeting*; this repetition serves to hold the turn and increase the illocutionary force behind the idea. All together, Ken uses extended words, descript and nondescript filler words, objects, and repetition to hold his turn. Turn-holding allows Ken to establish verbal dominance, which is characterized by an increased number of turns and increased time holding onto turns and which indirectly fulfills the transactional dimension of leadership (Maricchiolo et al., 2011). Holding his turn while making "suggestions" allows Ken to indirectly indicate to the group members that his suggestions are task-oriented commands. The way that turn-holding allows Ken to indirectly issue commands, which in this extract have the initial appearance of suggestions, is by preventing other members from interjecting either to agree, to disagree, or to provide other input to Ken's proposals. In the case of the repeated ideas, the repetition serves to hold the turn for longer and to give more illocutionary force to an indirect statement of holding a meeting, which at first would appear to be a suggestion. By holding the turn with the use of a repeated statement, Ken can imply that he is commanding versus merely suggesting that a meeting be held. Ken's indisputable propositions are then perceived as final decision-making for the new deadline and direction-giving commands for when the members should meet.

In sum, by holding his turn, Ken is asserting verbal dominance, which allows him to indirectly issue commands that give direction and make decisions. Goal-oriented direction-giving and decision-making function as features of leadership by fulfilling the

transactional dimension of leadership and thus allowing him to establish a leadership identity.

Even though Ken fulfills both the relational and transactional dimension of leadership, the fulfillments of which allow him to establish a leadership identity, the means by which Ken fulfills the transactional dimension of leadership in Extract 5 is notably indirect. Instead of directly delegating tasks, Ken takes an indirect route by using suggestions and turn-holding to formulate commands. Similarly, in Extract 3, instead of directly addressing a topic that needs to be resolved in order for the group to progress in its goals, Ken makes an effort to mitigate the topic in order to save the listener's face. The indirect and relational nature of Ken's fulfillment of the transactional dimension of leadership may be due to the context in which the meeting is held. In a small, student-led organization, Ken may believe that his leadership identity must balance the egalitarian peer identity with the hierarchical, institutionally determined presidential identity. In an attempt to neutralize power differences, the transactional dimension of leadership is then fulfilled primarily through means that cater to the maintenance of interpersonal relationships (Schnurr & Chan, 2009). Regardless of the fact that Ken may favor the fulfillment of the relational dimension of leadership over the transactional dimension, the key point is that he manages to fulfill both dimensions in order to establish the leadership identity in the end.

Summary

In conclusion, Ken uses positive back-channeling and hedging to encourage members and to mitigate threats, which fulfills the leadership goal of maintaining interpersonal relationships among members (Wodak et al., 2011; Holmes et al., 2003).

Similarly, Ken uses turn-holding to claim verbal dominance, which fulfills the leadership

goal of making decisions and solving problems by issuing goal-oriented commands

(Maricchiolo et al., 2011). The leadership goal of maintaining interpersonal relationships

caters to the relational dimension of leadership, while the leadership goal of fulfilling

group goals by giving task-oriented direction caters to the transactional dimension of

leadership. Altogether, Ken uses discourse strategies to fulfill communicative goals

characteristic of the leadership identity. Through the fulfillment of the dimensions of

leadership, Ken is able to establish a leadership identity.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

The data analysis in the previous chapter supported many findings about leadership from previous studies dealing in particular with the importance of leadership discourse in enacting transactional and relational work. This research is relevant because it shows that leadership discourse is the primary tool used by leaders to "do leadership" (Schnurr, 2009). While results from discourse analysis are not viewed as directly translational as it deals with the miniscule level and an inherent process of conversation, awareness of natural discourse strategies may be able to assist leaders in coordinating their communication styles within their own context.

The starting point for the data analysis was the observation that Ken appeared to be an effective leader. After these observations, an investigation was conducted on leaders and their discourse strategies. Data findings from this literature review showed that there are two characteristics, the fulfillment of transactional and the fulfillment of relational goals, that must be present in order for the speaker to acquire a leadership identity. Following a review of the literature, a discourse analysis was conducted in search of the ways in which Ken fulfills these goals for effective leadership. It was ultimately determined that he fulfills both, usually leaning more toward one goal than the other, by encouraging participation, mitigating threats, and delegating tasks.

The discourse strategies that he uses to encourage and mitigate are backed up by previous research, but an interesting discovery was made in Extract 5. Ken delegates

tasks, an action normally considered transactional, in a relational way with the use of a discourse strategy, that is, turn-holding. Turn-holding used predominantly to obtain verbal dominance. In other words, unlike what the literature says about delegating tasks being primarily transactional and turn-holding being used primarily for verbal dominance, Ken uses turn-holding to delegate tasks, which helps cater to relational goals since the commands resemble suggestions, softening the directness that a command normally has.

The relational way in which Ken goes about accomplishing the delegation of tasks, as well as the predominantly relational acts of encouraging and mitigating, are curious in that they are considered "feminine" styles of leadership. The findings in Garcia-Retamero and Lopez-Zafra's (2009) research are that certain cultures view the role of women as incompatible with the leadership role. The author asserts that characteristics associated with men are agentic (self-asserting, dominating), as opposed to the communal characteristics associated with women (kind, supportive). The agentic characteristics are the ones commonly and more obviously associated with managerial positions. Overall, it appears that men are associated with transactional goals and women are associated with relational goals.

From this, the data analysis proceeds with some suggestions for why Ken chose this "feminine" style of leadership, all having to do with context. First, Ken wants to maintain an egalitarian setting since he is among peers of similar levels of experience and equivalent social standing. The female-leadership style, which is associated with relational goals, may be perceived as better when trying to maintain an egalitarian environment among peers. Second, Ken may take into consideration that there is a

female-majority among the members, and perhaps Ken feels that a "feminine" style of leadership would therefore be more effective. Schnurr (2009) and Tannen (1994) support this hypothesis by stating that the reason why leadership discourse styles are often considered "masculine" and have characteristic "male" styles is because the high positions in the workforce have historically been taken by men, and therefore, their speech styles have become the norm in many professional settings. Overall, Ken's leaning toward relational goals could reflect the egalitarian context and/or the fact that there is a female majority.

Along with contributing to the data presently available concerning "doing leadership," this research may also shed light on factors such as gender in influencing leadership styles. Performing a discourse analysis on this organization the following year, when Carly replaced Ken as a president, could have illuminated leadership style differences in relation to gender differences among the leaders within the same organization. The data also exposes the possibility for further research concerning individualism versus collectivism (Schnurr, 2009), issues seen in Ken's self-repair between uses of *I*, *we*, and *you*. Another observation in the research that may be elaborated upon in the future is the function of Ken's pronouns in distancing oneself, in including others, in identifying facts versus opinions, in taking responsibility, and in lessening or increasing the threat to one's face, factors that have been considered by Schnurr and Chan (2009).

Just as chemistry can break down the molecular constituents of a naturally occurring biological process, conversation analysis can break down the semantic and pragmatic constituents of naturally occurring conversation. In both cases, a hypothesis

must be put to the test in different environments before a theory can be obtained.

Different theories from different research concerning leadership were put to the test with

the data obtained from Beta Beta Beta's meeting. Ultimately, the results support the

theories, and the theories were used as a foundation to determine the effectiveness of

Ken's leadership, what strategies he used for his particular leadership style, and for

analysis of different aspects of the theories that had not been analyzed in previous

research.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

Transcription Symbols

$\rightarrow$ An arrow indicates line with relevant dialogue.

[words]   Square brackets indicate multiple speakers.

((words))   Double parentheses enclose nonverbal action.

(.)   A period in parentheses indicates brief pause.

(0.5)   A number in parentheses indicates pause length.

:   A colon indicates extended sound.

=   An equal sign indicates no pause between turns.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (Eds.). (1998). *Identities in talk*. London: Sage.

Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (1998). Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp 1-14). London: Sage.

Atkinson, J., and Heritage, J., (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (2014). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 311-323). New York: Routledge. (Reprinted from *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*, by P. Brown & S. Levinson, 1987, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Caffi, C. (1999). On mitigation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31(7)*, 881-909.

Garcia-Retamero, R., & Lopez-Zafra, E. (2009). Casual attributions about feminine and l eadership roles. A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40(3), 492-509.

Goffman, E. (2014). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 287-298). New York: Routledge. (Reprinted from *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*, by E. Goffman, 1967, New York: Anchor/Doubleday).

Gordon, C. (2007). "I just feel horribly embarrassed when she does that": Constituting a mother's identity. In D. Tannen, S. Kendall, & C. Gordon (Eds.), *Family talk* (pp. 71-102). New York: Oxford University Press.

Gumperz, J.J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holmes, J., Marra, M., & Vine, B. (2011*). Leadership, discourse, and ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, J., Schnurr, S., Chan, A., & Chiles, T. (2003). The discourse of leadership. *Te Reo*, 46, 31-46.

Jurma, W.E. (1979). Effects of leader structuring style and task-orientation characteristics of group members. *Communication Monographs*, 46(4), 282-295.

Kangasharju, H. (2002). Alignment in disagreements: Forming oppositional alliances in committee meetings. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*, 1447-1471.

Klauber, C. (2015). *Mitigation in collaborative*. Lecture presented at Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

Liddicoat, A. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. London: Continuum.

Maricchiolo, F., Livi, S., Bonaiuto, M., & Gnisci, A. (2011). Hand gestures and perceived influence in small group interaction. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 14(2), 755-764.

Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M. (2012). The relationship between leader motivating language and self-efficacy: A partial least squares model analysis. *Journal of Business Communication*, 49(4), 357-376.

Raymond, G. & Sidnell, J. (2014). Conversation analysis. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 249-263). New York: Routledge. (Reprinted from *Conversation analysis: An introduction*, by J. Sidnell, 2010, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell).

Schegloff, E. (1988). Presequences and indirectness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12*, 55-62.

Schegloff, E. & Sacks, H. (2014). Openings and closings. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 239-248). New York: Routledge. (Reprinted from *Semiotica*, 1973, 8: 289-327).

Schnurr, S. (2009). *Leadership discourse at work: Interactions of humour, gender and workplace culture* (pp. 1-60). United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schnurr, S. & Chan, A. (2009). Politeness and leadership discourse in New Zealand and Hong Kong: A cross-cultural case study of workplace talk. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 5(2), 131-157.

Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and men in the workplace: Language, sex and power*. New York: Avon Books.

Ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London: Sage

Wodak, R., Kwon, W., & Clarke, I. (2011). 'Getting people on board': Discursive leadership for consensus building in team meetings. *Discourse & Society*, 22(5), 592-644.

Zimmerman, D. (2014) Identity, context and interaction. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 352-370). New York: Routledge. (Reprinted from *Identities in Talk*, by C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), 1998, London: Sage).