Human Relations
DOI: 10.1177/0018726704047140
Volume 57(9): 1103–1143

SAGE Publications
London, Thousand Oaks CA,
New Delhi
www.sagepublications.com

Managerial elites making rhetorical and linguistic 'moves' for a moving (emotional) display

Dalvir Samra-Fredericks

ABSTRACT

This article contributes to sociological studies of emotions in organizations. It resides upon an innovative move to extend the ethnographic approach to include audio-recording, in this case managerial elites' naturally occurring interactions, to provide the basis for an 'empirical filling out' of emotions research. Furthermore, theoretically to develop this field in ways that encompass the simultaneous *speaking* of emotionality and rationality, Nash's account of rhetoric as emotion is drawn upon. In particular, the four discursive constituents which orators are said to need for 'moving an audience' are deployed to analytically trace how elites intertwine emotional expressiveness and a rhetoric of rationality to influence management/strategic processes. These four constituents are empathetic matter/great theme, stance, utterance design (*taxis*) and utterance relation (*lexis*). Three brief transcribed extracts of elites-at-talk are reproduced from one ethnography to illustrate the scope of a fine-grained analysis of elites' assembly of emotional displays – two are abstracted from the ebb-and-flow of interaction to illustrate everyday 'mini-speeches' of 'great' oratory and the third specifically illustrates the intricate nature of *inter*action revealing the ways emotion can be likened to a 'barometer of moral and relational ethics'.

KEYWORDS

emotion ▪ linguistic ▪ managerial elites ▪ metaphor ▪ morals ▪ rhetoric ▪ strategizing talk

> I think I've said this before at one of these meetings when I (.) it now broke my heart when I joined the company to find *dozens* of procedures, practices, manuals which *somebody* in this company *years ago* spent I don't know how long doing and the whole thing has fallen apart 'cause *nobody* maintained them (.). . .[1]

It is talk such as this that captured the interest of the researcher here *and* the attention of the community of practitioners who listened to this 'appeal'. It conveyed feelings of frustration and despair during a routine meeting between a group of senior managers and executive board members (hereafter referred to as 'elites' as a shorthand for 'managerial elites' – a term deployed by Pettigrew, 1992 for senior managers, (non)executive directors, managing directors, chief executive officers, etc.). From an innovative move to extend the ethnographic approach to include audio-recording elites' naturally occurring routines over time/space, this article aims to contribute to the study of the *everyday* 'social and relational' (Fineman, 2000a) aspects of doing emotions in organizations. In this particular instance, it happens to be at the strategic apex of organizations. A series of ethnographies of elites' *talk*-based *inter*active routines has been undertaken, spanning between 5 and 12 months (on average, one day per week). These ethnographies have been extended to include not only interviews/chats, observation/work-shadowing and the collection of company documents, but also the move to audio-record elites' lived experiences. One early interest was in their 'role' as strategists who story (Barry & Elmes, 1997) or 'craft' (Mintzberg, 1987) or 'logically increment' (Quinn, 1980) strategic direction (Samra-Fredericks, 2003). Indeed, nowhere is Fineman's (1993; see also Hopfl & Linstead, 1997; Sturdy, 2003) contention – that the absence of research exposing organizations as 'emotional arenas' continues to reproduce the 'myth of rationality' – more pronounced than within the strategic management and decision-making fields (see Calori, 1998; Eisenhardt & Zbaracki, 1992).

Although there is a growing recognition that emotions management is an integral part of managers' work, in most cases, research has been based upon organizational members themselves deploying a 'language of emotion' (Waldron, 2000) during interviews (e.g. Watson & Harris, 1999). Without doubt, everyday talk is littered with such language – 'being annoyed', 'irritated by', 'makes me angry', 'it's so frustrating', 'I'm worried' and so on. How these apparently simple expressions are 'fed' into their (managers'/elites') split-second interactive routines to alter (or not) the subsequent trajectory of the talk remains elusive. Even more elusive is the actual performance of such self-reported feelings/emotions. For example, how is the *doing of worry* accomplished when face-meets-face in corridors and during meetings? Efforts

within the applied psychology field also lose the complex and performative aspects of emotion, especially when confined to capturing it through surveys and predefined Likert-type scales (e.g. Echardt et al., 2002; see also review by Cornelius, 1996 and Zajonc's, 1980 critique of cognitive psychology and emotions research).[2] Inevitably, given the continuing absence of studies of 'real-time' emotions in organizational life, there are calls for 'methodological ingenuity' (Fineman, 1993: 222–3; Hopfl & Linstead, 1997) to provide an 'empirical filling out' and to do so from a sociological perspective as this article does (Albrow, 1997; Sturdy, 2003; Waldron, 2000). As far as the researcher here is aware, fine-grained studies of how managers assemble emotions and 'put them to work' during their routine talk/task-based interactions are rare and even rarer for those deemed to be leaders/elites who endeavour to shape strategic direction (Samra-Fredericks, 2003).

In tracing elites' everyday interactions constituting strategizing, the eruption of conflict or disagreements between them over whose definition of the past *and* the future will prevail was routinely witnessed by the researcher. During these encounters where argument was instigated, the emotional domain was explicitly activated and interpersonally regulated in various subtle and complex ways. The stance taken was that emotions are 'integral and essential modalities of organizational performance' (Albrow, 1997: 110, cited in Sturdy, 2003: 97; Samra-Fredericks, 1996a). Within one ethnography, for example, one noticeable element for influencing strategic processes was deemed to be the ability to be 'more' emotionally expressive *and* to do so appropriately *and* at the 'right' moment (Samra-Fredericks, 2003). The specific intention in this article is to sharpen our understanding of such everyday 'doings' of emotional displays through making two specific contributions.

First, by drawing upon ethnographic research that also generates empirical materials in the form of audio-tapes and associated transcripts, of which three extracts are reproduced here, the article begins an empirical 'filling out' in a unique and richly textured fashion. It is proposed that from this basis the following two questions posed by Fineman (1993: 217) can be explored: 'in what ways do decisions unfold over time as a function of the way people *feel* . . . about themselves, their projects and significant others? How, for example, does anxiety, suspicion, love, and hate take decision making through various paths towards particular outcomes?' Second, given Sturdy's (2003: 97; also Hearn, 1993: 146) contention that we need to conceptualize emotion 'as a vehicle for broader social/organizational theoretical development', the article outlines one insightful route for doing so. It is one which conceptualizes performative capability as entailing the expression of both emotionality and rationality alongside recognition of the central

role of language use or 'talk-in-interaction'[3] for constituting such facets and ultimately, the social/political/moral world (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; see also accounts drawing upon the 'linguistic turn' within organization/management studies, for example, Chia, 1995, 2000 and contributors to Holman & Thorpe, 2002 and Westwood & Linstead, 2001). In this article, Nash's (1989) account of 'rhetoric as emotion' is shown to facilitate theoretical and analytical development of the ways language/talk assists the assembly of emotional displays for 'moving an audience', that is, persuading others while simultaneously speaking a rhetoric of rationality. This focus upon talk is also warranted as much of what these elites (and managers, more generally) do and accomplish is through talk (Gowler & Legge, 1983; Kotter, 1982; Mintzberg, 1973; Samra-Fredericks, 1994, 1996a, 1998, 2003, 2004; Shotter, 1993; Smircich & Morgan, 1982; Watson, 1994, 1995).

Nash (1989) asserts that rhetoric as the 'wit of persuasion' is a fundamental competence, also briefly illustrated by Watson (1995) in an organizational context while setting aside consideration of emotional expressiveness given his 'data' and objectives. More importantly, *unlike* Nash, rather than trace his 'four discursive constituents' for 'moving an audience' through written examples drawn from the traditions of literature, poetry and 'great man' speeches preserved in various historical artefacts (e.g. Lincoln's Gettysbury address), the article does this against detailed transcribed instances of elites 'doing' everyday emotion which, in quite complex ways, influenced subsequent management/strategic processes. Consequently, although there are no interpersonally based examples or analysis of the 'other' as envisaged here, Nash's analytical schema does, nevertheless, lend itself to verbal interaction in ways that develop our understanding of everyday 'rhetoric as emotion' in organizational settings. Based upon an analysis of an extensive set of empirical materials across three ethnographies to date, the interest here is confined to the way one elite deployed to advantage emotional displays such as frustration, despair and anger (glimpsed across three extracts) which then constituted the (conflictual) 'event'. In addition, to do so effectively there was also a need to invoke a rhetoric of rationality and to sustain integrally and collaboratively a moral order.

More specifically, then, in terms of the ethnography from which the three extracts are reproduced and by deploying Nash's (1989) four discursive constituents for 'moving an audience', the analysis suggests that the 'great theme' or 'empathetic matter' – the first constituent – was (organizational) 'survival' as opposed to Nash's 'universals' of love, war, death and so on. In our case, and given who our speakers are (elites) and their recent assessment of their company's weak position in the 'market', which then necessitated investment in the task of shaping strategic direction, it was

unsurprising that 'organizational survival' arises as the 'great theme' which 'moved' this community of listeners. Arguably, this *is* also the 'great theme'/empathetic matter within most *written* texts of Strategic Management where a rationality centred upon 'beating the competition' and *surviving* escalating market/global pressures is discerned.[4] In turning to our elites' everyday verbal interactions, however, this 'theme' of survival was indexed in complex and subtle ways to 'move' this community of listeners. In this case, this 'community' was a core group of elites who met regularly to discuss the ongoing implementation of strategic initiatives alongside discerning possibilities for the future.

The issue of 'moving' an audience/listeners takes us onto Nash's second discursive constituent termed 'stance'. This encompasses the emotional domain and is deemed to be crucial for effectively articulating the 'great theme' so that others are 'moved' or in Nash's terms, their sympathies are evoked.

> 'Sympathy' (is a capacity for) being simultaneously affected with the same feeling as another . . . sharing another person's or thing's emotion or sensation . . . mental participation *with* another in his trouble or *with* another's trouble; compassion or approval (*for*); . . . agreement (*with*) in opinion or desire
>
> (*Concise Oxford Dictionary*, 1984)

In evoking such 'feeling' states during verbal interaction and through 'rhetoric as emotion' we are also acutely sensitized to the relational aspect which is interestingly noted here as arising from 'participation with another in his trouble'. That 'shared trouble' for our elites is organizational 'survival', one of this epoch's 'great themes'. Great themes, then, are those which should resonate with the audience/listeners and correspondingly 'evoke sympathies'. Arguably, within an organizational setting one objective of doing so is that listeners subsequently act in ways envisaged/preferred by the speaker.

In dealing with feelings and emotions, this second discursive constituent of 'stance' is also rightfully acknowledged by Nash as the most difficult to constitute effectively, touching as it does upon other elusive interpersonal phenomena such as being sincere and engendering trust in one's account. This difficulty has also been noted by scholars interested in emotions in organizations from a sociological perspective (e.g. Fineman, 1993, 2000; Sturdy, 2003). It is here that the two remaining constituents become crucial for the articulation (display) of one's stance, that is, one's feelings on some matter or issue (great theme). These third and fourth discursive constituents specifically deal with how speakers pattern their utterances (termed 'design' or *taxis*) and

deploy from their cultural 'store' a set of rhetorical devices (termed 'relation' or *lexis*) simultaneously to express emotions (stance) while couched in a rationality around the 'great theme' of survival and which *did* evoke our community of listeners' 'sympathies' as we shall see.

This is a complex process, yet our effective orator Eddie (a pseudonym) did instil others' participation in his 'troubles' as perceived and articulated by him. To illustrate this, three extracts are reproduced here. The first two are purposefully abstracted from the ebb-and-flow of human exchange and concisely illustrate his effective deployment and combination of *lexis* and *taxis*. They are two typical examples of Eddie's (mini) 'great-man' type of speeches which evoked his listeners' sympathies. In other words, he 'moved' them to act, an interpretation based upon what transpired next. Indeed, in observing and recording such moments and what transpired, the researcher was able to backtrack to scrutinize *how* (a process also noted elsewhere; Samra-Fredericks, 2003). Consequently, one route for ascertaining when a speaker seemed to have effectively evoked listeners' sympathies through emotional displays was to examine any subsequent expressions of 'approval . . . [or] agreement (*with)* in opinion or desire'. In some cases, this could be simply discerned in the next turns, but when matters were strategically important and/or there was disagreement, then a *series* of mini-speeches of great oratory were called for (see Extracts 1 and 2).

The essential point here is that 'to move' others to act by evoking their sympathies requires more than a 'one-off' moment of great oratory. Human interaction is more complex, necessitating great interpersonal effort across time/space. Hence, to sway effectively – evoke sympathies and thus persuade – others to one's views/opinions (etc.) within the organizational settings where the ethnographic fieldwork was conducted did necessitate a series of emotional displays which were inextricably intertwined with forms of rationalities seeped in the 'great theme' of 'survival'. Equally, what could not be ignored was a fundamental moral component which Goffman (1959/1990, 1967) observed, giving rise to collaborative efforts to regulate the emotional domain (see Extract 3). Overall, then, the article suggests that from accessing elites' everyday routines and generating the sorts of empirical materials reproduced here alongside Nash's schema, we can begin to examine the dynamic, fragile and intricate way 'stance' or emotions are assembled or 'done' (Hearn, 1993; Mangham, 1998) (in Extracts 1, 2 and 3) *and* 'put to work' during the split-second flow of verbal exchange (Extract 3).

This article begins with a selective review of the literature accounting for emotions in organizations followed by a brief discussion of methodology. Given this article's objectives and space restrictions, further details on methodology and the practical issues arising from undertaking this form of

research are available elsewhere (Samra-Fredericks, 1998, 2004). The next section outlines Nash's four discursive constituents and associated maxims as one route for theoretical development. Then, to trace the analytical possibilities, three empirical illustrations are reproduced following a condensed ethnographic summary. As mentioned earlier, Extract 1 (opening utterance) and Extract 2 are purposefully abstracted from the ebb-and-flow of conversational exchange to provide concise illustrations of when our effective orator (Eddie) had secured the floor to make (mini) 'great man-type' of speeches which were deemed to have conveyed his stance/feelings in ways which 'moved', that is, evoked his listeners' sympathies so that particular 'actions' followed. While their responses are essential, the objective surrounding the reproduction of these first two extracts is to highlight concisely a series of rhetorical features (*lexis* and *taxis*) together with the ways subtle linkages to the 'great theme' were emotionally expressed. Consequently, what we glimpse is the 'skill' which elicited a (preferred) response from listeners but which is purposefully compressed into a descriptive summary.

In contrast, Extract 3 illustrates the split-second turn-by-turn *interpersonal* leveraging of emotional expressiveness to advantage. It also illustrates others' efforts (responses) to regulate the emotional terrain when a breach of the 'acceptable' and localized 'norms' or protocols of interaction were perceived to have occurred. The level and scope of analysis here also indicates how we can develop Goffman's (1967) seminal contribution. Indeed, this third extract reveals how two listeners (Martin, again a pseudonym, and the managing director, MD), when witnessing an angry outburst, were prompted to intervene and avert the breakdown of the relational dimension. Their split-second responses demonstrate their 'reading' of Eddie's emotional display (anger) and their investment in interpersonal effort which not only constituted it, but also sought to fine-tune it in ways which met their culturally derived notion of appropriateness. The conclusion follows.

Researching emotions in organizations

> Managers have to acquire a degree of emotional literacy in order to survive or thrive in the job. They will need to know the places to erect social defences, the kinds of emotions that can or cannot be expressed in particular settings and how emotions can be used strategically to gain desired ends.
>
> (Fineman, 1997: 21–2)

Managers' own *self-reporting during interviews* reveals such emotional

management to be an integral and routine aspect of their practice (see, for example, Hopfl & Linstead, 1993; Watson, 1994; Watson & Harris, 1999). Such research draws upon Hochschild's (1983, 1993) seminal work which proposed that emotion was a 'covert resource' needed by companies 'to get the job done'. Today, efforts to formalize the development of 'emotional literacy' noted by Fineman within organizational arenas has led to a proliferation of literature on 'emotional intelligence' (EI; Goleman, 1996; also presented at senior levels in terms of a competency, see, for example, Dulewicz & Higgs, 1999, 2000). EI comprises 'empathy, composure and self-assurance' and good emotional 'presentations' which 'dramatize these good feelings' (Fineman, 2000b: 110). It is where other 'feeling states' such as 'desire, fear, hurt, or rage', if acknowledged, should be 'turned away from'.

Is this possible or desirable? Indeed, during one of the numerous 'corridor chats' with the researcher while undertaking ethnographic fieldwork, one senior manager spontaneously stated that he was suspicious of his current vice president precisely because he did not get angry. This manager stated that "you don't know where he's coming from" and thus he felt unable to fathom out what the VP wanted or what was important to him (double quotation marks are used to indicate elites' speech). Even anger, then, can be crucial for marking out and understanding the intersubjective realm and the priorities, desires and needs of others, as Extract 3 reveals. Within the broader sociological literature on human interaction there is, however, a recognition that a certain level of self-monitoring always occurs (Giddens, 1984; Goffman, 1959/1990; Turner, 1988) with the inherent selection of what is appropriate behaviour in various settings. However, to assume that it is possible to develop 'the competency' of EI (usually with the assistance of consultants, see Fineman's, 2000b critique) and that acceptable emotions can be simply harnessed in favour of organizational goals for 'capitalist ends' (Sturdy, 2003: 96 citing Albrow, 1997 and Willmott, 1992) is simplistic. Indeed, as George (2000: 104) notes, even 'the same moods and emotions can result in both improved or impaired effectiveness depending upon multiple factors'. This is an important point which, unfortunately, does not prevent George from generating a series of prescriptions.

Leaders, emotions and strategizing

George's (2000) account is of interest because it focuses upon senior managers/leaders (elites) who need to 'possess certain emotional capabilities'. It also echoes aspects of Gardner and Avolio's (1998) account of charismatic leadership and the linked notion of 'transformational' leaders which pivots upon their ability to arouse emotions such as 'passion', excitement and so

forth in others (see Ashkanasy & Tse, 2000; Bryman, 1992). Overall, it is where,

> [i]n order for leaders to generate and maintain excitement and enthusiasm, they must be . . . knowledgeable about how to *influence these feelings*. They must also be able to anticipate how followers will react . . . Leaders need to *manage emotions* . . . leaders need to be able to distinguish between the emotions their followers are actually experiencing, their 'real' feelings, and the emotions they express.
>
> (George, 2000: 1041, emphases added)

More specifically, when discussing the strategic leaders' role, Westley and Mintzberg (1991: 43–4) observe the crucial linkages between language use and emotion. They propose, for example, that '[h]ow the vision is communicated . . . becomes as important as what is communicated' and add that language provides 'the ability to stimulate, not only through appeals to logic but also through appeals to emotion (Pfeffer, 1981; Edelman, 1964)'. What remains outstanding, however, is research into how appeals to logic *and* emotional expressiveness are simultaneously *spoken* at senior levels in organizations in 'real time' or, in George's case, how a leader can interpersonally influence feelings or manage others' emotions. What is also problematic and raises a spectrum of methodological issues is the attempt to distinguish between what are experienced/real feelings and those that are seemingly falsely expressed (see Sturdy, 2003: 87–8).

More recently, Brundin and Melin outlined a study which aimed to get close to two senior managers and explore the 'dynamics of emotions in strategizing'. The research approach was one where,

> [t]he emotions were co-interpreted with the strategists . . . in intimate conversations prior to and after meetings, in diary notes and through successive observations/conversations.
>
> (Brundin & Melin, 2003: 8)

The observational component, however, does not seem to furnish detailed illustrations of the interactive routines beyond general points concerning their two focal emotions (frustration and confidence) which are also at times referred to as 'rhetorical devices'. The authors conclude from 'chats' between the interviewer(s) and the two senior managers and their diary records that 'frustration' seemed to assist strategic efforts, whereas 'confidence' hindered them. Consequently, what remains elusive is a detailed account of *how* such emotions were actually expressed or 'done' *during* strategists' everyday

interactive routines. Hence, the 'ambition' 'to capture the role of emotions in strategy formation in real time, *in situ*, to reduce the effect of rationalization of emotions' (Brundin & Melin, 2003: 8) seems to be thwarted. Interesting questions that arise, include, for example, did the observational component add to or even contradict the strategists' own self-reporting of frustration and confidence? How was frustration *linguistically* and *inter*actively expressed or fine-tuned and thus made meaningful and consequential for next actions? Before moving on to outlining an approach which does access this dynamic happening, what Brundin and Melin's study confirms is the phenomena's complexity and elusiveness to which we turn next.

The sociological 'take' on emotions

From a sociological perspective, 'emotions' are simply defined as social 'displays of feelings' (Sturdy, 2003: 86) leading to calls to explore 'collaborative social performances' (Waldron, 2000) where emotions are 'done' (Hearn, 1993: 146). This sociological focus is further warranted as much organizational activity is *inter*actional *and talk*-based in nature. Indeed, in simply developing a central point regarding the 'linguistic turn' within the social sciences, where talk is deemed to be a form of *action* (Austin, 1962/1981; Serle, 1969; Wittgenstein, 1968; see also Giddens, 1979, 1984), actions such as blaming, denying, justifying and so on also imply emotional displays and evoke 'feeling states' in others. Language use or talk, then, not only realizes specific configurations of social and political realities constituting 'organization' and identities (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Boden, 1994; Garfinkel, 1967; Gergen, 1992; Giddens 1976, 1979; Samra-Fredericks, 1996a), it also integrally realizes aspects of the emotional terrain.

From such an understanding, emotions are deemed to be 'embodied and conveyed in discursive acts'. They are expressed 'within local rules as to how to do irritation and anger', also embracing the issue of what is 'socially acceptable' (Mangham, 1998: 58) within this current epoch (see Elias, 1994 and Newton, 1998 for a historical understanding[5]). It is where an individual's personal 'store' or set of resources acquired from prior experiences furnishes them with a culturally derived 'working' knowledge of norms and rights and obligations both in terms of what is right and wrong more generally and more specifically, in terms of what are appropriate forms of emotional expressiveness given the setting and who else is present. We also see here that there are close linkages between the moral order as a 'background expectancy' (Giddens, 1976, 1984; Goffman, 1959/1990, 1967, 1983; Turner, 1988) and emotional expressiveness. It is where, if the moral order is breached or challenged, emotions and feelings such as injustice and

anger are evoked. In one study, for example, interviewees' self-reported instances revealed a moral 'tinge' of emotional experience which arose when someone was deemed to have 'no right to be angry' (Waldron, 2000: 79). Importantly, Waldron adds that this is an indication that 'emotion is a barometer of moral and relational ethics'. Arguably, the intricate ways that emotions mark and express this moral outrage and give force to relational obligations remains elusive primarily because 'the interview' remains the dominant research 'method'.

Method(ological) issues

Many scholars (see collections edited by Fineman, 1993, 2000a; Hopfl & Linstead, 1997; also Albrow, 1997; Sturdy, 2003) acknowledge that studies of the emotional realm of human activity challenge conventional types of analyses. Emotions research is indeed hindered by its inherent complexity and elusive nature, so that accessing the phenomena remains difficult. Sturdy's (2003: 81) observation that emotions are 'private, intangible, transient, unmanageable, and even "unknowable" – and is a complex that spans disciplinary divides' indicates the formidable task facing the researcher. Yet, he also adds that aspects can be accessed and made 'known' and that this is important for challenging 'rationalistic and dualistic analyses', also displacing the 'transcendental tradition which has favored mind over body, thinking over emotions . . .' (Sturdy, 2003). Given the issues noted in the prior section and conceptualizing emotion as a key resource enabling 'organizational relationships' to be 'created, interpreted and altered', which Waldron (2000: 73) adds is accomplished 'in part through the language of emotion and the tactical uses of communication to create emotional experiences', the methodological crux of this social/relational perspective requires that we move from self-reported descriptions of what employees felt as stated during interviews to observing/recording how such feelings are linguistically assembled, expressed, acknowledged and reciprocated (or not) during actual *inter*-action. Indeed, as Sturdy (citing Fineman, 1993; Albrow, 1997) notes regarding the use of 'worker and executive autobiographies, narratives and memoirs',

> such accounts are, like those from interviews . . . reveal emotion through recollection, self-censorship (and other forms of censorship) and/or reflections rather than streams of consciousness or 'real time' emotion and feeling . . . others [have] place[d] emphasis on 'capturing emotion in process', through, for example, shadowing and narratives

> based on live dialogue, stories, observations, diary accounts, [and] taped personal musings.
>
> (Sturdy, 2003: 88)

Capturing emotional expressiveness being 'done' there-and-then between organizational members as part of their everyday task-based activities, as proposed here, remains rare. Simply to ask managers or our elites how they effectively convey or 'hide' emotions such as anger or frustration on some matter is immensely problematic. They tacitly *know* the acceptable levels and configurations of emotional display given their shared definition of the context *and* their prior knowledge of each other set alongside their ability to draw upon their personal 'store' of complex knowledges/resources. Essentially, this knowledge includes *knowing how and when to do* emotion (Polanyi, 1967; see also Garfinkel, 1967). It also suggests that an innovative research approach is called for in order to access the interpersonal realm in ways that render aspects of such everyday 'doings' to systematic scrutiny.

An ethnographic approach which places centre-stage recording *lived experience happening* across time/space is proposed here as one basis for making emotion 'knowable' from a sociological perspective (see Sturdy, 2003).[6] The intellectual infrastructure informing this researcher's initial move to include actual recordings of elites' everyday routines *happening* arose from the ethnomethodological (Garfinkel, 1967) and conversation analytical (Sacks, 1992; see also Boden, 1994; Boden & Zimmerman, 1991) traditions in which the interest revolves around members' implicit reasoning procedures, common-sense understandings, ethno 'methods' and so forth to produce social order (Samra-Fredericks, 1994, 1996a). Although there are some broad theoretical and conceptual overlaps with Goffman's (1959/1990, 1967) dramaturgical perspective, each has chosen to investigate the 'interaction order' (Goffman, 1983) in different ways. For example, whereas the founder of ethnomethodology, Garfinkel, placed centre-stage members' tacit background knowledges and reasoning procedures, more explicit attention to members' ethno (folk) 'methods' has been pursued within the conversation analytic (CA) tradition as founded by Sacks (1992) and colleagues (e.g. Sacks et al., 1974). Equally, while Goffman's contribution cannot be easily compressed – see Burns' (1992) review and in the organization studies field, Karreman (2001) – his notion of 'front-stage' performances in which elaborate interpersonal sequences maintain that 'ritually delicate object' known as the individual (Goffman, 1967: 43) is another influence and analytically traceable against Extract 3 here. While this is touched upon only briefly given both space considerations and our specific focus, it could easily be pursued in ways suggested by

Bargiela-Chiappini (2002; see also Samra-Fredericks, 2003) who 'calls' for interdisciplinary research encompassing, for example, linguistics/pragmatics' interest in 'politeness' (Brown & Levinson, 1987) and Goffman's sociological account of 'face-work'.

This intellectual infrastructure, then, provides a foundation for, and points to, a specific 'type' of research. It pivots upon accessing everyday human interaction. Essentially, for CA scholars such as Boden (1990), systematically to scrutinize the 'world as it happens' recording naturally occurring talk-in-interaction is the crucial first step. This is echoed by Silverman (1997) and informed this researcher's efforts to record elites' everyday-and-all-day routines. Miller (1997) and the organization/management studies scholars, Alvesson and Karreman (2000) have also argued for combining the ethnographic and CA traditions (see also Moerman, 1992; Nelson, 1994) in order to discern in a fine-grained fashion how social/economic/political/moral orders are (re)produced. In this researcher's case gaining access to do so took many years of protracted negotiations given the confidential nature of elites' talk-in-interaction. Once this access was finally secured, both observation and audio-recording began. These recordings were then repeatedly listened to again and again, and eventually transcribed (see Samra-Fredericks, 1998, 2004, for details on this process and issues therein).

It is from this basis and allied with associated ethnographic 'components' such as observations recorded in field notes and the collection of company documents (e.g. monthly newsletters, meeting agendas and so on), that a fine-grained analysis of elites' assembly and feeding in of emotional displays to *each other* then-and-there began. Whereas ethnographic field notes usually attempt to note conversations with participants, in this case there was no need to make such notes as a tape-recorder was always 'on'. Hence, the field notes specifically comprised the following: observations of dress, demeanour, gestures, routines/activities, etc.; scribbled asterisks marked any interesting emerging theoretical or conceptual ideas at that time. In the later ethnographies, the field notes included drawings of the layout of the offices/meetings rooms and the physical location of individuals together with 'props' (laptops, mobile phones, etc.) alongside copying down traces of prior talk 'left' on whiteboards and flipcharts and noting any books on shelves or pictures/cartoons on walls.

Although the ethnographic account is necessarily compressed here, it arises from this mix of 'data'. Overall, the fieldwork provides a sense of them as individuals (their interests, goals and so on), their current purposes (what they are doing now and why), alongside an understanding of their biography of prior dealings (what happened yesterday, last week/month). In this way, like these elites, the researcher acquires a 'store' of background

knowledge so essential for interpreting utterances and meaning-making given the indexicality of language (Garfinkel, 1967). Moreover, the detailed transcripts provide that essential basis for backtracking and scrutinizing *how* they make it all happen and one interesting feature which arose was that of 'rhetoric as emotion'. Although the range of theoretical and analytical resources deployed to understand human interaction has varied, Nash's (1989) discursive constituents for 'moving an audience' is proposed here as providing an insightful and robust route for developing our understanding around managerial elites making rhetorical/linguistic 'moves' for moving/emotional displays. It is premised upon the researcher herself having moved 'close' to their everyday routines as described here.

Making rhetorical/linguistic moves for a 'moving' display

The first subsection outlines Nash's contribution with the second moving swiftly onto a concise ethnographic summary before illustrating his schema against three specific extracts.

Rhetoric as emotion

Nash (1989) draws upon the tradition of rhetoric as founded by classical scholars such as Aristotle and observes that one integral basis for persuading others is the ability to express feelings or emotions and evoke corresponding ones in the audience/listeners. In taking Nash's stance of rhetoric as 'an ordinary human competence', some of the 'fearsome' terms originating in classical Greek/Roman scholarship were shown by Watson (1995) to provide for an insightful analysis of what was, for him, a rare and brief recorded exchange between two managers. Rhetoric as emotion was also set aside by Watson given his objectives. In addition, whereas Nash's examples were drawn from literary texts, this article demonstrates and develops its application to verbal interaction. Hence the performative aspect is placed centre-stage for analysis against his schema.

First and foremost, then, rhetorical devices such as verbal rhythm or metaphorical images are only deemed to 'move' us when correlated with 'great themes' or matters of 'empathetic concern' (Nash, 1989: 31). This is the first discursive constituent and from his analysis of literature and poetry, Nash observes that 'themes' such as 'patriotism', 'loyalty',' love', 'death' and so on are passionately and skilfully expressed by his writers (in our case, speakers) to evoke audience/listeners' sympathy. As noted earlier, in the case of the organizational ethnography referred to here, the fine-grained analysis

suggested that the 'great theme' or matter of 'empathetic concern' that evoked others' sympathy was 'survival'. This is further elaborated in the next subsection – 'Ethnographic background'. Integral to this accomplishment were the emotional displays which assisted efforts to index this 'theme' which then involved others in subtle ways.

This takes us onto the second discursive constituent of 'stance' (Nash, 1989: 41). This concerns the 'ethos of the act, the posture, tone and demeanor'. These features are deemed to be essential for convincing others that one is 'not putting on' a 'pretence'. Yet, 'stance' is also the most complex facet of human capability and whose excavation is central to this article. Nash's definition does point to a performative element, indicating how his schema is also applicable beyond literary texts. Indeed, tenor/tone of voice is specifically noted by Nash to convey the speaker's attitude to the 'great theme' and to the audience. Given this, one avenue is to examine the 'rhythmic management of a sequence of phrases' (Nash, 1989: 30) and/or *emphasis* placed upon key words which then frames listeners' attention, illustrated shortly. These are crucial for assembling the emotional domain and thus, one's 'stance'. Yet, it also inevitably gives rise to the rhetorical problem of which device(s) would enable one to 'discharge the desired emotion' so that one's 'stance' is conveyed and the audience/listeners 'sympathies' are evoked. Nash suggests that the two 'companion skills' of 'design' and 'relation', the third and fourth discursive constituents respectively are called for.

Design involves the 'patterning' of the text (for us, the spoken utterance) which Nash (1989: 51) observes has 'obvious affinities with the classical *taxis*' (framework/structure). Here, attention shifts to the syntactic and figurative components that build step-by-step to an 'emotional conclusion'. This aspect is closely tied to the crucial fourth constituent of 'relation' in terms of devices of style and imagery, itself having 'affinities' with classical *lexis*. One core device here *is* that of the 'tropes' or metaphors which can evoke images 'that correlate with, and thereby enhance, the emotions to be expressed or elicited' (Nash, 1989: 51), also illustrated shortly. Arguably, although efforts in combining *taxis* and *lexis* are more consciously undertaken when we are dealing with writing a speech or a literary text, everyday spoken rhetoric is also underpinned by this capability but it remains a split-second affair which *also* resides upon additional and complex sets of tacit skills and knowledges (e.g. knowing when and how to). Moreover, during verbal interaction there is also that crucial involvement of others where no amount of planning or prior rehearsals can envisage and account for their responses. In this light, it is also noteworthy that although each of the four discursive constituents gives rise to four maxims or basic principles, Nash observes that an 'orator' is 'free to depart as the occasion suggests'. Clearly,

when dealing with everyday verbal interaction this alludes to tacit forms of knowing such as 'when to' depart and this remains a split-second affair (as Extract 3 reveals). Briefly, then, the four associated maxims are:

> 1 *Let your matter be broadly empathetic* . . . 2 *Let your stance be direct and uncomplicated* [that is] let your audience be in no doubt that you mean wholeheartedly what you say . . . 3 *Make the design of your text* [talk] *compulsive* . . . to assert, or even impose, a powerful feeling . . . 4 *Let your relation focus powerfully on one or two tropes or 'correlates'*. Never pack your discourse with unrelated images and metaphors. . . . The trickiest of these rules is the maxim of stance which says in effect, 'publish your truth'; for it is possible to be wholly sincere in terms that ring insincerely, and to be quite insincere in language that trumpets sincerity.
>
> (Nash, 1989: 51–3)

One accomplishment derived from rhetorical effectiveness, then, is securing that elusive quality of being taken as 'sincere'.[7] But, when dealing with human interaction, as Nash (1989) observes, matters are never simple. Indeed, the 'speaker whose purpose is to move the deeper emotions of an audience is always at risk' and Nash adds that 'if rightly or wrongly, your audience perceives insincerity, it will no longer oblige you by being moved, however solemn and emotional your matter'. This is the task ahead for a manager/elite looking to persuade others and one which Eddie was deemed to accomplish in ways glimpsed shortly.

Ethnographic background

The task ahead for the researcher is first, how to compress enough ethnographic details to facilitate understanding of the extracts here given space considerations *and* second, how to translate the dynamic, split-second, rich, embodied and lived performative capability spanning both verbal and non-verbal domains of human activity into a *written* research account. Turning to the first issue and taking a pragmatic approach, ethnographic details are kept to a minimum but hopefully provide enough information to contextualize the extracts and appreciate the interweaving of emotionality and rationality and its consequentiality in terms of how it influenced subsequent talk-based routines. Briefly, the company was in the midst of managing a substantial strategic change initiative which, when simply expressed in the 'language' of strategic management, would (hopefully) secure 'competitive advantage'. More specifically, this was to be pursued through growing

'market' share (e.g. from product innovation and enhanced quality standards) and from efficiency gains given their recent capital investments in updating the manufacturing process. The senior management and executive teams routines were observed and recorded across time (approximately 12 months, averaging a day per week) and space (e.g. meetings, personal offices and so forth).

The focus here remains upon how one elite effectively made rhetorical/linguistic moves for a 'moving' display. The extensive analysis of the empirical materials identified 'Eddie' as effectively shaping strategic direction and one noteworthy feature for doing so was deemed to be his assembly of emotional displays. Although clearly a complex process which includes 'knowing when and how to' display emotions appropriately, Eddie did influence his colleagues and in Nash's terms, had evoked their sympathies to the extent that they took actions seemingly preferred by him. In being able to backtrack, it was possible to trace 'how' particular outcomes were realized (e.g. approval/agreement for a proposal, at times crystallizing into 'important' decisions). In this way, a sense of how he swayed listeners was possible. Here, Extracts 1 and 2 are purposefully abstracted from the ebb-and-flow of conversational exchange to provide concise illustrations of when he had secured the floor to make (mini) 'great man' type of speeches which were deemed to have effectively conveyed his stance/feelings in ways which 'moved' others to act. However, recognizing that the listeners' response to a speaker's expressions of impatience/frustration and anger is crucial for ultimately 'completing' and thus constituting the emotion, Extract 3 is reproduced. This third extract illustrates Eddie's split-second turn-by-turn *interpersonal* leveraging of emotional expressiveness to advantage together with how others sought to regulate the emotional terrain when a breach of the 'acceptable' and localized 'norms' or protocols of interaction were perceived to have occurred. In this way, it is hoped that a balance between outlining the scope of a fine-grained rhetorical/linguistic analysis deploying Nash's four discursive constituents (all three extracts) alongside insight into the *inter*personal ebb-and-flow of human exchange (Extract 3) is achieved.

Overall, what we see is a performative capability that defies prescription or any simple declaration of conscious adherence to the four maxims. In conducting the analysis, however, it was difficult to resist attributing to Eddie an 'artful' deployment of the discursive constituents. Yet, careful of implying simple intention or calculation on his part, what can be stated more generally is that to persuade others a speaker would raid their stores of 'knowledges' of which rhetorical/linguistic capability is crucial alongside making split-second judgements regarding appropriateness given the participants/setting in order to aim for their 'target'. Hence, there is always an

element of intention/calculation but not one which seamlessly observes the maxims as Nash notes also. On a more general level, one route for discerning a speaker's broader intentions can arise from undertaking ethnographic fieldwork in which some understanding of their interests and goals is acquired by the researcher, in turn, assisting interpretative efforts. Another more specific analytical route can arise through careful examination of 'devices of affective rhetoric' which let others 'know that you are bent on touching a nerve' (Nash, 1989). Indeed, in the opening extract (discussed shortly), the device of *hyperbole* – "broke my heart" – indicates some intention on Eddie's part to 'touch' 'nerves' while simultaneously speaking a 'language of emotion' (Waldron, 2000). Nevertheless, there are always unintended consequences, not least arising from others' responses to such dramatic claims.

Turning now to the second issue which concerns the translation of an embodied lived performance spanning both verbal and non-verbal elements. Clearly, emotional expressiveness, especially during the conflictual moments when 'tempers' flared, encompasses non-verbal gestures such as frowning, clenched fists, wagging one's finger and so on, alongside those more subtle aspects such as 'clenched teeth'. Although our focus remains upon the spoken element, where such observed features were jotted down in the field notes they either gave rise to noting it in [square brackets] in the transcripts or, as undertaken here, a brief description is provided (Extracts 2 and 3). In addition, given that tone/tempo of voice or inflection/intonation and the placing of *emphasis* upon words at various points and so on are an important component for assembling and expressing emotions, transcription practices aim to translate them into a written format. For example, *italics* indicate emphasis of 'words' and rising intonation is depicted through <u>underlining</u> in the extracts (see Appendix for other transcript conventions).

Now, to glimpse how Eddie combined 'design' and 'relation' set against the subtly voiced 'great theme' of organizational 'survival', while integrally conveying his feelings and thus, expressed emotion ('stance') effectively to sway or evoke the community of listeners' sympathies, three extracts are reproduced.

Speaking emotionally to 'move the audience'

Extract 1 – "broke my heart . . ."

> I think I've said this before at one of these meetings when I (.) it now broke my heart when I joined the company to find *dozens* of

> procedures, practices, manuals which *somebody* in this company *years ago* spent I don't know how long doing and the whole thing has fallen apart 'cause *nobody* maintained them (.). . .

This was one occasion where, in speaking as Eddie does here, the subsequent trajectory of the talk altered and he was deemed to have influenced process by having evoked listeners' sympathies. He made an explicit appeal. It was heard and acted upon in the sense that a set of actions/decisions did *follow* this appeal and its subsequent elaboration. As noted earlier, although such outcomes are difficult to trace directly back to any one utterance/oratory because simple cause–effect relations are discounted, what can be stated is that in consistently speaking in ways glimpsed here and through linking what are ostensibly everyday micro-issues (e.g. manuals not being maintained) to the 'great theme' (discussed shortly, see Extracts 2 and 3 also), alongside displaying emotions such as frustration here (and anger elsewhere; Extracts 2 and 3), Eddie made points that 'stuck' and which then needed to be addressed. Summarizing these subsequent actions in terms of Extract 1, Eddie's department was assigned formal responsibility for producing, maintaining and enforcing procedures laid out in the manuals. To do so, additional human resources were allocated to him to ensure that this was achieved so that "hearts" would not be "broken" in the future. Moreover, as it transpired, others seated around the table were subtly assigned blame for past failures. What these others seemingly *felt* given what was expressed included injustice and frustration as they undertook periodic explanations. Although this latter aspect is not elaborated upon here, given our objectives surrounding this and the next extract, Extract 3 nevertheless provides a glimpse of another speaker's (Martin's) split-second efforts in doing 'explanation' shot through with an emotional 'tinge'.

Returning to Extract 1 then, *why* and *how* was this utterance effective in 'moving the audience' and instigating particular actions? First and on a more general level, and linking us to the 'great theme' or 'empathic matter' of 'survival', the appeal was made to count given Eddie's framing of a 'problem' against the background or known-in-common understanding in which "procedures" and "manuals" form the backbone of 'quality' processes. Simply stated, having spent time/money developing complex processes for attaining Industry Quality Standards, a major problem identified by Eddie "when I joined the company" was that the necessary documentation was not updated against continuous improvement initiatives. Further analytical depth for assigning significance to this uttered 'problem' arises from the background knowledge derived from the ethnographic fieldwork and which concerns their collectively voiced organizational/strategic

'intent' (Hamel & Prahalad, 1989) to increase market share (in X market by Y percent). Like those elites seated around the table and listening to Eddie's appeal, the researcher too has some access to their background meaning systems to assist in interpreting what is *meant* or being inferred alongside what happens next.

In this instance, one route for increasing market share was deemed to be through enhanced quality standards in ways that would differentiate them from their competitors. Indeed, not only were glossy brochures made available to newcomers in 'Reception' outlining progress towards meeting Quality Standards, there was also a company-wide event at which the top two tiers of management attended a day-long audit review session which the researcher observed and recorded too. More specifically, then, in Extract 1 there is an implied and seemingly logical/rational relationship which is as follows: to develop/write "procedures, practices, manuals" takes time and effort; the declared 'fact' that they were not "maintained" must be interpreted as a waste of (scare) resources which; not only implicitly raises questions of inefficiencies and ineffectiveness, but also; prevents the ultimate goal of realizing competitive advantage which links us to the 'great theme' – survival. The spectre of failure compounds the pathos of survival and given that they subsequently allocated resources to Eddie's department following this emotionally laden appeal, it would seem that the listeners were 'moved' to act. In other words, he had evoked sympathy for his expressed 'troubles' here.

We need, however, to take this broad ethnographically embedded description further in terms of *how* Eddie established his 'troubles' as legitimate, prompting the series of actions/decisions. In other words, which rhetorical skills or features did he deploy and combine? The extract concisely illustrates a range beginning with the initial achievement of 'affect' through *aporia*. This, Nash (1989: 128) observes, is one 'common element and strategy in speech-making' dealing with the 'affectation of perplexity' or expression of doubt, here through "I think I've said this before" and "I don't know how long doing". For Nash, there is conscious intention, dealing as he does with written speeches, but here we see its everyday articulation to secure 'affect'. Then, there is *hyperbole* – "broke my heart" – which as a figure of speech consists of an exaggerated statement and deemed to be purposefully used to express strong feelings or to 'produce a strong impression' (*New Shorter Oxford Dictionary* definition). As a basic human experience routinely represented in extravagant terms, 'hearts are broken' usually through the actions of *others*. Thus the appeal is strengthened as it is on behalf of someone else – the "somebody" whose efforts have gone unrewarded by the "nobody". A moral highground is subtly constructed. This use of 'contrast' – "somebody" versus "nobody" – has also been deemed to

be an important component in the speeches of charismatic leaders (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996) and here it achieves expansionary 'effect'.

Another repeatedly identified feature deployed by such leaders (Hartog & Verburg, 1997) is the 'list of three' (see also Atkinson, 1984 regarding politicians' talk). Here there is "procedures, practices, manuals". Importantly, Nash (1989) notes how such listings provide a 'rhythmic structure' enhancing the rhetorical device of 'style'. Although written texts can capture this aspect too, it is the spoken performative capability which arguably fully utilizes the auditory reception of 'rhythm'. This is also the case in listening to 'somebody/nobody' and alongside tone and intonation (indicated through italics and underlining), in this instance *and* when taken together, it assisted the assembly of this fairly dramatic 'appeal'. In other words, Eddie constituted his 'stance' of frustration and despair around the 'somebody's' efforts going to waste. Further links to the 'great theme' also subtly surface through his emphasis upon "*dozens*", which highlights this as being not just one isolated instance but a series of lapses. Thus, Eddie consolidates his 'stance' against the 'great theme' of organizational 'survival' which is ostensibly jeopardized here through inefficient resource allocation and waste.

In terms of the companion skill of 'design', the patterning of this utterance arguably pivots upon the *hyperbole* of "broke my heart" as one waits to see how Eddie will legitimate this purposeful expression of strong feelings aiming (we assume) to evoke this community of listeners' sympathies. This apparently strategic use of language aiming to 'move' others (persuade) does have a long tradition as Nash (1989: 50) observes when Anthony warns his Roman audience that

> "if you have tears, prepare to shed them now" . . . [and thus] among the common devices of affective rhetoric is that of letting your hearers know that you are bent on touching a nerve.

In declaring that it "broke my heart" Eddie can also be seen as marking out his intention to touch a 'nerve'. Equally, it is one simple example of a speaker's routine referral to their 'subjective states' during their naturally occurring talk-and-task-based routines which Waldron (2000) labels as the 'language of emotion'. Extract 2 elaborates further.

Extract 2 – "you'd give a damn great drill . . ."

In Extract 2,[8] Eddie's repetition of "worried" (l. 1) can also be interpreted as alerting others to his intention to touch a 'nerve'. These others, then, listen and make a judgement of its legitimacy based upon Eddie's performance of

'worry' (emotional display) in this setting at this time. Significantly, the additional emphasis on the second speaking of "*worried*" also highlights the use of the rhetorical device of *epizeuxis* (Nash, 1989: 115) defined in the *New Shorter Oxford Dictionary* as the 'vehement or emphatic repetition of a word'. Its use is also apparent in Extract 3 – ("go ask"[9]). Here the swift shift from "I am worried about" (l. 1) to "we've gone and done" (l. 2) provides the means for entering into the 'doing of worry' and *phonetic figuration* and (masculine) *metaphor* use are two other crucial rhetorical devices which assisted his expression of exasperation/frustration verging on anger.

Eddie *so* but for that I'm not worried what I am *worried* about is that what we've gone and done you know that little drill you got at home that you used to put against your chest and do this [mimes use of drill] to drill holes in something
5 *well* would you give a riveter one of those to build battleships?(.) no you *bloody well wouldn't* you'd give a *damn great drill* that would *poww wow poww wow* and that's what we've done () we've *given* a riveter who's building battleships one of them (.) that's what we've done
10 **Martin** e:: [:r [quietly]
Eddie [at the back of a little PC with small volume usage fine no problem if someone had given me that printer to put on the back of a PC in my office ideal application but *not* for secretaries for heavy duty non-stop printing

Full transcription conventions are given in the Appendix. In addition to those given in note 1, here we see: [indicates points of interruption and e::r which indicates an elongated sound.

At ll. 8–9, "we've done/we've given/we've done" is a form of *parison* combined with *anaphora* (Nash, 1989: 113) to give the 'effect' of 'sequence and comparison'. As 'powerful figures of rhetoric' these constructions occur in pairs or threes where *parison* provides for an 'even balance of clauses, syllables in a sentence' and *anaphora* 'the repetition of the same word or phrase in several successive clauses' (*New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* definition). In employing this 'mix', there is again a rhythmic element. Significantly too, the employment of "we" not only draws attention to their collective responsibility as a senior management 'body' and hence, indexes their institutional identities (Drew & Sorjonen, 1997), but it can also be seen as a route for *involving* others in his 'troubles' and thus it paves the way to evoke their sympathies. We also witness here one of the most commonly known rhetorical devices, the rhetorical question (ll. 5–6). Those that require

no answer are termed *erotema* and are contrasted with *anthypophora* (Nash, 1989: 129) in which a 'dialogic response' follows as seen here. It is, of course, all intricately combined with rising intonation and *emphasis* to convey his feelings on the matter, that is, his 'stance' of frustration/exasperation verging on anger. As the associated maxim declares 'let your stance be direct and uncomplicated [that is] let your audience be in no doubt that you mean wholeheartedly what you say'. Noting this as the 'trickiest maxim' leads Nash to contend that one needs to 'publish one's truth' so that language 'trumpets sincerity'.

Whereas in written speeches/texts this can be carefully constructed and then rehearsed to secure a (hopefully) perfect delivery, here we see its everyday manifestation again. It is where, for example, the tone of voice with *emphasis* upon selected words and the pivotal "no you bloody well wouldn't" left no one in doubt regarding Eddie's strong feelings on this matter – he 'publishes' his account of the 'truth' as he sees it. Moreover, his worry was performed while tying it to a rhetoric of rationality which again connected to the 'great theme'. Simply stated, it was where inappropriate equipment *means* ineffective task completion and inefficiencies that can ultimately put organizational 'survival' at risk. In this fashion, Eddie invested emotionally laden efforts to evoke their sympathies. Furthermore, integral to any such achievement is the need to deploy a 'device' which needs to be 'precise . . . a momentary force that will work on [others]' (Nash, 1989: 41) so that they cannot 'resist' the speaker's claims. Metaphor provided that essential device or 'aesthetic technique' here with its inherent 'turn of meanings' based upon 'substitution or transference' giving 'access to otherwise evasive ideas . . . perceptions' (Nash, 1989: 145).

The literature on metaphors in organizations consistently notes the use of vivid imagery (usually of a religious or military type suggesting connections to the 'great themes' of salvation or war) which is said to strike an emotional 'chord' in others. What it does not highlight is the essential and integral component of delivery or style which takes us onto matters to do with voice and rhythm, as indicated earlier, together with gestures or posture, discussed shortly. In their study of three international business leaders' speeches (such as Roddick of The Body Shop), Hartog and Verburg (1997: 361) rightly proposed that metaphor was a linguistic device which 'provokes identification and commitment among listeners'. It is where the likeness of two things are proposed through metaphor use, yet,

> often things . . . are very unlike each other. They are used for vividness, clarification, or to *express certain emotions*. Metaphors can serve to interpret or illustrate reality . . . [they] *appeal to various*

> *senses* of the listener, they *engage emotion*, intellect, imagination and values.
>
> (Hartog & Verburg, 1997: 364, emphases added)

Metaphorical expressiveness resides upon a tacit and skilful representation of ideas and issues in selective language, also noted shortly. But what remains neglected in much of the literature, then, is an understanding of this rhetorical device in terms of what Hartog and Verburg (1997) refer to as 'the way in which one communicates' such as 'friendly, dominant' and 'delivery' which *must* include tone of voice for expressing such feelings and emotional involvement. This cannot be explored by Hartog and Verburg as their analysis is also based upon written records of speeches made by leaders. Although this applies to Nash's examples too, he nevertheless identifies 'stance' as a crucial aspect and alludes to its performative basis. Indeed, to consider further this aspect alongside the rhetorical/linguistic features already noted and the ways the transcript accounts for other elusive facets such as tone/tenor, there is also the issue of 'posture' or gestures which were observed by the researcher and, if noteworthy, were jotted down in the field notes made at the time. In this instance, what was briefly noted was that Eddie was leaning across the table and that the 'drill' sound was accompanied by gestures mimicking the 'idea' of a "damn great drill". Visually it was like a gun pressed against his chest and when activated (i.e. when he makes the drill sound) his hands, arms and upper body vibrated. When this is all taken together, a basis from which to trace, for example, Eddie's effective combination of both imagery (metaphor) and performative capability (delivery) is possible. Both were essential features assisting the articulation of his 'stance' or feelings on the matter.

Overall, then, the *taxis* or 'design' of this utterance pivots upon packing his talk not with 'unrelated images and metaphors' (*lexis* or 'relation') which Nash warns us of in the associated maxim. Instead, there is a step-by-step elaboration of vivid imagery (metaphor) staged via the rhetorical question and his immediate response closely followed by *phonetic figuration* including the sudden mimicking of the noise of a drill. Such sequencing carried the listeners *and* the researcher through both an emotional performance and a rational accounting process. To what extent he undertook this with conscious intention/calculation is not easily settled. Clearly, to speak effectively the metaphor there has to be the selection of key words or lexemes which resonate with this community of listeners. This requires a form of knowledge derived from their shared biography of prior dealings to which the researcher has also been partly exposed. Here, the current setting is a manufacturing company and most of them had previously

worked in heavy engineering companies. Hence, little drills, riveters, battleships, damn great drills, heavy duty and so on were all ostensibly familiar items which, when taken together, evoked strong masculine and unambiguous 'mental pictures' engaging their 'intellect' and making 'identification' possible (incidentally, all the elites/listeners here, excluding the researcher, were males).

In this way, a complex accounting procedure which aimed to legitimate the worry given the opening and explicit reference to this speaker's subjective state was undertaken. Given this (arguably appropriate) metaphor selection to which his listeners could relate, then perhaps we can tentatively ascribe some 'intent' to Eddie in his efforts to 'touch a nerve' and hence, 'move' (emotionally engage) his listeners. This metaphor's further 'appeal' to the immediate senses was, without doubt, accomplished through speaking of the "damn great drill that would powwwow powwwow" – and thus the auditory senses were activated, strengthening the imagery evoked. It is difficult to transcribe this sound but easy to imagine the loud and piercing sound of a 'great drill'. In this setting, Eddie's mimicking was unexpected and loud, and as one of the listeners, the researcher found it was captivating and imaginative too. Eddie, then, *appears* to have acutely observed Nash's maxim of 'let your relation focus powerfully on one or two tropes or "correlates" ' where you must 'never pack your discourse with unrelated images and metaphors'. Of course, it is unlikely that he had access to this schema and there is nothing in his 'background' to suggest that he had been 'trained' in formal/classical oratory enabling swift selection and combination of these 'constituents'. What this analysis does point to, however, is the value of Nash's schema in terms of rendering such everyday rhetorical flourishes to closer inspection once they have been observed, recorded and then transcribed.

Extract 3 develops the 'what-happened-next' aspect, but before moving on, other noteworthy features in Extract 2 include, once again, 'contrast' (Atkinson, 1984; Hartog & Verburg, 1997). Here, it is between "little drill" and "damn great drill" and related to the overall imagery, there was also *simile*, which is another figure of speech involving the comparison of one thing with another of a different kind. Here, the imagined situation facing the "riveter" (secretary), a work-placed skilled craftsperson who builds not just ships, but "battleships" is likened to someone dabbling in DIY at home. Eddie speaks for the 'secretary' whose current 'printer' is like the 'little drill' and so totally inappropriate for "heavy duty" work. Again, it is noteworthy that he legitimates his emotional appeal as being on behalf of someone else (like the "somebody" in Extract 1) which arguably adds further 'force', as in speaking for others who are absent, or silent or powerless – the secretary

– a moral 'high-ground' is constructed. This apparent moral prompt, couched in rational, but nevertheless aesthetically engaging terms, works to legitimate his display of emotion here as well as constitute a reality in which someone had failed the secretary/riveter who could not perform their craft effectively. In this way, he presents himself as someone who is morally bound and thus legitimately emotionally 'moved' by this failure to do something and in speaking as he does, seeks a corresponding response in others to 'act'. This 'call' for support was difficult to refuse given the rhetoric of rationality linking us to the great theme of 'survival' as noted earlier. It is in this manner that a wholly rational point was shot through with emotions of frustration/exasperation verging on anger, while simultaneously being articulated in such an aesthetically engaging fashion. Although Martin begins to speak at l. 10, he takes the floor hesitantly which may simply be due to uncertainty on his part regarding an appropriate response to Eddie's emotional display. Cueing into this hesitation may also have prompted Eddie to seize the moment again where he interrupts to restate further the basis of his worries leaving no one in doubt regarding his stance/feelings on the matter.

When such emotionally laden performances consistently and effectively warrant or legitimate the speaker's concerns and issues, then, he can be deemed to 'trumpet [] sincerity'. We return to this issue of discerning Eddie's sincerity in the concluding section but emphasize at this stage that constituting 'sincerity' is not accomplished through one single speech event (Nash, 1989) or one emotional or moving performance. Consistent and persistent efforts are called for. Indeed, shortly after investing the interpersonal effort witnessed in Extract 2, Eddie was prompted to provide further warrant for his feelings of exasperation and worry as evidenced in Extract 3. This third extract also explicitly illustrates the split-second positioning of self and others for regulating and constituting an effective emotional display. Hence, the response element or relational dynamics which completes and regulates 'the emotion' is now analytically traced.

Extract 3 – ". . . absolute crap . . ."

Extract 3 takes us onto consideration of the interpersonal ebb-and-flow of emotions management where others intervened to regulate and thus, in their responses, signal both recognition of and constitution of the emotion (anger). Furthermore, in this instance, they attempted to establish acceptable boundaries for doing anger. Once again, we see the 'language of emotion' marking out an intention to 'touch a nerve' but this extract aims to develop explicitly our understanding around those occasions when emotion as a 'barometer of moral and relational ethics' is stretched and then re-calibrated to a

speaker's advantage. While sensitive to making overly ambitious claims here, the discussion of Extract 3 also substantiates and tentatively develops Goffman's (1967) seminal account into the nature of human interaction. He suggests that individuals are fragile or 'ritually delicate', thus inviting elaborate moves/techniques to 'repair' perceived breaches or 'mishaps' arising from 'inappropriate tone/pitch, unmet gestures' and so forth, so that the relational ebb-and-flow is maintained.[10] It is where Goffman (1967: 43) also observes the inherent and fundamental role of communication, where

> [w]hat the person protects and defends and invests his feelings in is an idea about himself, and ideas are vulnerable not to facts but to communication . . . for communication can be by-passed, withdrawn from, disbelieved, conveniently misunderstood, and tactfully conveyed.

It is easy to envisage that such communications would give rise to feelings prompting a mosaic of emotional displays. Indeed, when confronted with an explicit attack on another's 'face' which 'anger' entails (and as glimpsed in Extract 3), then 'ideas' about the 'self' are risked and minor mishaps can easily spiral into potentially damaging interpersonal collisions. Collaborative interventions to repair and re-establish the basic protocols of human exchange are called for and discerned in Extract 3.

This extract has been condensed for reasons of space and although numerous noteworthy features surface alongside perhaps a broader interest in the ethnography, our focus must remain upon emotional expressiveness. Here, attention is directed to the rhetorical devices and utterance design features that assisted the positioning of listeners into 'temporary emotional roles' and which also positioned them to be 'receptive' to the beginnings of a 'redemptory argument' (Nash, 1989; here at ll. 26–8). Furthermore, for the duration of this intense exchange the field notes made at the time observed both direct eye contact between Eddie and Martin and the MD and no hint of a relaxed posture among them. Indeed, both Eddie and Martin seemed to be perched on the edge of their seats. Are they posed for flight or fight? In this setting and for these individuals there was limited possibility for flight. Instead, it was where fight translated into an intense verbal parrying:

	Eddie	well three pages a minute for a modern printer is *absolute crap!* [brief pause] [I know that a lazer printer would
	Martin	[ah we we Eddie you
	Eddie	[produce it far far [inaudible word]
5	**Martin**	[should you you Eddie I I appreciate that and I'm aware of it the question whether we need it or not I

mean if you're looking at *my* case (.) I was thinking with

. . .

Shortly after . . .

[[interrupts]

10 **Eddie** [well what's worrying me is we're being driven by let's keep the cost *down* instead of what's most *appropriate* for the job with a vision of what we're gonna use it for for the future=

MD =yeah well part of the problem maybe no one's actually told

15 him what we want

Eddie *go ask*!

MD ah=

Martin =well =

Eddie =*go ask*=

20 **MD** =well I thought [[inaudible word]

Martin [actually to be fair Eddie in this case and I an e::r I think when *we* spoke about the particular problem the problem was *very* clear (.) we could

A minute or so later . . .

25 [[interrupts]

Eddie [I just think that we've gone the *wrong* way and what we've done is we've taken a cheap option that we will *bitterly* [regret in the not too [distant

Martin [just [yeah

30 **Eddie** future=

Martin =hang on Eddie [I think he eeee what we do

Eddie [and

33 **Martin** in the future is is accepted as being questionable=

The full transcription convention is given in the Appendix. New symbols here are: = indicates immediate latching between prior and next utterance.

Once again, there is the simple prefacing of subjective states with the 'language of emotion', here – "what's worrying me" (l. 10) and later "bitterly regret" (l. 28). The latter expression may also be interpreted as an instance of *hyperbole*. Such 'states' may be variously elaborated upon, justified and defended given others' responses. Here, the claim that the "printer is *absolute crap*" (ll. 1–2) and then shortly after, "well what's worrying me" (l. 10) again indicates this speaker's intent to touch a 'nerve'. In these opening lines a blunt assessment of another's (primarily Geoff's, who remains silent for these two minutes of talk) decisions to purchase particular equipment is simply "*crap*".

This directness results in a noticeable pause. Couched in such strong feelings how can others respond to such an assessment?

To agree or disagree with the 'crapness' of the printers is called for, but both are 'positions' that would give rise to feelings of discomfort in others. Indeed, given that the response of others is important for legitimating and thus constituting the emotion of anger being expressed here, it is noticeable that we have a 'brief pause' which was unusual. What follows is that both Eddie and Martin begin to talk at the same time (ll. 2 and 3) and on reading what transpires (ll. 5–7, 21–4) discomfort appears to trigger Martin's *doing* of *explanation* as a way of managing and mitigating Eddie's emotional outburst. Martin is hesitant and uses indirect forms. He explicitly refers to Eddie by name four times (ll. 3, 5, 21 and 31) and adds "I appreciate that", "I'm aware of it", "if you're looking at *my* case". This use of "I" and "my" signals the taking-up of a personal perspective and responsibility for what is being stated against a 'we/our' which would convey a different positioning altogether. In this way, he moves to personalize the encounter as opposed to one imbued with institutionality (which Eddie does). Yet this talk does not diffuse the situation and calm Eddie, who does not seem to accept the basis of Martin's explanation. What happens then is that both Martin and the MD (ll. 14–15, 17, 18, 20, 21–4) endeavour to regulate the emotional crescendo that is building. In responding as they do they signal their recognition or 'reading' of the emotion 'anger' *and* thus complete or constitute it even though they also attempt to downplay or question its legitimacy (e.g. l. 21). Nevertheless, they are prompted into performing 'temporary emotional roles' (Mangham, 1986) in their efforts to calm this 'worked up' colleague. While fine-grained analysis of the relational web was purposefully set aside in Extracts 1 and 2, here we see it being stretched given the emotional outburst and it is noteworthy that Martin and the MD begin their utterances with the discourse marker, "well" (ll. 14, 18, 20).

Ostensibly a trivial linguistic resource, 'well' fulfils its pragmatic function to mitigate forthcoming dissonance (Schiffrin, 1987) and it is in such intricate ways that a fundamental moral order as a background expectancy is observed. Here too we can theoretically link such 'polite' linguistic forms with Goffman's (1967) notion of 'face' (Samra-Fredericks, 1996a, 2003; see also Bargiela-Chiappini, 2002). Indeed, it is through such subtle interpersonal efforts that speakers try to re-calibrate their moral and relational obligations to each other. In this way too, a route for witnessing and tracing that elusive interpersonal process where emotion has been likened by Waldron (2000) to a 'barometer' that measures and paces 'moral and relational ethics' can be opened up to scrutiny. Overall, what Martin and the MD *do* is try to regulate the emotional–relational tempo that was

building and through performing such collaborative moves (as on other occasions in the empirical materials) they managed 'face' issues (Goffman, 1967) because interpersonal collision was a strong possibility given Eddie's expression of anger. More specifically, at l. 21 Martin interrupts the MD's "well I thought" (l. 20) and begins with a noticeably stronger opening through "actually to be fair". In this way, the perceived breach of the localized moral order was further explicitly marked. In other words, Martin implies that Eddie is unfair and by inference, the emotional display of anger unwarranted. This response 'warns' of inappropriateness but it does not ignore the display of anger and hence, Martin is effectively positioned to take up a role which aims to mitigate and re-calibrate the relational realm.

In this case, Martin invests interpersonal effort to take some of the responsibility or blame given Eddie's emotional expressiveness around the original purchasing decision given his "case" (ll. 7 and 22). Can we go so far as to interpret Martin's utterances as the everyday assembly of empathy? What can be tentatively proposed is that this is one empirical illustration of what Fineman (1997: 19) terms the 'anticipation' of 'guilt' which 'cues and defines moral matters'. This can explain their efforts to intervene as well as reduce the anger 'felt' by another through this diffusion of blame. Yet, although Martin and the MD undertake such roles their efforts seem wasted as it continued to fuel expression of Eddie's anger at what he 'felt' were technically flawed and short-term decisions (subsequent exchanges substantiate this comment too).

Having opened with – "well what's worrying me" (l. 10), initially prefaced with the mitigating discourse marker "well" (and at l. 1 earlier), we see that this is noticeably absent in Eddie's subsequent and repeated "go ask" (ll. 16 and 19). Imagine a 'well' before each "go ask". Arguably, it is the notable absence of such basic mitigating linguistic resources that assisted Eddie's efforts to perform anger and that breached the basic protocols of human interaction which were cued into given what Martin and the MD 'do'. We also see here employment of the rhetorical device of *epizeuxis* (ll. 16 and 19) – the repetition of a word with emphasis and which prompts both the MD and Martin to 'latch on' (signaled by =) in their efforts to re-calibrate the spiraling emotional crescendo. As noted earlier, although Martin attempts to explain, justify and thus defend Geoff (ll. 21–4, and continues but not reproduced here) at l. 26, Eddie interrupts with a mitigated but still assertive account – "I just think . . ." but what he expresses is what he feels (as also noted elsewhere in relation to other empirical materials; Samra-Fredericks, 2003).

Further consideration of Eddie's utterance here (ll. 26–8, 30) and the twin discursive constituents of 'design' and 'relation' reveal the use of *parison*

with *anaphora* which again subjects listeners to a rhythmic and step-by-step process. Indeed, together with the earlier "we're being driven" (l. 11) he rhythmically consolidates his 'stance' through, "we've gone the wrong way . . . what we've done is we've taken" and thus, he appears to move his listeners towards his eventual direct and passionate expression, "*bitterly* regret" (ll. 26–8). As in Extract 2, "we" indexes a relational terrain that explicitly invokes their collective organizational identity as well as aiming to involve them in his 'trouble'. Furthermore, this rhythmic pattern is based upon a re-occurring syllabic structure just like "somebody" and "nobody" in Extract 1. The message is that they, that is, others – given this 'stance' (which sets him apart from them), should not have "gone" and "done" that. Indeed, going the "wrong way" (evaluative) and taking the "cheap [negative connotations] option" as one that "we will *bitterly* regret" is difficult to counter. One final feature to note before summarizing the links to the 'great theme' and subsequent 'outcomes' concerns this exchange's *taxis* of successive parts as spoken by Eddie. Specifically, we see four points of intensification – at ll. 1–2, 10, 16 and 19, and 26–8. The first three build the emotional crescendo with the fourth providing the initial speaking of a 'redemptory argument', which itself relies upon this prior positioning of others to *feel* discomfort and become involved so that they are then receptive to what is said at this fourth point of intensification where "bitterly regret" is spoken. It is in such intricate ways that this speaker did effectively consolidate a situation where others' sympathies were evoked.

There can be no doubt in the listeners' minds what Eddie's feelings are on the matter and in expressing them in this way, he did influence subsequent process. But equally, to evoke others' sympathies he once again needed to link it to the 'great theme' of 'survival'. Here to state the obvious, "crap" equipment will never yield that goal of realizing advantages over the competition. It is slow (inefficient) and will only be a source of much emotional turmoil (bitterly regret) in the future. More explicit linkages surface through "vision" and references to the "future" (ll. 12–13, 30). This draws our attention to their shared in-common forms of knowledges where such nebulous notions (including, competitive advantage) furnish a complex background of systems of meanings which are indexed in equally complex and subtle ways. Indeed, it is interesting to observe that as elites leading/shaping strategic direction, communicating the "vision" even among themselves, let alone to others, as proposed by Westley and Mintzberg (1991), demanded ongoing efforts such as these. Indeed, what the "vision" *means* required persistent interpretive efforts to render it meaningful given their current situational relevancies. Here, it is where "crap" printers risk the realization of sought-after futures and in terms of what transpired, the earlier

decision to purchase further equipment was overturned. This led to particular individuals (e.g. Geoff) expressing a diffuse set of concerns and anxieties during subsequent encounters. In particular, the analysis suggested that he sought to dislodge ascriptions of blame, yet, in providing explanations and justifications later (integrally also expressing emotions), he inadvertently constituted the 'blame'.

Concluding comments

Although Extracts 1 and 2 were purposefully abstracted from the surrounding ebb-and-flow of human conversational exchange, the objective was to indicate concisely the ways Nash's four discursive constituents can provide an insightful route for the analysis of those routine occasions where the floor was effectively secured in ways that swayed listeners and where emotional expressiveness was deemed to be one key 'resource'. Through reproducing Extract 3, the aim was to add further empirical and analytical texture in terms of elites' interpersonal collaborative efforts to display emotions and navigate acceptable emotional boundaries. As Waldron (2000: 75) comments:

> Fear. Enthusiasm. Pride. Sympathy. Anger. Delight. Envy. These and other emotions must be detected, manufactured, elicited and controlled as ordinary working relationships are enacted.

When we turn to the everyday interpersonal elicitation, manufacture and detection of such emotions, a complex and taxing lived experience is discerned. The issue of tacit forms of *knowing* around what is an appropriate level of emotional display and how to 'do' it during the split-second ebb-and-flow of human exchange demands the sorts of interpersonal dexterity undertaken by the MD and Eddie and Martin as glimpsed in Extract 3. Although the transcribed/written words can never fully capture the experienced on-the-spot spoken sentiment, feelings or emotions, it is hoped that the article indicates how a greater sense of the intricate and fragile nature of how these facets are 'detected' or 'manufactured' as everyday phenomena can be rendered more amenable to fine-grained analysis. In this fashion too, the ways in which emotion is like a 'barometer' that measures and paces 'moral and relational ethics' can be glimpsed. For example, in Extract 3 both the MD and Martin appeared to 'detect' and then sought to regulate the emotional tempo so that an ethics is preserved. Although there are numerous other features within this strip of interaction, we begin to glimpse how they

sought to 'pull off' a collective emotional performance when another's 'face' was explicitly attacked. Furthermore, while the emotional crescendo instigated by Eddie at l. 1 in Extract 3 was collaboratively regulated by others, his ability to 'do' rhetoric as emotion (and as glimpsed across all the extracts) did enable him to influence subsequent processes. Although space limitations meant that the ethnographic account was condensed here, it is hoped that there is enough background material to contextualize the extracts and discern a sense of outcomes/consequentiality.

One question which arises though is: was Eddie 'insincere in language that trumpets sincerity'? Was he manipulative, playing political games? Are the emotions expressed 'truly' felt? From a sociological and ethnographic basis, the researcher, like the community of listeners (his fellow elites) subjected to such emotional displays over time, builds a picture of this speaker in terms of what 'moves' him (is right/wrong, good/bad) or consistently concerns or worries him and thus, what sort of person he is. From this basis, a judgement is made whether or not to trust his emotionally imbued accounts. It is where any attribution of sincerity is not accomplished from one isolated moment of great oratory where ethos and pathos are seemingly assembled but from successive occasions where speakers aim consistently to convey their feelings on matters ('great themes') in ways which evoke the sympathies of others. These others can always choose to trust or challenge the expression of emotions as being feigned or insincere based upon their experience. In this case, this did not occur and Eddie was deemed to have been 'taken' as sincere. Equally, an interesting observation is that perhaps his language 'trumpet[ted] sincerity' through legitimating his emotional displays as being prompted on behalf of others. Here, there are others who are absent ("somebody", Extract 1) and/or who are less powerful ("secretaries", Extract 2) or less knowledgeable (Martin/others and slow printers).

Given this form of analysis, we can extend Shotter's stance that an 'argument is settled by the giving of good reasons' as one also settled by the giving of good emotional performances. An essential point is that what these elites '*felt today*' or are made to feel given, for example, mini 'great man' type of speeches as witnessed in Extracts 1 and 2 or the emotional outbursts as seen in Extract 3, is what matters. Indeed, it was on the basis of current feelings and emotional displays, shared/reciprocated, negotiated and legitimated, that future actions were envisaged and decisions crystallized. Even if some of our elites seated around the table had doubts about trusting Eddie's emotionally imbued (mini) speeches or accounts, the fact that such doubts were not expressed meant that Eddie had influenced process at that moment in time. Moreover, what we also cannot fail to observe is that such an

analysis begins to reveal the way speakers may be granted interpersonal leverage and thus exercise that elusive concept, power. In other words, it is an approach that acutely observes that power exists within networks of relations (Foucault, 1980; Gergen, 1992; see also Alvesson, 1996; Samra-Fredericks, 1997) and is deployed in such complex ways and instantiated at points of *human* contact. An integral facet, then, is where emotional expressiveness 'done' in the right way at the right time can grant interpersonal leverage.

Eddie's improvization there-and-then did get the rational, emotional, moral and relational 'job done', and whereas the themes highlighted by Nash in his analysis of literary works include love, defeat, triumph and death, in this setting, at this time, for this particular set of individuals, the *ethos* of their age furnishes a sensibility which elevates 'survival'. In this case, our orator Eddie, articulated a *localized* rhetoric of rationality (around maintaining quality standards/appropriate equipment for the 'job'/visions inadvertently giving way to costs) – which links to the great theme in complex and subtle ways as indicated here. Moreover, it necessitated his employment of devices such as *hyperbole*, metaphor use, *epizeuxis* and so on, *and* at the right time and in a particular fashion (design). Simultaneously, to constitute effective performative delivery, it required the tacit skill of placing emphasis on key words, deploying rhythmic contrasts, phonetic figuration and so forth.

Clearly, such forms of 'knowing' defy prescription and the objective here was not to make statements regarding what would constitute effective emotional performative capability (see also Fineman's, 2000 critique of EI literature here). The intention was to understand the complexity surrounding, in this case, elites' use of a range of interpersonal rhetorical/linguistic resources and forms of knowledge, *combined* during the ebb-and-flow of conversational exchange to assist the effective (or not) articulation of a rational and emotional terrain at that time. Hence, although the analysis notes, for example, the need for appropriate metaphor selection to strike effectively an emotional chord, the research approach also makes us keenly aware that rhetorical effect is accomplished when allied with 'style' or a performative capability that revolves around tone of voice, rhythmic patterning and so forth alongside forms of knowing which defy easy distillation. This would include forms of knowledge about other 'ritually delicate' person(s) who constitute the relational webs within which we are suspended.

When set against the generation of the sorts of ethnographic and detailed empirical materials reproduced here, this article opens up a route that demonstrates how Nash's framework provides further insight into theorizing emotionality as inextricably intertwined with rationality. Further

research capturing everyday orators in 'real time' making those rhetorical/linguistic moves for a moving (emotional) display, as outlined here, would add to our understanding of the intricate nature of everyday *human* organizing behaviour. In this way too, we can begin to answer those two crucial questions posed by Fineman (1993) and also meet Sturdy's (2003) call to challenge rationalistic and dualistic analyses. It is also an approach which not only substantiates Goffman's (1959/1990, 1967) seminal work into the intricate nature of human interaction, but also indicates how we can further extend and learn more about his 'interaction order' (Goffman, 1983). Equally, in terms of 'leaders' or strategists and what they 'do', the level and scope of the research glimpsed here enables us to scrutinize, for example, *how* Westley and Mintzberg's (1991) strategic leaders would seek interactively to weave and perform both logic and emotion in 'real-time' or, from getting close to George's (2000) leaders, actually expose the formidable task they face as they endeavour to influence and manage the emotional terrain.

In outlining this route for the fine-grained analysis of 'real-time' emotions being 'done' from a sociological perspective, the article (researcher) also acutely recognizes that when dealing with emotionality, one obvious challenge is how to translate the embodied lived moment into a written account. Having recorded such 'lived' moments, transcription practices allied with the ethnographic component briefly touched upon here are the best this researcher can do, but at conferences she has played parts of the tapes in order to convey the 'essence' of what we are dealing with. As the conversation analytic scholar Boden (1994) observed, even when undertaking research which records naturally occurring talk and the subsequent generation of detailed transcripts, there is still that sense of 'you had to be there'. A similar point is made by Fox (1990) with regard to humour in which he asserts that writing about it is like 'trying to put humpty dumpty together again'. Indeed, humour conceptualized as another crucial facet of our humanity, and which in contrast to frustration and anger generates potentially positive spirals of emotion, remains a fruitful line of enquiry for future efforts.

Another research avenue which serendipitously arose during one of two recently completed ethnographies was where a female vice president's everyday routines were observed/work-shadowed and recorded. Here, her expression of anger has been tentatively analysed as being a particularly risky venture due to the routine ascriptions of women as being 'just' or more emotional or, their 'upsets' being dismissed as due to "that time of the month" when this would not be the case for men and certainly was not for Eddie. The gendered nature of doing emotional displays warrants attention. Indeed, this article could only mention in passing the use of masculine

metaphors which would open up further analytical routes for understanding organizational members' (men/women's) richly textured and densely packed interpersonal rhetorical/linguistic moves for a moving (emotional) display. Clearly, to do so requires that you and I continue to move that much closer to their everyday doings.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the following people: Stephen Fineman and Tony Watson for their comments on an earlier version of this article and the three anonymous reviewers whose comments ranged from 'the challenging' to exuding 'warmth' which in turn evoked a spectrum of feelings within me. Special thanks to Associate Editor Rob Briner to whom I was assigned.

Notes

1 *Italics* indicate emphasis; underlining indicates rising intonation; and (.) indicates a brief pause – see Appendix for full transcription conventions.

2 I am grateful to one of the reviewers who made this observation.

3 'Talk-in-interaction' is a 'term' arising from within the conversation analytic tradition (see, for example, Psathas, 1995).

4 Interestingly, Nash's universals of 'war' and 'death' can also be said to stalk these literatures.

5 Here, as rightly observed by one of the reviewers, the issue of 'cultural embeddedness' arises. This must frame any analysis of human interaction and in this case we need to note that we are dealing with a group of White men in a UK company.

6 What is sought, however, is not some 'truth' about elites' feelings and physical states but an understanding of how they do emotionality and its consequentiality. It is where, from having been there throughout their typical day, this week, next week and so forth, the researcher also acquires a deeper understanding of their 'biographical/cultural history' and their 'physical' state on the day of the fieldwork where 'fatigue' (problems noted by Sturdy, 2003 for those undertaking emotions research) may be experienced. Knowing that an elite had returned from a business trip in the early hours of the morning would, for example, provide an ethnographic backdrop to the fine-grained analysis of their talk-based routines if he (and it was usually a 'he') seemed more tired perhaps prompting the irritation or distraction witnessed.

7 Elsewhere, the researcher has scrutinized Habermas' (1979, 1984) theory of communicative action in which one of four validity claims that speakers make on listeners concerns the expression of ones' subjective states in terms of feelings and dispositions in order to meet the claim to be sincere. This theoretical and conceptual overlap serves to strengthen the analytical route being forwarded here. Indeed, in both Nash's and Habermas' schema, then, the obligation to be sincere or truthful is deemed to be assisted through emotional expressiveness. In other words, emotional expressiveness is one 'resource' available to these elites in their efforts to secure interpersonal leverage and integral to this is the assembly of the relation of being taken as sincere (Samra-Fredericks, 1996b, 2000).

8 Their discussion around the 'printer' capability both here and in Extract 3 may be

seen as bordering on the trivial, especially as they are meant to be elites shaping strategic direction. However, such talk can be made strategically significant (Samra-Fredericks, 2003). Indeed, even this talk about the output quality of a printer was tied to the great theme of survival as glimpsed here, enabling Eddie to establish 'facts' around the incompetence of others which prompted a series of strategic decisions. The point is simply that life is 'made up' of minor moves with sometimes profound and (unintended) consequences.

9 While not drawing upon Nash's schema or centralizing the 'doing' of emotion, the significance of both repetition and *emphasis* can be seen to assist speakers' efforts in influencing process within other empirical materials (e.g. Samra-Fredericks, 2003).

10 I am grateful to one of the reviewers for discerning the links to Goffman prompting this minimal re-introduction having been edited out in an earlier draft as the article expanded beyond 'reason'. It remains a brief, but nevertheless essential, reference here.

References

Albrow, M. *Do organizations have feelings?* London: Routledge, 1997.

Alvesson, M. *Communication, power and organization.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996.

Alvesson, M. & Karreman, D. Taking the linguistic turn in organizational research. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 2000, *36*(2), 136–58.

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

Ashkanasy, N.M. & Tse, B. Transformational leadership as management of emotion: A conceptual review. In N.M. Ashkanasy, C.E.J. Hartel & W.J. Zerbe (Eds), *Emotions in the workplace*. New York: Quorum Books, 2000.

Atkinson, M. *Our masters' voices. The language and body language of politics*. London: Routledge, 1984.

Austin, J.L. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981. (Original published, 1962.)

Bargiela-Chiappini, F. Face and politeness: New (insights) for old (concepts). *Journal of Pragmatics*, 2002, *35*, 1453–69.

Barry, D. & Elmes, M. Strategy retold: Towards a narrative view of strategic discourse. *Academy of Management Review*, 1997, *22*, 429–52.

Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. *The social construction of reality.* London: Penguin, 1967.

Boden, D. The world as it happens: Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *Frontier of social theory: A new synthese*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

Boden, D. *The business of talk*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.

Boden, D. & Zimmerman, D.H. (Eds). *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Brundin, E. & Melin, L. Unfolding the dynamics of emotions in strategizing: How emotion drives or counteracts change activities. Paper presented at the 19th EGOS Colloguium, 2003.

Bryman, A. *Charisma and leadership in organizations.* London: Sage, 1992.

Burns, T. *Erving Goffman*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Calori, R. Epistemological critique of orthodox models of strategic management. *Organization Studies*, 1998, *19*, 281–306.

Chia, R. From modern to postmodern organizational analysis. *Organization Studies*, 1995, *16*(4), 579–604.

Chia, R. Discourse analysis as organizational analysis. *Organization*, 2000, *7*(3), 513–18.
Cornelius, R.R. *The science of emotion. Research and tradition in the psychology of emotion.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1996.
Drew, P. & Sorjonen, M.L. Institutional dialogue. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction. Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, Vol. 2. London: Sage, 1997.
Dulewicz, V. & Higgs, M. Can emotional intelligence be measured and developed? *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 1999, *20*, 242–53.
Dulewicz, V. & Higgs, M. Emotional intelligence – A review and evaluation study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 2000, *15*, 341–72.
Echardt, C., Narlander, B. & Deffenbacher, J. The assessment of anger and hostility: A critical review. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 2002, *9*(1), 17–43.
Eisenhardt, K.M. & Zbaracki, M.J. Strategic decision making. *Strategic Management Journal*, 1992, *13*, 17–37.
Elias, N. *The civilizing process. The history of manners and state formation and civilization*, Vols 1 and 11 (E. Jephcott, trans.). Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
Fairhurst, G.T. & Sarr, R.A. *The art of framing: Managing the language of leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1996.
Fineman, S. (Ed.). *Emotion in organizations*. London: Sage, 1993.
Fineman, S. Emotion and management learning. *Management Learning,* 1997, *28*(1), 13–25.
Fineman, S. Emotional arenas revisited and concluding reflections. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations*, 2 edn. London: Sage, 2000a.
Fineman, S. Commodifying the emotionally intelligent. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations*, 2 edn. London: Sage, 2000b.
Foucault, M. *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. Brighton: Harvester, 1980.
Fox, S. The ethnography of humour and the problem of social reality. *Sociology*, 1990, *24*(3), 431–46.
Gardner, W.L. & Avolio, B.J. Charismatic leadership, a dramaturgical perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, 1998, *23*, 32–58.
Garfinkel, H. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1967.
George, J.M. Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 2000, *53*, 1027–55.
Gergen, K. Organisation theory in the post-modern era. In M. Reed & M. Hughes (Eds), *Rethinking organization*. London: Sage, 1992.
Giddens, A. *New rules of sociological method*. London: Hutchinson, 1976.
Giddens, A. *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis*. London: Macmillan, 1979.
Giddens, A. *The constitution of society.* Oxford: Polity Press/Blackwell, 1984.
Goffman, E. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990. (Original published 1959.)
Goffman, E. *Interaction ritual. Essays on face-to-face behaviour*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967.
Goffman, E. The interaction order. *American Sociological Review*, 1983, *48*, 1–17.
Goleman, D. *Emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury, 1996.
Gowler, D. & Legge, K. The meaning of management and the management of meaning: A view from social anthropology. In M.D. Earl (Ed.), *Perspectives on management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
Habermas, J. *Communication and the evolution of society*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1979.
Habermas, J. *The theory of communicative action. Reason and the rationalization of society,* Vol. 1. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984.
Hamel, G. & Prahalad, C.H. Strategic intent. *Harvard Business Review*, 1989, *May–June*, 63–76.

Hartog, D.N.D. & Verburg, R.M. Charisma and rhetoric: Communicative techniques of international business leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1997, *8*(4), 355–91.
Hearn, J. Emotive subjects: Organizational men, organizational masculinities and the (de)construction of emotions. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations*. London: Sage, 1993.
Hochschild, A.R. *The managed heart: Commercialisation of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
Hochschild, A.R. Preface. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organization*. London: Sage, 1993.
Holman, D. & Thorpe, R. (Eds). *Management and language*. London: Sage, 2002.
Hopfl, H. & Linstead, S. Passion and performance: Suffering and the carrying of organizational roles. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations*. London: Sage, 1993.
Hopfl, H. & Linstead, S. Introduction. Learning to feel and feeling to learn: Emotion and learning in organizations. *Management Learning*, 1997, *28*, 5–12.
Karreman, D. The scripted organization: Dramaturgy from Burke to Baudrillard. In R. Westwood & S. Linstead (Eds), *The language of organization*. London: Sage, 2001, pp. 89–111.
Kotter, J.P. *The general managers*. New York: Free Press, 1982.
Mangham, I.L. *Power and performance in organizations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
Mangham, I.L. Emotional discourse in organizations. In D. Grant, T. Keenoy & C. Oswick (Eds), *Discourse + organization*. London: Sage, 1998.
Miller, G. Toward ethnographies of institutional discourse: Proposal and suggestions. In G. Miller & R. Dingwall (Eds), *Context and method in qualitative research*. London: Sage, 1997.
Mintzberg, H. *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
Mintzberg, H. Crafting strategy. *Harvard Business Review,* 1987, *65*, 66–75.
Moerman, M. Life after CA: An ethnographer's autobiography. In G. Watson & R.M. Seiler (Eds), *Text in context*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992.
Nash, W. *Rhetoric, the wit of persuasion*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
Nelson, C.K. Ethnomethodological positions on the use of ethnographic data in conversation analytic research. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 1994, *23*, 307–29.
Newton, T. An historical sociology of emotion? In G. Bendelow & S. Williams (Eds), *Emotions in social life: Social theories and contemporary issues*. London: Routledge, 1998.
Pettigrew, A. On studying managerial elites. *Strategic Management Journal,* 1992, *13*, 163–82.
Polanyi, M. *The tacit dimension*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967.
Psathas, G. *Conversation analysis, the study of talk-in-interaction*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1995.
Quinn, J.B. *Strategies for change: Logical incrementalism*. Homewood, IL: Irwin, 1980.
Sacks, H. *Lectures on conversation*, Vols 1 and 2 (edited by G. Jefferson). Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
Sacks, H., Scheloff, E. & Jefferson, G. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 1974, *50*, 696–735.
Samra-Fredericks, D. Talking change and changing talk. Paper presented to the Standing Conference on Organizational Symbolism, Calgary, Canada, 1994.
Samra-Fredericks, D. The interpersonal management of competing rationalities – A critical ethnography of board-level competence for 'doing' strategy as spoken in the face of change. Unpublished PhD, Brunel University, 1996a (access denied).
Samra-Fredericks, D. Talking of emotion for the development of strategy in the boardroom. In C. Combes, D. Grant, T. Keenoy & C. Oswick (Eds), *Organizational discourse: Talk, text and tropes*. London: KCM Press, 1996b.
Samra-Fredericks, D. The exercise of power in the boardroom when face-meets-face. Paper presented to the British Sociological Association, University of York, 1997.
Samra-Fredericks, D. Conversation analysis. In G. Symon & C. Cassell (Eds), *Qualitative methods and analysis in organizational research*. London: Sage, 1998.

Samra-Fredericks, D. Speaking validity claims to shape strategic direction. Paper presented to the International Conference on Organizational Discourse, Kings College, London, 2000.
Samra-Fredericks, D. Strategizing as lived experience and strategists' efforts to shape strategic direction. *Journal of Management Studies* [Special Issue], 2003, *40*, 141–74.
Samra-Fredericks, D. Talk-in-interaction. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research*. London: Sage, 2004.
Schiffrin, D. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
Serle, J. *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
Shotter, J. *Conversational realities: Constructing life through language*. London: Sage, 1993.
Silverman, D. The logics of qualitative research. In G. Miller & R. Dingwall (Eds), *Context and method in qualitative research*. London: Sage, 1997.
Smircich, L. & Morgan, G. Leadership: The management of meaning. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 1982, *18*, 257–73.
Sturdy, A. Knowing the unknowable? A discussion of methodological and theoretical issues in emotion research and organizational studies. *Organization*, 2003, *10*, 81–105.
Turner, J.H. *A theory of social interaction.* Maldon, MA: USA Polity Press, 1988.
Waldron, V.R. Relational experiences and emotion at work. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations*, 2nd edn. London: Sage, 2000.
Watson, T.J. *In search of management, culture, chaos & control in managerial work*. London: Routledge, 1994.
Watson, T.J. Rhetoric, discourse and argument in organizational sense-making: A reflexive tale. *Organization Studies*, 1995, *16*, 805–21.
Watson, T. & Harris, P. *The emergent manager.* London: Sage, 1999.
Westley, F. & Mintzberg, H. Visionary leadership and strategic management. In J. Henry & D. Walker (Eds), *Managing innovation*. London: Sage, 1991.
Westwood, R. & Linstead, S. (Eds), *The language of organizations*. London: Sage, 2001.
Willmott, H. Postmodernism and excellence: The de-differentiation of economy and culture. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 1992, *5*, 58–68.
Wittgenstein, L. *Philosophical investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.
Zajonc, R.B. Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. *American Psychologist* 1980, *35*, 151–75.

Appendix

Transcription symbols (simplified)

[signals interruption
(.) signals a brief pause of less than a few seconds (does not conform to conversation analytic method)
[square brackets**]** contain references to names of people, financial figures, products, etc. *or* the transcriber is unsure of exact word spoken *or* notable non-verbal gestures
E::longated sound
= signals immediate latching on, no pause
Italic signals emphasis
underlining signals rising intonation

Dalvir Samra-Fredericks is a lecturer at Nottingham Business School at the Nottingham Trent University. Prior to this, she worked at Aston Business School and was awarded her PhD from Brunel University. Her research interest is in managerial elites/strategists 'real-time' and everyday talk-based interactive routines constituting tasks, self/other and that entity commonly known as 'organization'. She has published in *Corporate Governance: An International Review, Journal of Management Studies* and *Management Learning*. Current research is exploring the interpersonal construction of identities, humour and 'magic'.
[E-mail: dalvir.samra-fredericks@ntu.ac.uk]