

The Pragmatics of Executive Coaching

Eva-Maria Graf



John Benjamins Publishing Company

The Pragmatics of Executive Coaching

Pragmatics & Beyond New Series (p&BNS)

ISSN 0922-842X

Pragmatics & Beyond New Series is a continuation of *Pragmatics & Beyond* and its Companion Series. The New Series offers a selection of high quality work covering the full richness of Pragmatics as an interdisciplinary field, within language sciences.

For an overview of all books published in this series, please see
<http://benjamins.com/catalog/pbns>

Editor

Anita Fetzer
University of Augsburg

Associate Editor

Andreas H. Jucker
University of Zurich

Founding Editors

Jacob L. Mey
University of Southern
Denmark

Herman Parret
Belgian National Science
Foundation, Universities of
Louvain and Antwerp

Jef Verschueren
Belgian National Science
Foundation,
University of Antwerp

Editorial Board

Robyn Carston
University College London

Thorstein Fretheim
University of Trondheim

John C. Heritage
University of California at Los
Angeles

Susan C. Herring
Indiana University

Masako K. Hiraga
St. Paul's (Rikkyo) University

Sachiko Ide
Japan Women's University

Kuniyoshi Kataoka
Aichi University

Miriam A. Locher
Universität Basel

Sophia S.A. Marmaridou
University of Athens

Srikant Sarangi
Aalborg University

Marina Sbisà
University of Trieste

Paul Osamu Takahara
Kobe City University of
Foreign Studies

Sandra A. Thompson
University of California at
Santa Barbara

Teun A. van Dijk
Universitat Pompeu Fabra,
Barcelona

Chaoqun Xie
Fujian Normal University

Yunxia Zhu
The University of Queensland

Volume 303

The Pragmatics of Executive Coaching
by Eva-Maria Graf

The Pragmatics of Executive Coaching

Eva-Maria Graf

Alpen-Adria Universität Klagenfurt

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

DOI 10.1075/pbns.303

Cataloging-in-Publication Data available from Library of Congress:
LCCN 2018051715 (PRINT) / 2018054161 (E-BOOK)

ISBN 978 90 272 0245 1 (HB)

ISBN 978 90 272 6272 1 (E-BOOK)

© 2019 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Company · <https://benjamins.com>

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	IX
Transcription conventions	XI
CHAPTER 1	
Coaching and linguistics: An introduction	1
1.1 Setting the stage	1
1.2 Outline of the book	8
Part I. Executive coaching: Concepts, contextualization and analysis	
CHAPTER 2	
Executive coaching	15
2.1 Contexts	15
2.2 Process	23
2.3 Participants	29
CHAPTER 3	
Emotions and Emotionally Intelligent Coaching	33
3.1 Emotional intelligence and Emotionally Intelligent Coaching	33
3.2 Emotions in late modern society	37
3.3 Discursive co-construction of emotions	41
CHAPTER 4	
The Basic Activity Model of executive coaching	49
4.1 Theoretical framework	49
4.1.1 Coaching as activity type and discourse type	49
4.1.2 Coaching as an interaction frame	53
4.1.3 Coaching as professional and institutional discourse	57
4.2 Methodological framework	60
4.2.1 Integrative discourse analytic framework	60
4.2.2 Data collection and analysis	64
4.2.3 The issue of double competencies: The role as discourse researcher and coaching practitioner	67
4.3 Transition from 'phases of coaching' to 'basic activities of coaching'	69

Part II. Emotionally Intelligent Coaching: A theme-oriented linguistic description

CHAPTER 5

► Defining the situation 75

- 5.1 Establishing the coaching realm 78
 - 5.1.1 Offering drinks 78
 - 5.1.2 Discussing seating arrangements 80
 - 5.1.3 Offering and using tissues 81
- 5.2 Methodological and procedural framing of coaching 85
 - 5.2.1 Explaining methods and/or procedures (of Emotionally Intelligent Coaching) 85
 - 5.2.2 Sketching out the thematic scope 100
 - 5.2.3 Differentiating coaching from therapy 104
 - 5.2.4 Integrating clients' experience with coaching or other intervention formats (such as emotional intelligence training) 107
 - 5.2.5 Negotiating the individual definition of coaching 110
- 5.3 Temporal framing of coaching 115
 - 5.3.1 Arranging dates for next meeting(s) 115
 - 5.3.2 Temporal framing of the individual session 118
 - 5.3.3 Discussing the length of the coaching engagement 121
- 5.4 Summary – 'Defining the situation' 123

CHAPTER 6

► Building the relationship 127

- 6.1 Establishing the roles and identities of 'coach' and 'client' 130
 - 6.1.1 Negotiating knowledge and expertise 130
 - 6.1.2 Clients' self-presentation 137
 - 6.1.3 Coaches' self-disclosure and personal topics 142
- 6.2 Negotiating hierarchy in an asymmetrical relationship 146
 - 6.2.1 Establishing an asymmetrical-hierarchical relationship 147
 - 6.2.2 Establishing an asymmetrical-non-hierarchical relationship 150
- 6.3 Topicalizing the coach–client dyad within the triadic coach–client–organization relationship 153
 - 6.3.1 Addressing trust and performativity 154
 - 6.3.2 Addressing financial, organizational and (pre-)diagnostic aspects 158
- 6.4 Summary – 'Building the relationship' 163

CHAPTER 7

▶	Co-constructing change	165
7.1	Diagnosing	169
7.1.1	Eliciting and presenting the concern	169
7.1.2	Exploring the concern and defining the goal	178
7.1.3	Mapping the current state	184
7.2	Intervening	186
7.2.1	Practicing mindfulness	187
7.2.2	Processing the concern on the intra-personal level	190
7.2.3	Re-enacting concrete situations	195
7.2.4	Processing the concern on the inter-personal level	206
7.2.5	Linking the intra-personal and inter-personal level	213
7.3	Securing transfer	219
7.3.1	Developing transfer practices	219
7.3.2	Corroborating learning and development	223
7.4	Summary – ‘Co-constructing change’	226

CHAPTER 8

▶	Evaluating the coaching	229
8.1	Evaluating clients’ change as regards their goal(s)	231
8.1.1	Evaluating clients’ change on the inter-personal level	231
8.1.2	Evaluating clients’ change on the intra-personal level	235
8.1.3	Evaluating clients’ change on the inter-personal level with their coach	246
8.1.4	Corroborating clients’ reported change	251
8.2	Evaluating the coaching interaction	256
8.2.1	Evaluating methods and procedures	256
8.2.2	Evaluating the relationship between coach and client	263
8.3	Summary – ‘Evaluating the coaching’	270

CHAPTER 9

	Executive coaching – A hybrid and interdiscursive professional format	273
9.1	Coaching as activity type	274
9.2	Coaching as discourse type	279
9.2.1	Executive coaching: The discourses of power and equality	281
9.2.2	Executive coaching: Between therapeutic and managerial discourse	285
9.2.3	Executive coaching: Between discourse and meta-discourse	290

	References	295
--	-------------------	------------

	Index	319
--	--------------	------------

Acknowledgements

This book would have been impossible without the help and support of many people.

First of all, I want to thank Ingeborg and Thomas Dietz and their clients for making this study possible in the first place by allowing me access to their sensitive and emotionally challenging coaching work. The Austrian Science Fund (FWF) supported this project for three years with an Elise Richter *Habilitationsstipendium* and, among other things, financed the transcription of more than 100 hours of authentic coaching data.

As regards discussing, amending and refining my ideas and analytic categories, my grateful thanks go to Ina Pick, Yasmin Aksu, Monika Wastian, Marlene Sator, Joanna Pawelczyk, Florian Schulz, Alexander Onysko and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy, as well as to many coaching colleagues who commented on my work on various occasions.

A very special ‘thank you’ to Helen Heaney for her fast and thorough translating and proof reading as well as her helpful comments, to Elke Brandner and Melanie Fleischhacker for their wonderful work on and with the transcripts and to Johanna Lalouschek for being by my side from beginning to end and for her empathic, supportive and constructive feedback on the whole book.

My best friend Christiane Hunstein is responsible for the good looks of the original manuscript, but much more than that, she accompanied me through very difficult times at certain points in the project. Thank you!

And finally, my deepest thanks go to Lisl Graf for her eternal optimism and Thomas Maisel for preparing breakfast, taking me for walks, making me laugh when I felt like crying and for so much more...

Karlsfeld, September 2018

Transcription conventions

Transcription conventions (cGAT) (Schmidt et al. 2016)

Minimal transcription (no capital letters, no apostrophe, no dash, no diacritic signs)

CO	coach
CL	client
(.)	micro pause
(0.35)	measured pause
°er °eer °eēr	inhaling
ea° eaa° eaa°	exhaling
latching	weren_t
back channeling	hm
[word]	overlap
()	sequence / word hard to understand
((unintelligible))	unintelligible sequence
((laughs))	non-verbal action

Coaching and linguistics

An introduction

1.1 Setting the stage

The issue of a definition in coaching is one which has been actively explored in the literature A host of papers have considered the question, some focusing on reviewing previous definitions, others offering new definitions. This activity reflects the immature nature of the domain and the desire to delineate boundaries and mark out territory for coaching being a different and distinctive intervention to other organizational interventions such as mentoring, career counseling, appraisals and feedback. (Passmore, Peterson and Freire 2013: 1)

This monograph is the first book-length description of executive coaching from an applied linguistic perspective, based on the analysis of authentic coaching data. It is a pioneering endeavor to define the discourse of coaching or – in Stober and Parry’s words – to linguistically determine “what makes coaching unique” (2005: 13). Coaching is a buzz word in the modern business world, yet unlike other forms of professional and institutional discourse such as doctor-patient interaction or psychotherapy, this relatively recent, yet booming organizational helping profession has so far not been the object of systematic linguistic research. Linguistically speaking, coaching is still more or less unknown territory. In view of the extensive linguistic or discourse-analytic dedication to professional and institutional communication,¹ this is rather surprising as the very profession of coaching is constituted

1. Qualitatively analyzing the communicative characteristics of professional discourse has long been a core interest in discourse and conversation analysis, interactional sociolinguistics and related fields (e.g. Drew and Heritage 1992; Sarangi and Roberts 1999; Candlin 2002; Candlin and Sarangi 2011; Koester 2006, 2010; Schnurr 2013 and Schnurr and Zyats 2017). Unlike coaching, other types of professional and institutional discourse have thereby been extensively analyzed (for health-care communication see e.g. Mishler 1984; Ainsworth-Vaughn 1998; Neises et al. 2005; Heritage and Maynard 2006; Lalouschek 2008; Brünner 2011; Sator 2011; Spranz-Fogasy 2014 and Hamilton and Chou 2017; for psychotherapeutic talk see e.g. Labov and Fanshel 1977; Wodak 1986; Gale 1991; Ferrara 1994; Peräkylä et al. 2008; Pawelczyk 2011; Scarvaglieri 2013; Marciniak et al. 2016; Voutilainen and Peräkylä 2016 and Voutilainen et al. 2018; for counseling talk see e.g. Nothdurft et al. 1994; Peräkylä 1995; Silverman 1997; Vehviläinen 1999; Habscheid 2003; Muntigl 2004; Hutchby 2007 and Pick 2015; for studies on language and discourse in

in language, too. Yet, besides representing unknown territory from a linguistic perspective, the helping format coaching itself is somewhat ill-defined. Despite its rapidly growing application and acceptance, it has not yet been fully standardized from a professional perspective. As such, an exploratory and systematic investigation into the linguistic and discursive morphology of executive coaching should be illuminating and timely for the area of linguistics and the practice of coaching alike. To this end the book provides micro-level detailing to macro-level theorizing about discourse and interaction practices in executive coaching with a strong focus on the practical relevance of its findings.

Coaching as helping professional practice helps individuals to tackle non-pathological life situations and problems with a strong focus on business-related issues. It rests on the application of professional skills and methods that originate in other professional formats such as psychotherapy, counseling and management consulting. Unlike more problem-oriented encounters such as psychotherapy, where these skills and methods help to unfold and understand problematic issues (predominantly) from the past, in coaching their application is solution-oriented, with an explicit focus on future development and an (underlying) organizational benefit. Moreover, unlike more directive contexts such as management consulting, the application of these skills and methods in coaching ideally fosters the clients' capacity to help themselves. The relationship between coach and client is idealized as one of co-operation and equal standing, with the coach being responsible for the process and the client being responsible for the content of their interaction. This conceptualization of the coach, not as a diagnostic expert but as a process facilitator, co-expert and sparring partner, is found across a variety of newer counseling formats that all show an underlying humanistic orientation towards client empowerment, self-reflection and re-evaluation of emotions. The coach-client relationship is theorized as an open, trustful coalition that allows for the verbalization of honest feedback on the part of the coach and less-dominant discourses on the part of the client.

Coaching is both a linguistic, i.e. language-based, and a social phenomenon: both dimensions of coaching mutually influence each other and, as such, one dimension cannot be explored and satisfactorily explained without the other. To capture this multi-dimensionality, coaching is approached here as a discursive event or discourse. According to Fairclough (1992: 4), "(a)ny discursive 'event' (i.e. any instance of discourse) is seen as being simultaneously a piece of text, an instance of discursive practice, and an instance of social practice". In other words, coaching as

organizations and management settings see Habscheid 2003; Spranz-Fogasy 2003; Schulz 2013, Schulz and Staeyart 2014 and Illie and Schnurr 2017. Finally, for helping professions in general see e.g. Graf et al. 2014; Pick 2017; Graf and Spranz-Fogasy 2018a and Graf et al. under review).

discourse or as a discursive event simultaneously spreads out on the textual level, the level of discursive practices and the level of social practices:

A discourse is a way of signifying a particular domain of social practice from a particular perspective. [...] We assume a dialectical relationship between particular discursive practices and the specific fields of action (including situations, institutional frames and social structures) in which they are embedded: on the one hand, the situational, institutional and social settings shape and affect discourses, and on the other, discourses influence discursive as well as non-discursive social and political processes and actions. (Wodak 2001: 66; transl. EG)

As a linguistic practice or phenomenon, the ‘discourse of coaching’ refers first of all to the concrete communicative interaction in which the participants, i.e. coach and client, engage and through which the very action of coaching is constituted. This “text as action” perspective regards discourse as a particular way of acting and interacting linguistically (cf. Fairclough 2003: 17). An analytic focus on this micro-level dimension of discourse is the necessary prerequisite for extracting the discursive techniques or practices that constitute a particular type of discourse (Fairclough 1992, 2003), broadly defined as specific manifestations of language form in their interactional contexts (cf. Sarangi 2000: 1). While this textual level of coaching is the starting point for the linguistic analysis here, the primary focus lies on carving out the underlying and recurring discursive practices that help define coaching as a proper discourse type.

As a social practice or phenomenon, the ‘discourse of coaching’ refers to the multiple meanings that are bestowed on coaching as a professional helping format and organizational intervention in late modern (Western) society. Coaching embodies the postmodern ideal of “living and working in a communication culture” (Cameron 2000) and a therapeutic culture (Furedi 2004), both of which stress the importance of a reflexive and emotionally competent and open self (Giddens 1991; Illouz 2007, 2008). Although the primary focus of this investigation is on communicative interaction in executive coaching, i.e. at the level of its discursive practices, a critical and fruitful discussion of any kind of professional interaction hinges on a consideration of the larger socio-cultural discourses and contexts in which the particular discourse is embedded and which, as such, mold the professional discourse. In the current analysis, the ‘discourse(s) of executive coaching’ is (are) therefore understood and analyzed primarily on two levels, the complex of which interrelation is vital for an understanding of the local and the global dimension of coaching (cf. Candlin 1997: viii). Thus, firstly, ‘discourse’ is interpreted as part of a larger socio-cultural practice in the sense of representing, creating and distributing knowledge, attitudes and ideologies (cf. Lalouschek 2005b: 59ff; see also van Dijk’s (2001) “discourse-cognition-society triangle”). Secondly, ‘discourse’

is interpreted as a linguistic practice in the concrete sense of a particular communicative event and in the sense of ‘discourse type’, characterized by a particular pattern of recurring and endemic discursive practices. This approach allows for a critical assessment of how society or, to be more precise, socio-cultural fashions frame and are replicated in the local communicative practice of coaching as talk and text must be considered part of social practice (cf. Potter 1996: 37). While executive coaching is indeed experienced as emancipatory and empowering by clients, it represents a professional format and organizational intervention that focuses on the clients’ personal benefits on a surface level and their organizational benefits on a deeper level: despite its unquestioned creation of a reflexive space for clients to learn (more) about their motives, emotions and attitudes, this gain in self-reflection, self-awareness and self-guidance on the part of the client is (often) functionalized for greater organizational purposes such as optimizing performance, smoothing out problematic emotionality or pre-empting burn-out (as part of what Schulz and Steyaert (2011) term “happy productive worker discourse”). A critical, systematic assessment and discussion of this double benefit as it emerges locally in in-situ coach-client interaction have not been attempted so far (but see Schulz and Graf (2011) on fashioning emotions in soft capitalism and Graf (under review) on the double functionality of change).

While the practice literature on coaching largely provides affirmative and idealized intervention models coupled with invented sample dialogues, this linguistic project applies a communication and discourse perspective on coaching (Sarangi 2002b; Sarangi and Candlin 2011) and investigates coaching as a process-oriented discursive practice. It works with authentic coaching data and strives for the practical relevance of its findings (cf. Roberts and Sarangi 1999: 475). As such, the book is positioned at the interface between applied linguistic analysis and the activity of coaching, coupled with its structuring professional theory. The study represents an interprofessional research site (see e.g. Roberts and Sarangi 2003; Sarangi and Candlin 2011; Alessi and Jaccobs 2015) aiming to contribute to the solution of social and institutional problems. To this end, the research foci are “real phenomena” and not “intellectual fabrications” (Dörnyei 2007: 39) that result from a joint problematization and perspective alignment between discourse research and the practice of coaching:

Such perspective alignment in which discourse researchers verify their interpretations against the participants’ theories of practice brings a double benefit. On the one hand participants can become reflexive about their practice while discourse researchers can challenge their own theories which may not always be data-driven.

(Sarangi 2002b: 127)

Yet, due to the fickle state of coaching, both from a linguistic and a practical perspective, the project contains aspects of basic research coupled with an applied focus. i.e. for coaching “a kind of ‘application oriented basic research’ is needed, where disciplines [...] take up a certain still diffuse practical issue, define it as a problem against the background of their respective theoretical and methodological paradigms, study this problem and finally develop various application oriented suggestions for solutions” (Knapp and Antos 2011: vi) (see also Sarangi and Candlin 2011). To this end, the book presents a linguistic model for the micro-level analysis and description of executive coaching as discourse type and activity type. As “(a)t the surface level, a given professional account will have identifiable linguistic features, which are not only durable, but also legitimate and authoritative” (Sarangi and Roberts 1999: 15)”, carving out recurrent linguistic and interactive categories that capture the particular communicative features and discursive norms characteristic of coaching fulfills both linguistic and practical goals:

Linguists will gain important insights into a relatively recent, yet pulsating and internationally relevant discursive domain; they can further elaborate their understanding of professional and institutional discourse in the context of a new language game. In addition to broadening its theoretical knowledge of helping professional discourse, linguistics can prove its practical relevance in addressing and solving real-world, communication-related problems: Given that “institutional and professional action is constituted in language/activity” (Sarangi 2004: 145), applied linguists can act as discourse experts and discourse consultants in the professional development of coaching. By shedding a communication and discourse perspective on this developing type of professional interaction, linguists can contribute to the endeavor of the coaching business to become more academic and to professionalize its field. Linguistic insights into the character and layout of the underlying discursive patterns add a missing and indispensable perspective to a better understanding of coaching as professional conversation. Given that the question of its professional status (see e.g. Lane et al. 2018 on *The Future of Coaching as a Profession* or DBVC 2012) is among the “real phenomena” that are currently affecting the coaching market, these discursive patterns can play an important role in the professionalization debate of coaching, both in delineating coaching’s “shared habitual practices” (Sarangi and Roberts 1999), in setting up qualification and accreditation processes for future coaches and in assessing the quality of coaching in the sense of best practice. Insights into the discursive layout of coaching interactions then contribute to the theoretical and methodological underpinning of coaching and help promote the coaching practice.

A related question or “real phenomenon” that is currently moving the coaching market (and coaching research, too) concerns gaining insights into the ‘black box coaching’ (Galdynski and Kühl 2009; Ianiro and Kauffeld 2011). *The Pragmatics of*

Executive Coaching strives to critically assess, amend or further detail the models and assumptions concerning the work of coach and client as (theoretically) expounded across the abundant coaching practice literature. It thus complies with the general demand for more (systematic) research on coaching (Möller and Kotte 2011; Kotte et al. 2015; Fillery-Travis and Cox 2018) in order to lay the academic grounds for an ‘evidence-based coaching’ instead of a ‘belief-based coaching’ as currently represented in most coaching practice literature (cf. Stober and Grant 2006; de Haan et al. 2010; Grant 2017a). The dominating research paradigm in the little existing research on coaching is involved in quantitatively assessing the efficacy of coaching interventions in the context of outcome or impact research via pre-and post-interviews, goal-attainment scales, etc. (Künzli 2009, in prep; Grant 2013; Theeboom et al. 2014; Greif 2017). However, voices are growing louder that knowing about ‘what’ happens or works in coaching is not enough; instead, we need to investigate into the ‘how’ of coaching:

In order to understand the impact and contribution of executive coaching and other organizational consulting interventions, it is not enough to just understand general effectiveness or outcome. One also has to inquire into and create an understanding of the underlying coaching processes themselves, from the perspective of both clients and coaches. (De Haan, Bertie, Day and Sills 2010: 110)

The primary aim of process research, whether in the context of psychotherapy, coaching or other counseling formats, is defined by McLeod (2003: 163) as “identifying process variables that make a difference to outcome. Indeed, the ultimate purpose of process research is to make a contribution toward the increased effectiveness of counselling and psychotherapy”. While organizational psychologists such as Theeboom et al. (2014: 14) acknowledge the importance of shifting attention from ‘does coaching work?’ to ‘how does coaching work?’ in their recent meta-analysis on the effects of coaching, the role of qualitative discourse-based process research to sensitize practitioners to the interactive richness of coaching has also been recognized recently by leading coaching practitioners such as Jonathan Passmore (in his 2011 article with Annette Fillery-Travis). This applied discourse-analytic research on executive coaching is located in the emerging field of coaching-process research (see also Schulz 2013 and Deplazes 2016 from a psychological perspective; Geißler 2017 and Wegener 2017 from an educational perspective; Wegener et al. 2017 from an interdisciplinary perspective and Graf 2018 from a linguistic perspective) that helps to spell out the ‘how’ of coaching instead of the ‘what’ as is tackled in the context of outcome research, based on the insight that “(c)ounting numbers is not enough, qualitative counts too” (Grant 2017b). As such this book contributes to a firm theoretical framework to identify the underlying mechanisms and processes which help answer how coaching works in Theeboom et al.’s (2014) sense and also

unravels the interactive richness in coaching for the purpose of sensitizing coaching practitioners in Passmore and Fillery-Travis's (2011) sense.²

To this end, this book presents the Basic Activity Model of Executive Coaching. This advanced, action-based model for the analysis and description of executive coaching has emerged from of a case study that applied a phase-model on one exemplary coaching process from the corpus (Graf in press). The relational dynamics and interactional complexity as well as the thematic and communicative loops of executive coaching thereby evinced that executive coaching cannot be satisfactorily captured in such a phase model. The current, innovative model, developed with the help of an Integrative Discourse Analysis (see e.g. Pawelczyk 2011), centers on what the participants do, instead of when the participants do something. It builds on four basic activities, i.e. 'Defining the Situation', 'Building the Relationship', 'Co-Constructing Change' and 'Evaluating the Coaching'. These action units, together with their respective interactive and communicative core components, allow for capturing the complex structural, interactive, and thematic loops across both, whole coaching processes and individual sessions that are characteristic of the discourse-based professional helping format 'executive coaching'. In focusing on both coach and client and their respective contributions, analyzing authentic coaching data and focusing on the coaching process as a temporally transpiring and developing communicative and discursive construct, a comprehensive picture of this thriving human resource intervention emerges as it stands at the beginning of the 21st century. To round off this first monographic portrait of executive coaching as verbal interaction, the discussion of its discursive practices is critically embedded in its larger socio-cultural and organizational contexts.

The current Basic Activity Model lays the general foundations for a new communication and discourse perspective on coaching. It should be read as a stimulus for future linguistic research into the discourse of coaching. The fluidity of the research object render the endeavor particularly challenging. As such, the following decisions were taken for this endeavor to be successful:

1. Due to the heterogeneity and amorphousness of the coaching market with its gamut of types of coaching and coaching approaches, it is paramount for the current project to limit its scope to one particular type of coaching and one particular coaching approach. I will concentrate on executive coaching

2. To speak with Vehviläinen (1999: 37), "(p)rofessionals do know what they are doing, but it is not often easy for them to say in so many words how they are doing it. Furthermore, their accounts of their actions are often based on idealizations, typifications and selected post hoc observations" (see also Hutchby 2007: 120). Sarangi (2002b) talks about the difference between 'discourse practitioners' and 'discourse researchers' and their different kinds of knowledge, namely 'know that' vs. 'know how'.

and have opted for the approach *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* practiced by Dietz Training & Partner in Germany. Executive coaching represents the most well-established and elaborate type of coaching, while emotional intelligence is a vibrant buzz concept in the organizational world.

2. The analysis is based on German data. Gaining access to such highly confidential data in the form of video-taped recordings of coaching processes requires trust in the researcher on the part of both coaches and clients. In this case, personal contacts and the ensuing non-profit cooperation with the coaches granted me access to the data. This degree of cooperation facilitated the constant exchange between linguist and practitioner, an indispensable condition for the interprofessional direction of this book. Moreover, as I practice this coaching approach myself, I can employ both my professional linguistic and my professional coaching competence for and in the analysis.
3. It is essential to compile a large corpus of coaching data to extract the core of discursive practices across the chosen approach. The analysis will focus on selected thematic and interactional lines to highlight central concepts in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* and to unfurl their underlying patterns of interaction. This procedure allows me to obtain a comprehensive overview of the actually existing variety of interactional phenomena; endemic and replicable patterns can thus be set apart from idiosyncratic and singular occurrences. The resulting heuristic meta-model, i.e. the Basic Activity Model of coaching can be applied to other forms of coaching in the future.

1.2 Outline of the book

The book *The Pragmatics of Executive Coaching* is structured as follows:

Part I ('Executive coaching – Concepts, contextualization and analysis') sets the thematic and methodological framework for the linguistic analysis of executive coaching to follow in Part II. To this end, Chapter 2 outlines the outer and inner contexts of coaching. Section 2.1 defines the research object of 'executive coaching' as regards its outer contexts, i.e. its historical, organizational, socio-cultural and academic status. Sections 2.2 and 2.3, in turn, focus on the inner contexts of coaching, i.e. the process or interaction of coaching and its participants. Its various areas and genres as well as underlying theories and ideologies are discussed alongside relevant information on settings, participants and reasons for coaching.

Chapter 3 tackles the discourses of emotions and Emotional Intelligence as the underlying focal themes of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, the executive coaching approach under scrutiny here. Here emotions are discussed both as part of the larger socio-cultural discourse of emotions in our therapeutic culture and late

modern society and as a linguistic phenomenon as regards their local and in-situ discursive co-construction in (professional) conversations. Furthermore, Chapter 3 lays out the professional theories and underlying professional stock of interactional knowledge of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* itself as these guide the coaches' professional agenda and interactional behavior in the data. The coaching approach is based on the therapeutic *Internal Family Systems Model* by Richard Schwartz (1995) and *Hakomi Body-Centered Psychotherapy* by Kurtz (1990) and assumes that the clients' conflicts on the outside (often) originate in inner conflicts of their personality parts and that by exploring, understanding and re-defining their emotional experiences such outer conflicts can be solved.

Next, Chapter 4 lays the theoretical and methodological framework: coaching is linguistically conceptualized as an 'activity type and discourse type', as an 'interaction frame' and as 'professional and institutional discourse': while 'coaching as an activity type and discourse type' focuses on the overall action- and discourse-based layout of coaching and helps to define its endemic basic activities, 'coaching as an interaction frame' emphasizes the local negotiation and interpretation of the participants as regards (the purpose of) their current doing, i.e. their particular discursive interacting with each other on the various interaction fields they define. The primary focus of 'coaching as an interaction frame' then is an internal one, geared towards the local, individual definition and orientation of coaching by the participants. Finally, the perspective of 'coaching as professional and institutional discourse' addresses the concrete discursive practices of coach and client as professional expert and layperson respectively. The professional and institutional character of coaching emerges on the linguistic micro-level in the differing conversational rights and obligations of the participants. Thus, this perspective allows an assessment of the coaching-specific morphology of professional asymmetry and hierarchy.

Chapter 4 also informs about the coaching data and the methodology: the corpus comprises nine complete and authentic coaching processes based on the executive coaching approach *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* (Dietz Training & Partner), practiced one-on-one between a female and a male coach and their nine executive clients. The coaching processes cover between 3 and 9 sessions and each session lasts for about 2 hours. The coach-client dyads were filmed by the coaches themselves between 2007 and 2009. The data (around 145 hours of authentic coaching interaction), originally in German, were linguistically transcribed with the help of HIAT (Ehlich 1992) at a rate of 1:25. The excerpts presented here are translated into English and adapted to a vertical' transcript layout following the cGAT conventions (Schmidt et al. 2016) for readability. Given the particular interest of the book to investigate into the pragmatics of executive coaching for the first time, the data are analyzed within an integrative discourse analytic

framework that draws primarily on Theme-Oriented Discourse Analysis along with Activity Analysis, but includes tools and insights from Conversation Analysis and Interactional Sociolinguistics, too.

In addition, Chapter 4 details the transition from ‘phases of coaching’ to ‘basic activities of coaching’ and thus builds the bridge between the phase- model of coaching as outlined and applied in a separate case study and the Basic Activity Model of coaching outlined and applied here.

Part II (‘Emotionally Intelligent Coaching – A theme-oriented linguistic description’) embarks on the description and application of the Basic Activity Model. This model makes it possible to capture the interactive and discursive endemic particularities of executive coaching as a discourse type and activity type. The following four chapters sketch out the four basic activities of coaching plus their communicative tasks and core components with the help of excerpts from the corpus. Chapter 5 illustrates the basic activity ‘Defining the Situation’ alongside its communicative tasks and their core components ‘Establishing the Coaching Realm’, ‘Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching’ and ‘Temporal Framing of Coaching’. Chapter 6 illustrates the basic activity ‘Building the Relationship’ together with the communicative tasks ‘Establishing the Roles and Identities of ‘Coach’ and ‘Client’, ‘Negotiating Hierarchy in an Asymmetrical Relationship’ and ‘Topicalizing the Coach-Client Dyad within the Triadic Coach-Client-Organization Relationship’ as well as their core components. Chapter 7 illustrates the basic activity ‘Co-Constructing Change’ alongside its communicative tasks ‘Diagnosing’, ‘Intervening’ and ‘Securing Transfer’ and in Chapter 8, the basic activity ‘Evaluating the Coaching’ is sketched out focusing on its communicative tasks ‘Evaluating Clients’ Change as regards their Concern(s)’ and ‘Evaluating the Coaching Interaction’ as well as its core components. Each of the basic activities is first theoretically introduced, then illustrated and detailed on the micro-level in its intra-activity dimension with the help of excerpts and finally, summarized as regards their recurring structures and principles of interaction on the structural, thematic and interactive level. The relatively large number of excerpts across the four empirical chapters serves the purpose to illustrate the external and internal diversity of executive coaching.

Chapter 9 brings the findings from Chapters 5 through 8 together and discusses them against the backdrop of conceptualizing coaching as activity type and as discourse type. *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* thereby emerges as an inter-discursive activity type and hybrid discourse type that evinces a format-specific reading as regards the negotiation of power and asymmetry of coach and client (within the confines of an endemically asymmetrical professional and institutional interaction). *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* furthermore oscillates between therapeutic

discourse and managerial discourse, i.e. between discourses of emotionality and self-reflection, as well as less-dominant discourses of illness etc., and the discourses of high-performance, success and peak performance as underlying organizational values and ideologies. In particular, the critical analysis of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* with its explicit focus on the clients' emotional experiences offers a picture of a professional helping format that is experienced as emancipatory and agentic by the executive clients as they are given the necessary and secure self-space to work on their emotionality. Yet, given that working on their emotionality is always linked back to the clients' organizational origins in the local interaction between coach and client, coaching is also a site of the functionalization or commodification of emotions in late modern society. Finally, *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* oscillates between 'discourse' and 'meta-discourse' as a local result of its undefined professional and institutional status and of its person-centered approach and adaptive flexibility that allow for individual coach-client definitions of their doing.

PART I

Executive coaching

Concepts, contextualization and analysis

Executive coaching

A critical first step ... is a clear understanding of the construct in question.

(D'Abate et al. 2003: 381)

It is a truism that research requires an object of research. Yet, in the context of executive coaching, the first challenge research faces is to come up with a clear delineation of its research object, given that “creating a unique identity of coaching is a difficult and potentially unresolved problem” (Bachkirova et al. 2018: xxxi). Or, as Jackson (2005: 45) puts it, “(c)oaching means different things to different people”. The conceptual and theoretical fuzziness that surrounds this form of intervention as well as the blank slate situation of (linguistic) research on coaching turn its definition into a major task.

Chapter 2 thus aims to lay out the central parameters of ‘coaching’: its contexts, i.e. its historical development and current status, its process, i.e. its core procedures, and its participants. It needs to be borne in mind that the following presentation, especially as regards the process of coaching, is based on the (idealizing) coaching practice literature as well as on the little available research from other disciplines. These theoretical coaching concepts serve as a point of orientation for the linguistic analysis of authentic data in Part II, where they will be critically assessed.

2.1 Contexts³

Executive coaching [...] has grown and become mainstream in many business sectors worldwide. Coach-training organizations have also grown and thrived across the globe. It looks like coaching is here to stay. (Peltier 2010: xv)

Coaching has turned into a buzzword in our modern (business) world. A Google search of the term ‘coaching’ in August 2018 resulted in 327.000.000 hits within 0.48 seconds. In fact, ‘coaching’ is commonly used as a container term for instruction or counseling in a great variety of more or less serious contexts. There are applications such as ‘life coaching’, ‘personal coaching’, ‘health coaching’, ‘career coaching’, ‘business coaching’ and ‘executive coaching’, but also ‘diet coaching’, ‘beauty coaching’

3. Contexts is understood here merely from a sociocultural perspective, not from a linguistic or cognitive perspective (cf. Fetzer 2004).

and ‘dating coaching’, etc.. According to Stein (2007) and Drath (2012), the major and most widely practiced types are ‘life coaching’ and ‘personal coaching’ on the one hand and ‘business coaching’ or ‘executive coaching’ on the other. While the service in the first pair is paid for by the clients themselves and the focus is on personal and life issues, the service in the second pair is paid for by the clients’ organizations and the focus is on professional issues. Worldwide, organizations, and a growing number of private clients, spend huge sums buying this fashionable type of counseling service or organizational intervention. According to the ICF (International Coach Federation) executive summary of its 2016 Global Coaching Study (2016: 8), there were roughly 53,3000 professional coaches worldwide at the time (with a strong dominance in Western Europe followed by North America), while there were also 10,900 managers / leaders using coaching skills.⁴

The basic meaning of ‘coaching’ is still related to the original idea of ‘coach’ as a means of transport. In the mid-19th century, a coach was a private tutor in a university context who functioned as an intellectual companion for his students, i.e. somebody who transported knowledge. Towards the end of the 19th century, ‘coach / coaching’ became related to the field of sports and was understood as offering motivation strategies, etc. to achieve peak performance, both on a physical and psychological level. In the entrepreneurial context, the context of this analysis, coaching appeared for the first time in 1937 in an article by Gorby on “Everyone gets a share of the profits”. The current proliferation of coaching in this entrepreneurial extension is a relatively recent development. Its origin lies in the United States in the late 1970s, where coaching was understood and applied as a person- and development-oriented management style for CEOs (chief executive officers) of large organizations.⁵ High failure rates among middle- and senior-level managers due to poor and unsatisfactory leadership skills rather than technical skills fostered the need for specific measures to overcome such poor performance (cf. Feldman and Lankau 2005: 830f; Judge and Cowell 1997: 71; Drath 2012).

From the late 1980s / early 1990s onwards, the term ‘coach’ appeared more frequently on the international business scene (cf. Grant 2005: 8) and human resource consulting firms added coaching to their gamut of services (cf. Judge and Cowell 1997: 71). More recently, the focus has shifted from correcting to empowering, and coaching is viewed as a means of supporting learning processes and optimizing performance by “developing more skillful, more sustained, more effective means of

4. The ICF Global Coaching Study (2016: 7) thereby talks about a coaching continuum as there is a growing number of people who apply coaching approaches and skills outside the context of traditional coaching engagements.

5. According to Judge and Cowell (1997: 71), Dr. Dick Borough, an American practitioner, was the first to call his leadership development ‘executive coaching’ in 1985.

helping good people grow into their current assignments and into the challenges of their next assignments and the ones after that” (Bacon and Spear 2003: xiii). Thus, “(a)s coaching has become more common, any stigma attached to receiving it at the individual level has disappeared. Now, it is often considered a badge of honor” (Charan 2009: 93). Alongside this proliferation, the target group of coaching has also shifted from ‘CEOs only’ to all staff with managerial functions: “(t)hus, executive coaching is now both remedial for average executives and performance enhancing for high-potential managers” (Judge and Cowell 1997: 72). We witness a broad application of coaching in the business context to support change and developmental processes in organizations, departments, teams and, of course, in the individual manager (Böning 2002).

The proliferation and speedy development of coaching is first of all a consequence of the demands of a globalized professional world with its rapidly changing working conditions – Williams and Davis (2007: 3) talk about change as the reigning norm in (post-)modern society – and its resulting high intellectual, psychological and physical load for the individual worker, all of which has led to a new work order (Gee et al. 1996). This new work order necessitates innovative developmental formats to support the professionals in their particular needs and has thus led to a “wide-ranging new profession of work-related adult learning facilitators” (Hawkins and Smith 2006: 20). We witness a growing market of people in need of individualized professional services and thus coaching has become an important tool for (organizational) learning and development over the last few years (Diedrich and Kilburg 2001; Wasylshyn 2003; Peltier 2010; Peterson 2018). To speak with Hudson (1999: 16): “coaching is one of the very few professions to be born in a change paradigm, requiring it to function and be organized differently from the older professions that embrace permanence, linearity, and hierarchies”.

Yet the growing spread and immense popularity of coaching have also been prepared and reinforced by a number of socio-cultural movements: there is humanistic psychology as epitomized in Carl Rogers’s person-centered psychotherapy (1951, 1961) as its most prominent and influential approach, along with the ‘Human Potential Movement’ as put forth by Maslow (1976), highlighting the individual’s potential as the very source of solutions to our personal problems. Similar assumptions as regards the inherent goodness and potential of the individual are replicated in positive psychology as proposed by Seligman (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi 2000) and favorably and explicitly integrated in the coaching business (Seligman 2007; Kauffman 2016). A closely related socio-cultural phenomenon is the reflexivity of the (post-)modern self (Giddens 1991; Lupton 1998; Bruner 2004; Furedi 2004) that highlights the importance of talking things through to achieve an advanced understanding of one’s thoughts and especially feelings. This self-reflexivity leads to an infiltration of the therapeutic or the therapeutic

habitus (Costea et al. 2008) into everyday life (Fairclough 1992; Cameron 2000; Furedi 2004; Hausendorf 2011) and into organizational life (Schulz 2013; Schulz and Steyeart 2014). Self-reflection focuses on emotions and emotional experience and gives center stage to communication⁶ as a “technology of self-management relying extensively on language and on the proper management of emotions” (Illouz 2007: 19). Self-reflection is a core activity across any type of therapy (Pawelczyk 2011). Yet, as further advocated by Illouz (2007: 19), such “communicative management of emotions” pursues a clear goal, i.e. “the aim of engineering inter- and intra-emotional coordination” (ibid.) (see also Cameron 2000, 2003; Pawelczyk and Graf 2011; Graf and Pawelczyk 2014). Thus, communicative self-reflection has turned into a cultural tool strategically applied to manage and coordinate intra- and inter-personal affairs. To learn how to apply this ‘tool’ successfully, so-called ‘expert systems’ have emerged as another fundamental change of late modernity. No longer merely limited to areas of technological expertise, expertise is now very much applicable to social relations and to the intimacies of the self (cf. Lupton 1998: 95; Pawelczyk and Graf 2011: 276). Following Giddens (1991), therapy constitutes one of the most important expert systems in late modernity with the assistance of which the self can be explored and constructed “as part of a reflexive process of connecting personal and social change” (1991: 33). However, therapists are not the only experts to deal with the project of the self; instead, numerous professions such as social work, counseling and – relevant for the current analysis – coaching have established themselves as experts in “measuring the psyche, in predicting its vicissitudes, in diagnosing the causes of its troubles and prescribing remedies” (Rose 1990: 3; see also Lupton 1998: 6). At the same time, the subjectivity and reflexivity of the modern self and the principal focus on emotional experience as providing access to one’s underlying strengths and weaknesses have blurred the boundaries between the private and the public and have rendered our culture a culture of emotional capitalism. According to Illouz (2007: 5), in such a culture “emotional and economic discourses and practices mutually shape each other, thus producing [...] a broad, sweeping movement in which affect is made an essential aspect of economic behavior and in which emotional life [...] follows the logic of economic relations and exchange”. Such an amalgamation of the private and the public has led to a more holistic conceptualization of coaching, where clients are considered as members of different, interrelated systems. Coaching thus addresses both the person and his/her respective professional and private roles (see Hall and Duval

6. “To communicate, in this context, means more than just to talk. Communication is prioritised as the genuine expression of feelings, as genuine care for the other, as the authentic attainment of mutual understanding in a mutually beneficial process” (Hutchby 2007: 127; see also Illouz 2007: 8).

2004, 2005; Whitworth et al. 1998, 2007; Martens-Schmid 2007). Approached from a more critical perspective and adapted to the current context of executive coaching, these larger socio-cultural trends account for the introduction or translation of psy- or therapeutic practices into an organizational or managerial context. There, the ‘treatment’ of the individual in the form of functionalizing one’s emotions or streamlining one’s behavior serves the higher goals of the organization by optimizing managerial performativity and profit, for example, or to put it differently, where the well-being of the individual is pursued for the sake of the organization. At the same time, however, coaching is also experienced as emancipatory and agentic by clients, who are given the necessary self-space in their interaction with the coach to oppose such dominant discourses of performativity and profit (Pawelczyk and Graf 2011; Schulz 2013). This dualistic orientation is aptly captured in defining executive coaching as ‘result-oriented self-reflection’ (Greif 2008), which points towards the two opposing poles, the managerial and the therapeutic, between which coaching oscillates (see also Judge and Cowell 1997: 74). On the discursive level – both in its socio-cultural and its linguistic dimension – this is reflected in discursive transformation processes or translative moves between managerial and psychotherapeutic discourse.⁷ The exact nature of the translation or recontextualization processes (Linell 1998a) between these meta-discourses as well as the resulting hybridity and interdiscursivity in the local talk that transpires between coach and client will be investigated in Part II of this book.

Irrespective of its market success across the western world, coaching is still an elusive concept in many respects. It is an umbrella term for widely differing “developmental interactions” (D’Abate et al. 2003: 360) or counseling activities situated in the larger terrain of organizational development tools, techniques and services (cf. Bjorkeng et al. 2008: 3), which are hard to discriminate at times. Coaching in its current practice has many conceptual and professional roots such as social psychology, learning theory or theories of human and organizational development (Bachkirova et al. 2018), applies a great variety of interventions, often originating in psychotherapy⁸ and management theory (Hudson 1999; Peltier 2010; Schulz

7. Given the opposing connotations of ‘therapy’ and ‘management’, the therapeutic roots as well as the adaption of therapeutic interventions in coaching need to be veiled, a fact that represents one of the paradoxes of executive coaching: “(t)here is a cultural problem one encounters when making the transition from clinical counseling to management consulting or executive coaching. It has to do with primary value orientations in the two fields of mental health and business coaching. [...] Executive coaches must navigate between these two cultures” (Peltier 2010: 358).

8. Although I talk about ‘psychotherapy’ throughout this book as being opposed to ‘executive coaching’, ‘psychotherapy’ is, of course, a very varied (discursive) practice, characterized by a multitude of often diverse approaches (for an overview of the essential psychotherapies and the

2013) and most coaches have a professional background in psychotherapy, training, counseling, etc. and/or have worked as managers themselves (cf. Rauen 2003; Bluckert 2005; Schreyögg and Schmidt-Lellek 2007). At this point we are (still) faced with a lack of a standardized theoretical and methodological underpinning as well as with a lack of standardized educational background or specific diploma for those working as coaches (cf. Wasylyshyn 2003: 106); according to Bachkirova and Kauffman (2009: 95), the problem with defining coaching thereby runs deep as it lies “in the difficulty to establish a clear identity of coaching *in principle* as a practice or process”.

Three salient characteristics define executive coaching as it stands at the beginning of the 21st century: 1) its wide-ranging (global) application as a key measure in human resource and organizational development and life-long learning, 2) its unresolved and undefined professional status and 3) the stark contrast between the available coaching practice literature and the lack of academic research and a conceptual foundation.

1. Bresser's (2009) *Global Coaching Survey* analyzed the situation of coaching in 162 countries and came up with the following: around 44,000 business coaches worldwide were offering coaching services at that point, yet more than two thirds of all coaches were located in Europe, the US and Canada. The seven countries with the highest number of coaches (the US, UK, Germany, Australia, Japan, Canada and South Africa) comprised only 10% of the world population, but about 73% of all coaches. According to Bresser (2009: 8), “(c)oaching is on the rise across the globe and there are singular, highly developed and dynamic “centres” of coaching”. From a financial perspective the ICF *Global Coaching Study* (2016) estimated worldwide revenue from coaching in 2015 to add up to around 2,356 billion USD. All in all, coaching is on the move as a key counseling format in our post-modern and globalized business world (with North America and Western Europe as the leading continents as regards both supply and demand). Private and (more recently also) university-based coach training programs are mushrooming and increasing numbers of institutions and organizations are setting up their own coach pools according to their own quality criteria and gatekeeping practices.

dimensions on which these approaches differ, see Gurman and Messer 2011) : “(t)he ways in which psychotherapists of different schools engage the patients vary, and, therefore, it is not likely that any single overall structure or other organizing principle of a psychotherapeutic session, applicable to all therapies, could be found” (Peräkylä et al. 2008: 22). However, according to Pawelczyk (2011) and her book *Talk as Therapy*, there are certain endemic features, i.e. ‘discursive norms’, that characterize psychotherapy as such. Throughout the current book, these norms are implied if ‘psychotherapy’ is topicalized as a discourse type and activity type.

2. The next salient characteristic of coaching is its undefined professional status. Coaching is in the process of establishing itself as a profession in its own right, with clearly defined professional practices, specific academic qualifications and licensing requirements, generally accepted and valid professional credentials and a code of ethics as well as a common body of knowledge and skills (cf. Wasylyshyn 2003: 106; Feldman and Lankau 2005: 832f.; Grant 2005: 9; Lane et al. 2018: 417f.). Yet, whereas traditional professions such as medicine or psychology have grown out of or have at least been accompanied by an academic foundation and conceptualization, coaching has a different history of development. It has not emerged from an academic field; instead “the practice of coaching had [has, EG] moved far ahead of the existing knowledge base” (Cavanagh, Grant and Kemp 2005: v). While coaching at present is an applied and well-established field of practice, its cross-disciplinary methodology and the heterogeneous educational backgrounds of its professionals as well as its vast areas of application pose major challenges to its striving for professionalization and thus to regulating this field of practice (cf. Lane et al. 2018). Besides criteria such as institutional autonomy and questions of accreditation, examination and qualification, the notion of a profession centers on a technical and specialized knowledge as well as on the professional expertise of its members. Yet, it is especially this shared technical and specialized knowledge base which is currently (partly) lacking in coaching. Given its heterogeneous roots, a key concern in the professionalization debate centers on differentiating coaching from other counseling formats such as training, consulting and especially, (psycho)therapy (cf. Stober and Parry 2005: 13; Peltier 2010; Crowe 2017). Coaching is often defined *ex negativo* and following Peltier (2010: xxix) as “(i)t is no accident that management consultants often start by declaring what coaching is not”.
3. The third characteristic of coaching at the beginning of the 21st century, and this is closely related to its still undefined professional status, is the dearth of empirical research. Whereas we find an abundance of practice literature on coaching written by coaches or human resource developers, who may lack a critical distance to their own doing, there is still little empirical and conceptual work accessible: “(a) chasm presently divides the worlds of academic research and coaching institutes and practice, with little dialogue between those involved” (Stober and Parry 2005: 15) (see also Grant and Stober 2006: 6; Greif 2014: 295ff; Theeboom et al. 2014: 1). This lack of academic analysis and conceptual work on coaching is being criticized more and more by responsible professionals and researchers, who call for a theoretical and conceptual underpinning of coaching based on sound academic research. In this vein the academic interest in coaching has been growing since 1990 as reflected in

empirical studies and doctoral theses, etc..⁹ ‘Evidence-based coaching’ is the new catchword. In analogy with ‘evidence-based medicine’ (Brown et al. 2006) and in contrast to ‘belief-based coaching’ as represented in most coaching practice literature, evidence-based coaching “should be one of shared empirically validated knowledge, rigorous peer reviewed publishing, a common language, and clear and explicit links to a wider knowledge base. In short, coaching needs to be evidence based” (Grant 2005: 1; see also Stober and Grant 2006; Grant 2017a). The academic discussion of coaching is currently situated at the interface of a psychological, a leadership and an adult learning view on coaching (Garvey 2010). The communicative and discourse views on coaching as put forward here represent a fourth, recently established, academic perspective on coaching, i.e. the linguistic view (see also work by Behn-Taran 2014; Jautz 2017, 2018; Winkler 2017). This discourse analytic approach to coaching is part of the new, evolving research paradigm in the context of coaching, i.e. ‘process research’ (vs. ‘outcome research’), where a vibrant and dynamic discussion is under way (see Bachkirova et al. 2011; Graf 2015; 2018; Wegener 2017; Wegener et al. 2018; Deplazes et al. 2018), motivated by the fact that “(o)utcome research has to be silent on what happens *within* a coaching relationship” (De Haan et al. 2010: 110).

To recap, coaching at the beginning of the 21st century is an “embryonic field” (Bjorkeng et al. 2008), characterized by a rapidly growing application and acceptance, by a relatively ill-defined professional status and a lack of academic and conceptual underpinning. These three characteristics of coaching relate to the current book in the following way: while the growing acceptance and proliferation of coaching render its further empirical and, especially, linguistic analysis highly relevant, the coaching industry’s endeavor to professionalize its practice calls for applied linguistic expertise as regards the establishment of ‘shared habitual practices’ (Sarangi 2002b) as one characterizing feature of any profession. As coaching is realized in and through a particular type of communicative interaction, these underlying ‘shared habitual practices’ refer to specific and repetitive communicative patterns and discursive norms, which must be uncovered via a discourse-analytic study of authentic coaching interaction. As regards the general dissatisfactory research situation in coaching, the linguistic Basic Activity Model of executive coaching applies a so far missing perspective on coaching and by focusing on the micro-level of coach-client conversations helps to further establish the emerging coaching process research

9. For an overview see de Haan et al. (2016) for the Anglo-American-Australian market and Böning and Kegel (2015) for the German market.

2.2 Process

While the above section sketched out the external frame of coaching (= the Discourses of coaching), the next section focuses on the coaching interaction itself (= the discourses of coaching) (cf. Alvesson and Kärreman 2000). Due to its practical rather than academic origin, its multi-disciplinary procedures and manifold applications, ‘coaching’ subsumes a plethora of different interaction constellations. To shed light on this confusing situation, recent publications by Cox et al. (2010, 2014, 2018), Passmore et al. (2013) or Bachkirova et al (2017) have offered a matrix that distinguishes between areas or genres of coaching and theoretical and conceptual backgrounds to coaching. Whereas we encounter executive coaching, workplace coaching, life coaching, personal coaching, etc. as areas or genres of coaching, there are humanistic, systemic, positive psychology, emotional intelligence and NLP perspectives, etc. as underlying theoretical or conceptual backgrounds. These layers are frequently combined both across and within individual coaching offers.

As regards the underlying reading of coaching, we encounter two broad conceptualizations across the literature: coaching as facilitation of self-directed learning and coaching as teaching or direct instruction (cf. Grant 2005: 2; Grant and Stober 2006: 2), with currently a strong tendency towards the former (Peterson 2018). These two conceptualizations hint at coaching’s roots in psychotherapy and management consulting respectively, and result in different interaction formats. Most of the time, however, both conceptualizations are integrated within one and the same approach, where we find both reflection and instruction, i.e. “(i)t seems that counseling and consulting occupy opposite ends of a continuum of coaching approaches” (Joo 2005: 468; see also Witherspoon 2000; Hawkins and Smith 2006). This coaching continuum is summarized succinctly by Hall and Duval (2004: 18) as follows:

As coach, you will be called upon to step aside from *coaching* as such, and shift to providing some skill development (training), healing of some hurt emotion (therapy), giving suggestions about how to arrange things (consulting), and even treating the other as a protégé (mentoring). What’s important is being *conscious* of what we are doing, when, with whom, and why.

Coaching is practiced in different settings: there is one-on-one coaching between a coach and a client; there is team and group coaching and coaching can be executed face-to-face, over the phone and, more and more, online coaching. Furthermore, coaching is executed both by internal and external coaches: while internal coaches are either – in the context of large organizations – from the company’s own coach pool or executives who coach their own staff, external coaches are usually freelance coaches who also work as trainers in the context of other HR measures. A coaching

process, i.e. the work between coach and client(s), entails a series of sessions and is of medium length: on average, a coaching process encompasses between three and eight sessions, the individual sessions last between one and three hours and the whole coaching engagement stretches over some months (cf. Peltier 2010: xxxv). The professional contact between coach and client is usually established – in the context of business or executive coaching – via the client's line manager or the organization's HR department. As a result, executive coaching is a dyadic constellation between coach and client which is embedded in and influenced by the triadic constellation 'coach – client – client's organization' (cf. Lee 2013: 40ff) (see Graf and Jautz in prep.).

According to the practice literature on coaching, both the coaching process as a whole and the individual sessions run through different phases that account for the overall structural organization of coaching (see e.g. Hudson 1999; Flaherty 2005; Feldman and Lankau 2005; Greif 2008 on various phase models of coaching). Rauen and Steinhübel (<http://www.coaching-report.de/definition-coaching/coaching-ablauf/coach-modell.html>) talk about the COACH model in this context: given that the relationship between coach and client is (idealized as) one of partnership and equal standing, the first phase, i.e. the initial contact phase, is considered a key element in coaching as it lays the foundation for a trustful and open relationship (phase 1: Coming together). The next phase centers both on further establishing the coaching relationship and on the question as to what brings a client to coaching and what his/her goals are for the coaching (phase 2: Orientation). Then, coach and client agree on the concerns and goals of coaching and explore these, together with client's professional (and personal) context, in more detail (phase 3: Analysis (= analysis)). The focus then shifts from problem orientation towards solution orientation; a change scenario is developed by implementing the coaching interventions, coach and client thereby focusing on concrete steps or measures to attain the aspired changes (phase 4: Change). Finally, the coaching sessions and the goal attainments are evaluated and reviewed and the working relationship between coach and client is brought to an end (phase 5 = Harboring). To summarize the coaching process in line with Hawkins and Smith (2006: 26f), there is contract, listen, explore, action and review as prototypical actions on the coaching agenda. These actions underlie both the individual coaching sessions and the overall coaching process, i.e. coaching takes place in communicative and thematic loops that allow for the successive development of appropriate solutions for the clients' primary concern and their goals as well as for the integration of current issues.

The clients' primary concern(s) and goal(s), i.e. the reason(s) why people come or are sent to coaching, are another relevant parameter when portraying the coaching process: Most clients in executive coaching seek improvement in management

or leadership skills, aspire to improving their performance, need to resolve conflicts in business contexts, want to prepare for a higher position or need to prevent or overcome job burnout (Feldman and Lankau 2005; Greif 2008): thus, “(c)oaching regularly focuses on three main topics which are: crisis, power and action at an institutional level” (Fengler 2001: 37). Due to the clients’ demanding professional commitments, more general issues such as work-life balance or search for meaning are also listed as possible coaching concerns in the literature. The aim of executive coaching is sustained cognitive, emotional and behavioral changes that facilitate the attainment of the clients’ coaching goals on a professional level (cf. Grant and Stober 2006: 2). To put it in a nutshell, “(p)eople come to coaching for lots of different reasons, but the bottom line is change” (Whitworth et al. 1998: xix).¹⁰ Clients’ change is facilitated by particular coaching modes of talk based on intimacy, non-judgmental support and empathy that allow for the unfolding of (so far hidden) emotional experiences and feelings. Yet, given the above-mentioned coaching continuum, the clients’ learning and change is also fostered at times by clear feedback and challenging statements on the part of the coach (see Bjorkeng et al. 2008, who talk about the “hard” and “soft” polarities of organizational coaching). As executive clients are embedded in the larger contexts of their organizations and coaching is paid for by the client’s organization, the aspired changes do not (only) aim at the client as an individual person. Instead, clients’ change and development becomes relevant for their professional role and concurrently serve larger organizational purposes, i.e. the sake of coaching for the individual client must be critically assessed against the sake of coaching for the organization. (Hawkins and Smith 2006; Bachkirova et al. 2010, 2014; Peltier 2010; see also Graf under review).

As regards the interactive design of the process of executive coaching, a few overarching characteristics have emerged in the literature in spite of the elusiveness of coaching outlined above. These characteristics mark an (idealized!) action framework for coaches’ interventions in their professional dealings with clients: to this end coaching is a co-active, person-centered, process-oriented and solution-focused form of organizational intervention that aims to support clients’ striving towards self-awareness, self-reflexivity and self-regulation (in an organizational context). To put it differently, coaching is predominantly help for self-help.

10. Given that change is the *raison d’être* for any kind of helping professional interaction and that helping professional interaction is locally and sequentially co-constructed by professional and client, the question how change is achieved in and through the sequential trajectory of professional conversations figures prominently in conversation analytic and discourse analytic research on professional and institutional talk (Muntigl and Horvarth 2005; Voutilainen et al. 2011; Pawelczyk and Graf (under review); Voutilainen et al. 2018; Graf and Jautz (under review); Graf et al. (under review)).

Being co-active is the most far-reaching trait as it circumscribes the very interaction and relationship between coach and client as one of equal-status partners who collaborate in achieving a common goal, i.e. the client's self-discovery, development and change. Unlike classic asymmetric and hierarchically organized relationships as found in traditional doctor-patient interaction or management consulting, coaching, according to coach training manuals, transpires in and through a (communicative) collaboration between (more or less) equal partners who each bring their respective expertise to the process (Jautz 2017). Clients' expertise refers to their individual and subjective life and professional story; coaches' professional expertise rests primarily on managing the structural and procedural agenda. Of great importance in the context of such a co-active mindset is that coach and client negotiate the concrete procedure, the direction of their work and the depth of their interaction.¹¹ Contrary to other, more directive, forms of counseling, the coach in the co-active framework has the questions and the client has the answers, not vice versa: "(a)sking rather than telling is at the foundation of co-active coaching" (Whitworth et al. 1998: 69; Graf and Spranz-Fogasy 2018b; Graf et al. in prep.). Across the coaching literature, the ultimate success or failure of coaching is ascribed to the coaching alliance between coach and client, i.e. their collaborative, non-hierarchical relationship: "(t)he 'product' of coaching comes from the bond between a coach and a client" (Hudson 1999: 26), not (so much) from the coach's expert knowledge and perspective. The social relation that underlies coaching is rooted in values traditionally associated more with private environments such as (female) friendship (cf. Pawelczyk and Graf 2011; Graf and Pawelczyk 2014):

If you were to observe a coaching session, you see that it is typically very open, often friendly, casual, and light. Coaches laugh with their clients and, when appropriate, may even joke or gently tease. With caution, coaches may feel comfortable sharing personal experiences that are pertinent to what the client is experiencing. Clients and coaches feel as though they know each other on a deeper level than is possible in many other professional relationships. Coaching clients frequently report that they appreciate that openness. (Williams and Davis 2007: 49)

This strong and trustworthy coaching alliance between the participants is considered the *sine qua non* for clients to open up and discover new options and choices. It creates the necessary non-judgmental¹² empathic self-space that allows for

11. Aspects of a co-active cooperation between coach and client are also found in other professional contexts, for example in the context of 'shared decision making' in doctor-patient interaction (Scheibler 2006; Brünner 2009).

12. This goes back to Carl Rogers's (1951) "unconditional positive regard" as one of the necessary and sufficient growth conditions for clients in the context of humanistic psychology and person-centered therapy.

verbalizing and constructing less-dominant discourses; talk with their coaches is often described as emancipatory and liberating by clients (cf. McLeod and Wright 2003: 6), i.e. “(h)aving a place to ‘release’ frustration or anxiety and express their deepest desires or fear, as in the coaching relationship, is very freeing” (Williams and Davis 2007: 6).

The person-centered stance in coaching implies – in contrast to problem-centered approaches – that the whole process orients to the person and personality of the client and not to the problem as an isolated objective entity, as in the area of legal, fiscal or management consulting. According to Flaherty (2005: 22), coaches are required to have a profound understanding of human nature, as humans, not problems, are the primary focus, the center and the subject of coaching. To regard clients as a ‘whole person’ (“*ganze Person*”; Martens-Schmid 2007) automatically focuses the attention on the clients’ subjective perspective as well as on the underlying (and often hidden) feelings and emotions: “(i)n person-centered counseling, objective truth is not a useful concept” (Tolan 2003: 23). In person-centered theory, the client is regarded as a trustworthy source of necessary information, although at the beginning of the coaching process the client is often unaware of having such knowledge. By paying special attention to the client’s “given off” information (Goffman 1959) and by communicating these perceptions in a tentative manner to the client to make him/her start reflecting on these perceptions, clients ideally come to integrate such ‘knowledge’ of themselves into their self-structure, i.e. to relocate it in the conscious part of their territory of information. The integration of newly discovered experience into one’s self-structure is only possible in a climate where the client feels safe and accepted with all their fears, shortcomings and prejudices, etc.; i.e. where they feel accepted the way they are (cf. the co-activeness of coaching above). The coach should leave his or her own attitudes aside and should be fully ‘over there’ with the client. One of the desired outcomes of person-centered coaching is to re-locate the locus of evaluation from the external to the internal, i.e. to support the clients’ in their process of rediscovering their own (hidden) strengths and resources (cf. Tolan 2003: 75).

The next defining feature of coaching, process-orientation, means that coaching is not about passing on ready-made solutions by the coach as the professional expert in a directive, top-down manner. Instead, the appropriate solutions for the clients’ problems or concerns are collaboratively advanced in a step-by-step reflection process that considers the clients’ specific individual, social and professional circumstances in each session anew (Schein 1969; Geißler 2009; Schreyögg 2010; Graf and Jautz under review). The reflective, secure and empathic atmosphere allows the participants to develop, try out, take up or dismiss ideas and new forms of behavior and thus to eventually come up with the best possible solution for themselves and their specific concerns. Another relevant aspect of the process-oriented

procedure in coaching lies in the constant monitoring of the interaction itself, the state and the currency of the original primary concern and of other developments within or outside the coaching setting. Such monitoring happens in communicative and thematic loops alongside the whole coaching process that also allow for the integration of the client's development in between the individual coaching sessions.

Finally, the solution-focus encompasses formulating concrete, individualized goals and evaluating their attainment during the coaching process (Greene and Grant 2003). The basic assumptions of solution-focused coaching are that any person is competent to solve his or her own problems and that it is more useful to focus attention directly on creating solutions for problems than on analyzing causes of problems and making a diagnosis. Focusing on solutions instead of on problems implies an orientation to the clients' future instead of the clients' past. Concurrently, the solution-focused perspective stresses the entrepreneurial orientation of executive coaching and the fact that coaching does not serve as an end in itself, but aspires to concrete and measurable results and changes for the paying organization such as the executive clients' higher performativity or increased profit.¹³

To conclude with Kilburg (2000: 65f), executive coaching is

a helping relationship formed between a client who has managerial authority and responsibility in an organization and a consultant who uses a wide variety of behavioral techniques and methods to assist the client to achieve a mutually identified set of goals to improve his or her professional performance and personal satisfaction and consequently to improve the effectiveness of the client's organization within a formally defined coaching agreement.

Such a co-active, person-centered, process-oriented and solution-focused framework of executive coaching is an idealized normative description of what the interaction between professionals and clients 'should' be like according to the available literature and coach training manuals. The interaction with their clients should thus be "a collaborative process of facilitating a client's ability to self-direct learning and growth, as evidenced by sustained changes in self-understanding, self-concept and behaviour" (Stober and Parry 2005: 14). The coach's role in such a process is that of a facilitator of the client's change.

13. A case in point in the context of solution-orientation is the formulation of SMART goals in coaching: research has shown that goals are easier to attain and their success is more sustainable if they are formulated as specific, measurable, atttractive, realistic and time-framed (Graf and Wastian 2013; Grant 2018).

2.3 Participants

This final subsection introduces the participants in one-on-one coaching as the default setting, namely coach and client. In the context of organizational or executive coaching, however, we need to further specify the role of ‘client’ and ask, in line with Feldman and Lankau (2005: 844)

...who is the “client” in an organizationally arranged coaching relationship: the executive or the organization? Whose needs take precedence? What are the boundaries of confidential and non-confidential information? Are there, or should there be, zones of privacy between coach and client that cannot be breached simply because the organization pays?

The triadic constellation causes a potential conflict of interest for both coach and client and represents one of the core paradoxes or dilemmas of coaching: on the one hand the coaching alliance between coach and client is conceptualized as the *sine qua non* for clients to open up, access and work with their emotional experiences, fears and apprehensions, etc. and on the other hand, the triangular relationship and the coach’s dependence on the paying organization threaten the intimacy of this very alliance. Unfortunately, this conflict of interest has not yet been sufficiently acknowledged in the coaching practice literature (cf. Bjorkeng et al. 2008: 9; but see e.g. Hannafey and Vitulano 2013). The question to be raised in this context is also who benefits (most) from the coaching, the client and/or the company as the sponsoring organization (cf. D’Abate et al. 2003: 366f; Graf under review)? The organization is represented by the HR manager and/or the client’s line manager or boss, who may materialize and become visible when their voices are introduced into the local coaching process by the participating coach and client via quotes or references.

Yet, the following remarks on the participants of coaching refer to those present in the local ‘here-and-now’ of the coaching interaction, i.e. coach and client. Whereas the outline of the former centers on their formal preparation and in particular on their professional (interaction and communication) skills and responsibilities, the outline of the latter focuses on questions of voluntariness and motivation as well as on questions of emotional stability and health issues. To delineate the key qualities and competencies of coaches is of core concern for coaching associations and professional practitioners. Without an agreement on professional coaching core competencies it is neither possible to establish the norms of best practice and assess the quality of coaching nor to set up and standardize the accreditation, examination and qualification of professional coaches. These core competencies thus represent a corner stone in the efforts of the coaching business to professionalize their field of practice (see Section 2.1). And although to date no formal

training or particular academic background is compulsory, according to the 2016 ICF Global Coaching 81% of the coach practitioners have received accredited coach training programs with 42% of them have participated in 200 hours or more of specified training (p. 10f). A look at the available requirement profiles for executive coaches as regards skills and competencies reveals that they entail, on the one hand, general personal and communicative competencies such as empathy, active and non-judgmental listening, orientation to ethical standards such as confidentiality, and common social and cultural competences acquired from their own personal life experience. On the other hand, coaches should have expert knowledge in the field of psychological theories, management theories and/or adult learning theories.¹⁴ What is more, they should have a sound understanding of their clients' particular professional situations.

The methods or interventions coaches apply to support their clients' professional development cover a broad spectrum. They range from enhancing clients' problem- and self-reflection as well as activating their resources to methods of analyzing and consulting in establishing and realizing (entrepreneurial) solutions and changes (cf. Greif 2008: 100). The central medium of all interventions and actions in coaching is language and communication. To speak with Nadler (2005: 73), "(c)ommunication is at the heart of all counseling relationships".¹⁵ In particular, coaching rests on communicative strategies such as active listening via response tokens, for example, to encourage clients' continuation, or acknowledgement tokens, mitigating devices such as hedges to demonstrate empathy and attunement and to avoid the expert role, other-oriented and circular questions¹⁶ to instigate clients' reflexive processes and the use of formulations and interpretations to introduce and trigger a new perspective for clients (see Deplazes 2016 on the tools and interventions in coaching). Talk is part and parcel of coaching and one can concur with Garvey (2010) that coaching is a conversation with a purpose. Coaches

14. On the particularities of these competencies and skills see, for example, Garman et al. 2000; Hawkins and Smith (2006); Grant and Stober (2006); Greif (2008); DBVC (2012) or ICF (2016).

15. The same holds true for other forms of counseling such as psychotherapy, where the aspired change or development in the client or the patient is also brought about in and through communicative interaction between the professional and the client. Psychotherapy is therefore frequently termed 'the talking cure'. This label was originally used by Dr. Breuer for his interaction with the hysterical patient Anne O. and was later adopted by Freud in his lectures on psychoanalysis (see also Lock and Strong (2012) on the "discursive perspectives in therapeutic practice" and the recent edited volume by Pick (2017) titled *Beraten ist Sprechen* (Counseling / consulting is talking).

16. Questions are the most widely discussed intervention across the coaching literature. Despite this prominence, there is hardly any empirical insight in their use and effectiveness (but see Graf and Spranz-Fogasy 2018b and Graf et al. in prep.)

thereby serve their clients as “trainers, facilitators, motivators, moderators, devil’s advocates, sounding boards, and confidants” (Judge and Cowell 1997: 71) and thus have to have a command of a variety of different interactional styles, which they apply situation- and context-specifically and in accordance with their underlying professional coaching agenda.¹⁷

To summarize the key competencies of executive coaches, they need to manage relationship and rapport building, understand organizational systems dynamics, design personal transformational interventions, skillfully use framing and reframing and employ a wide repertoire of methods to engage emotionally with the client and the issues at stake (cf. Hawkins and Smith 2006: 33f). Despite this portfolio of the required skills and competencies of professionally working coaches, the crucial factor in assessing a professional’s ‘coaching competence’ (Greif 2008: 156ff; Lalouschek, personal communication) is their individually oriented application of the coaching interventions during the particular conversation with one particular client. Each individual coaching process then represents a unique constellation between client and coach and their individual experiences embedded in a particular context of situation (cf. Greif 2008: 231; Künzli in prep.). Such a personalized counseling service, which also includes flexible time frames, varying lengths of sessions, etc., pays tribute to the executive’s complex professional reality. At the same time, as will be shown later on in the analyses of authentic coaching data, this personalized aspect adds to the interactive complexity and discursive hybridity of coaching.

As regards the question as to who seeks out a professional coaching service and why, we need to return to the above distinction between a private clientele on the one hand and a business clientele on the other. Coaching as an organizational intervention is addressed to a business clientele and serves the enhancement of individual (and collective) learning and development in the context of professional issues; the focus is thereby either pre-emptive, developmental, orienting and/or problem-solving (cf. DBVC 2008: 19). This focus links in with the delicate question of the clients’ participation in coaching programs: Is it voluntary or mandatory? There are executive clients who self-select the coaching service, but

(i)n business coaching, clients may participate in coaching without a clear consenting agreement, especially when told that they need coaching to advance their career, to make partner, or to simply survive with the company. What executive would decline such an “opportunity?” (Peltier 2010: 364)

17. However, as will be critically discussed later on, such a communication and discourse perspective on coaching is neither established nor accepted amongst most practitioners. An exception is e.g. Schreyögg (2012) who argues that the verbal acts of communication are a central method in coaching.

And even in those cases where the client initiates the coaching process, the triangular relationship between coach – client – client's organization remains (see above). Although their influence on the success or failure of coaching are difficult to assess empirically, clients' voluntariness, their motivation and trust are relevant influential factors for the success and quality of coaching (cf. Greif 2008: 172ff; see also Grant 2006: 164; Müller 2006: 27f). Irrespective of these questions of voluntariness and confidence, clients in executive coaching are well paid executives in leading positions who expect to be treated in a particular way in coaching and to be esteemed and respected in their managerial responsibilities, their workload and their fast changing and demanding day-to-day work life.

Finally, coaching services are addressed to healthy clients, while psychologically dysfunctional clients are explicitly excluded (cf. Greif 2008: 69): "(t)he idea that the coaching client is mentally healthy, or at least "normal" is a recurring theme in the literature when talking about the differences between the coaching client and the therapy client" (Buckley 2007: 18). Given that many coaching interventions originate in psychotherapy and that coaching in large parts focuses on the clients' attitudes, feelings and emotions, delineating the boundaries between (executive) coaching and psychotherapy is a relevant, yet complex task. There are more and more critical voices who question the dichotomous categorization of 'mentally healthy' vs. 'mentally ill' (Bachkirova and Cox 2004; Buckley 2007) and call for ethical boundary management as part of a professional and conscientious coaching practice. What is more, the corporate world still stigmatizes therapy and people who seek therapy as weak and inefficient and this is "hardly an attractive image for the corporate executive charged with the task of moving "market mountains" (Peltier 2010: xxxvii); instead, management and business "hire stars, not mental cases" (ibid.). Executive coaching, in return, has come to be associated with a special service for high performers who are worth the investment as they strive for peak performance for the sake of the organization and their own success (cf. Charan 2009: 93; Peltier 2010: 363). As "(e)xecutives with issues that require more than coaching come in many shapes and sizes" (Berglas 2002: 86), professional coaches are required to detect serious mental disturbances and refer those cases to professionals offering psychological and psychotherapeutic services.

Emotions and Emotionally Intelligent Coaching

Emotions are central to human experience and an appreciation of their role in the process of change is an essential component of comprehensive coaching interventions. (Davis 2005: 64)

Chapter 3 introduces the different discourses of emotions as well as the peculiarities of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, the coaching approach under scrutiny here. In analogy with Fairclough's (1992) discourse model, the 'discourse of emotions' is viewed both as a macro-level phenomenon, i.e. socio-cultural knowledge, attitudes, norms, etc. about emotions, and as a micro-level phenomenon, i.e. the feelings-talk¹⁸ or displays of emotion that transpire between coach and client in the local coaching interaction. Moreover, 'discourse of emotions' also refers to the meso-level phenomenon of Emotional Intelligence, a popular and prevailing (psy-) model, which also molds *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*. Such a multi-dimensional perspective on emotions helps to assess and critically evaluate the local discursive emotion work that coach and client engage in.

Emotions are understood here – in accordance with a social-constructionist approach – as “phenomena that are shaped, experienced and interpreted through social and cultural processes” (Lupton 1998: 2), i.e. emotions are socio-culturally constructed in discourse, not inherent bodily phenomena; they are social actions (Prior 2016: 1; see also Sieben and Wettergren 2010: 7).

3.1 Emotional intelligence and Emotionally Intelligent Coaching

The emotional-intelligence framework advances self-reflection about emotions to insightful, actions-oriented management of them. (Davis 2005: 62)

Emotional Intelligence (EI) was originally proposed by Salovey and Mayer in 1990 and defined as “the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to

18. Feelings-talk refers to “explicitly and/or implicitly addressing and working with and through the clients' various emotions to accomplish relevant personal and professional goals” (Graf and Pawelczyk 2014: 59f).

understand emotions and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (Mayer and Salovey 1997: 10). EI has gained its immense popularity and omnipresence in psy-discourses and especially in managerial discourse through books by David Goleman such as *Emotional Intelligence. Why it can matter more than IQ* (1995) or *Working with Emotional Intelligence* (1998). Goleman’s approach fleshed out the best-selling concept of Emotional Intelligence into the following five domains: ‘self-awareness’, defined as the perception and accurate understanding of one’s own emotional states; ‘self-management’, defined as emotional self-control and an effective intra-personal reaction to feelings; ‘social awareness’, defined as the awareness of relationship surroundings; ‘empathy’, defined as understanding of the emotions of others, understanding how organizations work; and, finally, ‘relationship management’, defined as working effectively in the social arena, accomplishing goals with and through others, collaborating with teams and organizations (cf. Peltier 2010: 219). Emotional Intelligence thus pertains to both the intra- and inter-personal dimension of human (professional) interaction.

Its underlying tenor as expounded by Goleman (1995: xv) is that in dealing with one’s emotions “the problem is not with emotionality, but with the *appropriateness* of emotion and its expression”. Emotional Intelligence thus advocates a controlled and conscious dealing with emotions, that is, “Emotional Intelligence does not mean giving free reign to feelings – ‘letting it all hang out’. Rather, it means managing feelings so that they are expressed appropriately and effectively, enabling people to work together smoothly toward their common goal” (Goleman 1998: 7). With the help of Emotional Intelligence, emotions, or a competent managing of emotions, have been re-conceptualized as a measurable entity and product, i.e. as a commodity (cf. Fineman 2000: 111). In the world of organization and management – where executive coaching is located – emotion regulation has been transformed into an essential skill and success factor in the twenty-first-century workplace (cf. Lewis and Simpson 2007: 5). According to Illouz (2007: 64), emotionally competent behavior, or the intelligent management of emotions, has become so central to economic behavior that when the notion of Emotional Intelligence emerged in the 1990s, it took over (American) corporate life:

In hard times, the soft stuff often goes away. But Emotional Intelligence, it turns out, isn’t soft. If emotional obliviousness jeopardizes your ability to perform, fend off aggressors, or be compassionate in a crisis, no amount of attention to the bottom line will protect your career. Emotional Intelligence isn’t a luxury you can dispense with in tough times. It’s a basic tool that, deployed with finesse, is the key to professional success. (Harvard Business Review 2003: 5)

Emotional Intelligence is thus both the aspired goal of the professional worker or executive and the method or way to achieve this goal via learning, development and change. The particular attractiveness of EI resides in its integration of rational thinking, or the reigning rationalist paradigm, and emotions, as the ‘new’ and softer paradigm, as well as in its (supposedly) easy assessment, learnability and usability. Besides workshops and training dedicated to (the learning and practicing of) Emotional Intelligence, a relatively recent popular organizational context is (executive) coaching based on the tenets of EI. Emotions are considered pivotal to self-regulation and change (see Davis 2005: 58); consequently, perceiving, using, understanding and regulating emotions as the four interrelated abilities of Emotional Intelligence have turned into the major overarching goal of many coaching approaches: “(t)he importance of self-understanding, introspection and reflection, empathy, and effective social interaction skills is indisputable, and can often be enhanced through coaching” (Peltier 2010: 237).¹⁹ Reference to an Emotional Intelligence framework is found in many recent books on (executive) coaching (e.g. Peltier 2010, Cox et al. 2010, 2014, 2018 or Bachkirova et al. 2017; its effectiveness has been shown in e.g. a study by Schlatter and McDowall 2014).

The executive coaching approach that underlies the current analysis, *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* by Dietz Training & Partner (www.dietz-training.de), also lists the core competencies of Emotional Intelligence – self-awareness, self-regulation, self-management, empathy and relationship management – as its underlying coaching agenda and its primary thematic and interactive focus. The principal (therapeutic) models applied by the coaches to attune their clients towards these emotional competencies are the *Internal Family Systems Model* (IFS) by Richard Schwartz (1995) and *Hakomi Body-Centered Psychotherapy* (Kurtz 1990). While “IFS represents a new synthesis of two paradigms. One is called the multiplicity of the mind – the idea that we all contain many different beings. The other is known as systems thinking” (Schwartz 1995: 9), Hakomi stresses the shift of the (therapeutic) focus from talk towards experience and further from experience to the organization of experience (cf. Kurtz 1990: 22). In its work with (executive) clients, *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* unites the concepts of person-orientedness, multiplicity of mind, systemic thought, family therapy and mindfulness with the assets of Emotional Intelligence. The coaches’ overall professional coaching goal is to (re-)direct clients’ attention from a cognitive, facts-oriented access to their questions and concerns to an experiential, emotion-oriented one and to

19. The relevance of (topicalizing) emotions or feelings-talk to support clients’ development and change was originally analyzed and confirmed for psychotherapy and counseling (Safran and Greenberg 1991; Greenberg and Paivio 1997; Pawelczyk 2011; Greenberg 2015). To speak with Tolan (2003: 54), “(c)hange is prompted by and accompanied by feelings”.

raise their self-awareness and self-reflection with the aim of strengthening their self-regulation. The underlying and action-guiding core assumption thereby is that very often inter-personal problems in the clients' professional life (as an executive) originate from intra-personally conflicting feelings, emotions and attitudes; these feelings, emotions and attitudes represent clients' different personality parts and by learning about one's personality parts, these (and thus the underlying emotions) can be better, i.e. more appropriately, handled on the outside.

Emotionally Intelligent Coaching is based on a psychodynamic understanding of how change processes happen in people and how they can be supported, and stresses an appreciative, empathic and authentic attitude. The concrete interventions and attitudes used by the coaches to facilitate and support such change and development in their clients are in particular the concept of 'mindfulness', a slowing down of the action to self-observe and focus on the current experience, 'active listening', i.e. listening and repeating what the client has said to make him/her aware of their own resources, and 'tracking', i.e.

the skill of following the flow of the other's present experiences. It is the constant seeing and listening in order to keep track of what is happening for the other. It requires an ability to get out beyond one's self and continuously stay with what someone else is feeling and doing. It is a constant reading of signs.

(Kurtz 1990: 75)

In addition, there are 'contact statements', namely "a single direct statement about the client's present experience, without interpreting" (Kurtz 1990: 81), 'accessing questions', i.e. questions that address and thus deepen the current experiencing and 'externalizations' as well as 'summaries and reformulations'.

In *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, emotions are thus both the object of work (i.e. it is the coach's primary agenda to influence their clients' (dealing with) emotions), a means while working (i.e. the coach's emotional repertoire as the primary means of verbalizing the method) and a condition of work (i.e. the particular emotional coloring of the relationship between coach and client as the necessary prerequisite for clients to open up and face their emotions) (cf. Sieben and Wettergren 2010: 10f).²⁰

20. These tenets and procedures of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, found in the coaches' manual, training program and on their website represent their 'professional theory' or 'professional stocks of interactional knowledge' (Peräkylä and Vehviläinen 2003), defined as "organized and codified knowledge that concerns social interaction between professionals and clients [...] found from professional texts, training materials, and codes of conduct" (Peräkylä et al. 2005: 105). As such they theoretically inform the interaction that transpires between coach and client during the individual coaching sessions.

The popularity of Emotional Intelligence across the psy- and organizational discourses and the current boom in such ‘intelligent management’ of emotions can, however, only be truly understood against the backdrop of larger socio-cultural trends such as the therapeutic culture or soft capitalism, i.e. against the overall meaning of emotions in late modern society.

3.2 Emotions in late modern society

The language of emotionalism pervades popular culture, the world of politics, the workplace, schools and universities and everyday life. (Furedi 2004: 1)

Emotions are *en vogue* in late modern society. Their omnipresence across popular and scientific discourses attests to the “affective revolution” (Ashkanasy and Humphrey 2011) or the emotional turn in our times. Across both public and private spaces, we witness the rise of the *homo sentimental* in the 21st century (Illouz 2007). This process of emotionalizing society in its private and professional realms and its reflection in scientific discourse has been fostered by socio-cultural trends such as the ‘therapeutic culture’ (Furedi 2004) and organizational trends such as ‘soft capitalism’ (Thrift 1997, 2005; Heelas 2002), the morphology and strategies of which will be detailed in the following.

Late modern society is characterized by an infiltration of therapeutic discourse into everyday life, turning our culture into a therapeutic one, characterized by lifestyles imbued with confessional narratives and strategies for better understanding and managing of the self (Illouz 2007, 2008). Psychological and psychotherapeutic discourses have broken out of the confines of medicine and have conquered both the private and public life as dominant discourses of our modern times. In essence, the psychotherapeutic discourse follows the idea that salvation from neurosis, unhappiness, unproductivity, psychosomatic symptoms, psychosis, relationship problems and so on can (only) be found when turning one’s attention to the self and its relationships. At the core of this socio-cultural development is the self as a reflexive project (Giddens 1991), defined as “the sustaining of coherent, yet continuously revised, biographical narratives” (ibid.: 5). The self has been turned into the subject of political, moral and cultural discourses (cf. Costea et al. 2008: 663). Such necessary self-reflection is inseparably linked up with a prioritizing of experiencing and verbalizing of emotions to achieve a better understanding of the self (Lupton 1998). Members of late modern society thereby show a “diminished sense of self that characteristically suffers from an emotional deficit and possesses a permanent consciousness of vulnerability” (Furedi 2004: 414). Thus, the necessary focus on emotions is often imbued with negative connotations in the sense of ‘emotional

deficits', i.e. negative emotional responses to certain experiences are pathologized as part of a general normative assessment of emotions: "(t)he contemporary focus on emotion is not equal to 'letting emotions out', rather it recognizes their existence and value while simultaneously demanding their use in accordance with norms of an 'intelligent' management of emotions" (Sieben and Wettergren 2010: 4). A functional perspective on emotions thus prevails today (cf. Frijda 2000: 71). The local moral orders of the relevant (professional) context thereby decide on the conventions and evaluations of (displays) of emotions (cf. Harré 1986: 8; see also Hochschild's (1983) 'feeling rules').

The aspired re-skilling of the self (cf. Swan 2008: 7) as regards dealing competently with one's feelings and emotions has concurrently led to the emergence of a new system of (psy-)experts, whose psy-expertise is on social relations and the intimacies of the self (cf. Lupton 1998: 6; Pawelczyk and Graf 2011). The original and prime locus of psy-expertise and emotional work is psychotherapy or, to speak with Pawelczyk (2011), communication of emotion is a discursive norm of psychotherapy. Yet, as part of the infiltration of the therapeutic into everyday practices, therapeutic interventions that aim to elicit feelings-talk in clients are "not simply confined to the relationship of the therapist and the client. Such interventions characterize all contemporary organisations and institutions" (Furedi 2004: 10). The immediate concreteness of the therapeutic culture thereby materializes in the 'therapeutic habitus' (Costea et al. 2008), i.e. a set of discourses, techniques and practices that have historically emerged from psychotherapy and that are being translated into other, non-therapeutic realms such as the everyday or the managerial (cf. Schulz 2013; Schulz and Steyaert 2014). Consequently, a 'therapeutic emotional style' (Illouz 2007) is an omnipresent and pervasive socio-cultural and discursive practice, defined and promoted by psychologists, therapists, counselors and coaches alike.

The other relevant context of the therapeutic habitus is late modern (organizational) society (Schulz 2013). Late modern (organizational) society is imprinted by soft capitalism, a shift of attention towards the inner world of the individual worker and an agenda of developing their soft characteristics (Cameron 2000; Thrift 1997, 2005). (Late modern) Capitalism is closely linked with management as they both share the notion of maximizing the productivity and performance of the workforce to ensure continual profit as their fundamental aims. While, nowadays, the landscape of managerial discourse is vast, we might say that the key notion of management is 'getting things done through people'. In the light of this thrust towards optimizing economic performance in and through people, one central tenet in late modern capitalism is the idea that success is linked to one's capacity to unleash the 'soft' priorities of the self, i.e. to be emotionally competent. This double nature of capitalism is encapsulated in the concept of soft capitalism, a term that

aims to reflect capitalism's adaptive and vital nature, but also its "supposedly caring, sharing ethos" (Thrift 2005: 11). Soft capitalism is contrasted with other modes of capitalism centered on external techniques of governance while – according to the ethos of soft capitalism – corporate performance can only blossom if people learn to intensify their performance in all areas of life; only then can the full potential of human resourcefulness be unleashed.

Following Kärreman and Alvesson (2004), especially two modes of management must be differentiated here: a mode of technocratic control which "attempts to directly control worker behavior" (*ibid.*: 152) and a mode of socio-ideological control which "attempts to control worker beliefs" (*ibid.*). Socio-ideological control targets the emotions, social relationships and values of the worker. The former seems to be rooted in traditional forms of management and uses external control methods and surveillance technologies such as registration, assessment and classification, while the latter employs psychotherapeutic techniques to enhance self-reflection and self-management, thus targeting the employees' soft side. This managerial mode thus embodies the therapeutic habitus.

Yet, while the term 'soft' implies less external forms of control, this does not mean that its governing effects are innocent; instead, managerialism – considered here as the materialization of capitalism – is currently producing alternative, more intrusive, modes of governance. We now find new socio-technical and socio-discursive practices that have been designed to modify the intimate, emotional self of the working subject next to audit and surveillance technologies. Individuals are expected to put their whole being into their work as "productivity, profitability, efficiency and effectiveness have increasingly become dependent upon a new cultural and political economy of subjectivity at work" (Costea et al. 2008: 666). In such a "pro-emotional organizational arena" (Fambrough and Hart 2008: 741), psycho-technical practices are applied as organizational interventions to unlock the above-mentioned full potential of the self as "human resourcefulness" (Costea, Crump and Amiridis 2007). Employees' emotional competence or management thereby serves the larger goals of the organization as it is translatable into a social benefit or capital such as professional advancement or raised performativity.

Both contexts of the translated therapeutic habitus, therapeutic culture and soft capitalism, thus put emotions center-stage, blurring the private and the public. This leads to a rationalization of intimate relationships, i.e. the rationalization of emotions and the emotionalization of rationality or the "intellectualization of intimate bonds" (cf. Illouz 2007: 34). Emotions are decontextualized, objectified and have to be controlled; the handling of emotions has turned into a strategy, a competency and thus an important (social and organizational) capital:

Successful emotional management thereby implies a situation-adequate emotional behavior where positive emotions may show while negative emotions need to

be controlled by all means (cf. Lupton 1998: 50; see also Harré (1986: 8), who talks about the local moral order as regards emotion-adequate behavior). According to Hochschild (1983), we as humans constantly subject our own feelings and those of others to cognitive assessments and attempts to fashion and control them according to the local moral order of our current context by performing emotion work in relation to feeling rules that apply to the frames of each situated interaction. Thus, emotions do not ‘happen’ to people as the conventional stress on the irrationality of emotions would have it, but are part and parcel of the social and cultural world we live in (cf. Sieben and Wettergren 2010: 2). All in all we can conclude with Lupton (1998: 20), following Hochschild’s (1983) seminal work, that “the management of the emotions has become increasingly commercialized”.

A central and concrete site of such a capitalization and commercialization of emotions is the organizational context, as executive coaching deals with clients working for internationally operating organizations. Although organizations are considered a concrete site for soft capitalism, “(t)he role of emotion in organisations has always been a difficult issue” (Bachkirova and Cox 2007: 600). According to Sieben and Wettergren (2010: 4), the current attitude towards emotions in the organizational context is one of validating the expression of positive emotions such as happiness, self-confidence or self-enhancement, while concurrently discouraging the expression of negative feelings such as anger, disappointment, etc.. Professionals are expected to control and manage their emotions accordingly and are molded by their organization’s emotional culture (Schulz 2013).

In the organizational world we are faced with an alienation from the private experience of emotions. The conscious control of emotions is required and performed as part of the professional role expectations and in return for a wage (cf. Sieben and Wettergren 2010: 2). Clients’ personal theories, i.e. their assumptions about and attitudes towards emotions are thereby strongly shaped by the organizational world they (professionally) move in. The act of adapting one’s emotions to fulfill organizational expectations can be summarized by Hochschild’s (1983) term of ‘emotion work’, i.e. “the act of attempting to change an emotion or feeling so that it is appropriate for any given situation” (Bolton and Boyd 2003: 292). Such an explicit and conscious management of emotions in the professional context requires an intelligent dealing with emotions, a handling of emotions that can or must be learned with a (psy-) expert, who supports clients’ strive towards self-reflection and self-advancement, yet not only for personal, but also for organizational purposes.

Summarizing, we might say that late modern society is characterized by putting emotions center-stage in the private and the public life of the individual via the infiltration of the therapeutic into non-therapeutic contexts in the form of discourses, practices, norms and values. Especially in the organizational context, the stance towards emotions is one of validating the expression of positive emotions such as

happiness, self-confidence or self-enhancement, while at the same time expecting the professional to control and manage negative feelings such as anger or disappointment. The current proliferation of emotions and emotional management in the executive world is thereby epitomized in the discourse of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* as one institutionalized variety of therapeutic narrative invited and supported by coaching experts in an organizational context for the sake of both clients' self-reflection, change and development and for their enhanced performativity and, thus, for the ultimate benefit of the paying organization.

3.3 Discursive co-construction of emotions

This final section zooms in on the micro-level linguistic representation of emotions.²¹ Emotions are considered a 'discursive practice' (Abu-Lughod and Lutz 1990) and as such they underlie the dominant socio-cultural norms that shape the meaning that is attached to these practices. Adapted to the current analysis, the discursive co-construction of emotions in executive coaching is the relevant local site of translation of the therapeutic habitus into the managerial world (cf. Schulz 2013.).

How are emotions locally and discursively co-constructed in (professional) interaction? In other words, how are they manifested, interpreted and discursively processed (Fiehler 2005), or – in the current terminology – how are emotions co-constructed in discursive interaction? And what are the participants' communicative resources to do so? In an institutional and professional setting such as executive coaching, the discursive practices of 'communication of emotion' underlie particular responsibilities and expectations as regards the division of strategies or vehicles of emotional communication between the participants. Unlike in other interactional contexts such as conversational narratives among (women) friends (cf. Coates 1996), reciprocity is not an issue, neither on the thematic nor the structural dimension of emotion display. Instead, the particular emotional processing strategies or the particular discursive emotion work orient to and at the same time manifest the respective institution: while the professional's emotion strategies are an essential part of his or her professional interactive responsibility and – in the context of psychotherapy or (*Emotionally Intelligent*) coaching – his/her professional agenda, the clients, in their verbalizations of emotions and emotional experiences, also orient to the anticipated institutional norms and expectations. As with other discursive practices, it is the professional who exerts conversation control (cf. Buttny 1996: 147f) over co-constructing the discourse of emotions.

21. For a recent discussion on the terminology as regards 'emotion', 'affect', 'stance', etc. see, for example, Selting (2010) and Wetherell (2012, 2013).

Clients' emotional experience and its verbalization is a central object of attention in psychotherapy and linguistic research of therapeutic interaction (Besnier 1990; Ruusuvuori 2005, 2007; Voutilainen 2010, 2012; Voutilainen et al. 2010; Sorjonen and Peräkylä 2012; Muntigl, Knights and Watkins 2014). As Pawelczyk (2011: 200) expounds, "(t)he all-encompassing term (*communication of emotion*) is to indicate that aspects of constructing, doing, experiencing, describing, and eliciting, as well as validating one's emotions occupy the primary position in the interaction between the therapist and client". In the current data relating to *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, emotions are a central object of attention, too, and the coaches' orientation to their clients' (problematic) emotional experience is a core feature of the coaching interaction. Emotions are thus a focal theme in Roberts and Sarangi's (2005) sense. Consequently, a major communicative task for coaches is to (re-)focus their clients towards their emotional experiencing.

In institutional and professional encounters such as therapy or coaching, clients are explicitly invited and prodded to discuss their state of being, i.e. to describe what bothers them and how they are doing emotionally or otherwise, as an essential part of the underlying professional agenda (cf. Pawelczyk 2011: 221). According to Sorjonen and Peräkylä (2012: 11), in these settings "emotion displays and explicit talk about emotions are central for the main goal of the activity". Such tellings of clients' (troublesome) experiences thereby represent 'empathetic opportunities' (Suchmann et al. 1997) or 'empathetic moments' (Heritage 2011) for the professionals to display understanding and affiliation with their clients. In contexts where talk epitomizes the very action itself, clients' (emotional) accounts serve both as important evidence and raw material for the ensuing interaction. Part of the professional's task of fostering change and development is to turn the clients' attention towards so far blocked, veiled or unconscious motives, emotions, etc.; negotiating the meaning of emotion terms is of special relevance (Graf 2007b). To accept change, clients have to integrate new experiences related to change into their self-structure (cf. Tolan 2003: 3). Such integration is only possible on the level of the clients' feelings and attitudes; the process of change in therapy and coaching therefore hinges on making people aware of their own emotions and attitudes, i.e. their beliefs and evaluations.

A relevant notion in the discussion on how clients' emotions are discursively co-constructed by the participants is Heritage's (2011) 'territory of experience'. As the author expounds (2011: 159), "(t)he relationship between knowing something and having experienced it is deeply entrenched in interactional practices associated with assessment and evaluation". Of particular importance here is what Heritage terms 'the problem of experience' (ibid.: 160):

In particular, when persons report first-hand experiences of any great intensity (involving, for example, pleasure, pain, joy or sorrow), they obligate others to join with them in their evaluation, to affirm the nature of the experience and its meaning, and to affiliate with the stance of the experiencer toward them. These obligations are moral obligations that, if fulfilled, will create moments of empathic communion.

Heritage's (2011) 'problem of experience' must be differentiated according to the interaction frame in which such a problem of experience arises, i.e. the problem of experience has different interactional consequences when it arises in mundane conversations or in an institutional and professional interaction such as psychotherapy or coaching. In the latter, clients' emotional distress, personal or business-related worries or other types of concerns are the prime motivation for the interaction between client and professional and at the same time represent the prime material for the ensuing 'work'. As such, clients' experiences evince different obligations and affordances as regards the receiver's resources for responding to such accounts of personal experiences via emotional support strategies and other devices.

In the following, findings on professionals' and clients' resources in the discursive co-construction of emotions, i.e. empathic practices, from other professional contexts such as doctor-patient or therapeutic interaction are summarized. I will then critically assess their applicability and relevance for the current context of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* via a set of questions that will eventually lead to an adapted inventory of discursive strategies and linguistic means to describe emotion talk in the coaching data in Part II.

In his work on emotionality in doctor-patient interaction, Fiehler (2005) focuses on the following two aspects: How are emotions turned into the topic of the conversation between doctor and patient and how is this topic further processed in the course of the ensuing interaction? And secondly, what do the participants' emotions refer to? As regards the first issue, Fiehler (2005: 122f) explicates that emotions and emotional experiences need, in a first step, to be constituted as a conversational topic by the participants via manifestation on the client's part and interpretation on the professional's part before they can be further processed interactively, i.e. before emotional involvement can be displayed and managed in the ensuing interaction. He thereby distinguishes between the emotional processing strategies of responding to, questioning, challenging or ignoring the patient's manifestation of emotion or emotional experiences by doctors in their interactions with patients. As regards the content of the participants' emotions, Fiehler (2005: 123) lists the following referents as patients' emotions: 'his/her complaint', 'doctor-patient interaction', 'kind of treatment', 'concrete treatment', 'person of the doctor', 'visit to the doctor' and 'prior experiences with doctors'. Patients' emotions thus have both

inner and outer referents. Yet not only patients experience emotions or emotionality during their interaction with doctors. Doctors are also emotionally involved and, according to Fiehler (2005: 123f), the patient's emotional experiences, the patient himself/herself, the ensuing interaction with the patient and the working situation itself represent the primary referents of the professional's emotionality. Doctors' emotional referents are thus of inner or outer nature, too.

Of vital importance for the quality and success of professional encounters in general, and of therapeutic or coaching encounters in particular, is the way displays of emotionality or affect are interactively processed by the participants on a turn-by-turn basis (cf. Graf and Pawelczyk 2014). The emotions and emotional experiences of a professional that refer to the patient or client's emotions and emotional experiences are conceptualized as empathy or empathic reactions (cf. Voutilainen et al. 2010). Besides other professional helping contexts such as doctor-patient interaction,²² empathy is widely analyzed in discourse and conversation analytic studies of psychotherapy (e.g. Wynn and Wynn 2006; Voutilainen, Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori 2010; Pawelczyk 2011; Muntigl, Knight and Watkins 2014; Pawelczyk under review). Translated into the discursive practice found in such therapeutic contexts, "empathy can be seen as a multi-phased process, involving a sequence of experiences, including the therapist's 'resonating' with the patient's experience, the therapist's expression of empathy, and the patient's reception of it" (Pudlinski 2005: 267). Empathy, then, is an interactional phenomenon which appears in particular interactional trajectories across a number of turns via verbal and non-verbal means; thus "empathy can be understood to be a higher level conversational resource that builds on more basic conversational resources, such as questions, assertions, other types of utterances, and even non-verbal behavior" (Wynn and Wynn 2006: 1389).

In her discourse analysis of Relationship-Focused Integrative Psychotherapy, Pawelczyk (2011) lists the following four strategies of emotional support on the part of the psychotherapist as interactional practice of expressing empathy:

- Emotive extension of the client's account defined as "understanding and paraphrasing back what the other speaker (here the client) has said and presumably means" (ibid.: 243);
- Emotive reaction, defined as "the emotional sum-up of the client's previous turn" (ibid.: 246);

22. See, for example, the work on affiliation and empathic responses in ordinary conversations (Stivers 2008; Selting 2010 and Heritage 2011), in peer support lines (Pudlinski 2005) or health care encounters (Ruusuvuori 2005, 2007).

- Validation, defined as legitimizing the client's feelings and experiences (cf. *ibid.*: 248);
- Mirroring, defined as giving emotional support by directly referencing one's own (emotional) experience (cf. *ibid.*: 250).

As Pawelczyk expounds (2011: 252), “(t)he four strategies of emotional support applied by the therapist are the consequence of his *active listening* to what the client is communicating both verbally and non-verbally”. In addition to these emotional support strategies, the author names ‘giving priority to ‘feelings-talk’ and ‘enabling the client to voice his/her less socially acceptable emotions and attitudes’ as additional therapeutic strategies to encourage the client’s communication of emotions.

More generally, Voutilainen (2010) and Voutilainen et al. (2010) in their analysis of therapists’ responses to clients’ emotional experience in psychotherapy distinguish between ‘recognition’, ‘interpretation’ and ‘confirmation’, defined as “different types of combinations of linguistic means of *paraphrasing* and *interpreting* the patient’s expressed experience and *displaying affect*” (Voutilainen 2010: 31f.; italics in original). These emotional support strategies create an opportunity for the patients’ self-reflective talk in the next turn:

It is a central task – maybe the central task – of a psychotherapist to convey to the patient that her experiences are real and valid (recognition) and to show that these experiences have a comprehensible history and linkages to other experiences (interpretation). [...] This means that the emotional responsiveness – empathetic response – is a prerequisite of the more cognitive, interpretative actions.

(Voutilainen et al. 2010: 104)

A relevant distinction – introduced by Voutilainen et al. (2010) – in the context of therapists’ responses to clients’ experiences is whether these are inner, emotional experiences or external issues. Only therapists’ reactions to the former are captured by the terms ‘empathy’ or ‘affiliation’. Affiliation, the more common Conversation Analytic term for ‘empathy’ or ‘empathy as action’ according to Voutilainen (2010: 31), is defined thus as “the hearer displays support of and endorses the teller’s conveyed stance” (Stivers 2008: 35).

Professionals’ affiliation, i.e. displaying understanding, compassion or agreement with the client’s verbalizations of emotions, and thus creating cooperation on the affective level, fulfills different actions. It serves both as an important means of problem-solving or concern-processing itself in psychotherapy and related contexts as it creates a climate of intimacy and a sense of closeness necessary for the clients to feel safe and be able to delve deeper into their emotional experiences. Affiliation thus helps to complete the institutional task at hand and can be regarded as the central discursive practice that characterizes both psychotherapy and coaching based on Emotional Intelligence. Concurrently, it serves other communicative goals of a

more local nature such as working towards the closure of the sequence of clients' verbalizations of emotional experience, for example (cf. Ruusuvuori 2007: 598).

After tackling the professionals' resources and strategies to evince and process the verbalization of emotions and emotional experiences in their clients, the next question to be addressed in an analysis of the discursive co-construction of emotions is: What are the primary discursive means and contexts for clients to display their emotions and their states of affectivity? One relevant context is (institutional) narratives (often in the form of troubles telling or problem talk), which can be invited, pre-announced or proposed (Benwell and Stokoe 2006; Prior 2016).²³ As a situated discursive practice they fulfill various functions concurrently (cf. Graf 2012):

- In verbalizing past events and experiences, clients' narratives symbolize, transform and displace these from the past into the present and into the 'here-and-now' of the professional interaction between professional and client (Schiffrin 1996).
- Thereby, they are a means to invite professionals into the clients' territory of knowledge (Kamio 1997) and territory of experience (Heritage 2011). Such sharing of knowledge and experience is an important means to establish common ground for the participants.
- In those settings where language and communication is both the primary means and the primary method of the professional encounter, clients' narratives function as evidence (cf. Sarangi 2001: 6).
- In choosing to narrate certain events and experiences from their lives, clients display a particular portrayal of self and identity. In so doing, they show an orientation to the local context of the production, its constraints and implications and their verbalizations are implicitly guided by questions such as 'what is appropriate – as regards the display of emotions – for a particular audience or a particular professional setting'?
- As clients' version of past events and experience, narratives represent the 'raw material' out of which a synchronized version is co-constructed by coach and client. Coaching or therapy-relevant information is thereby teased out (cf. Pain 2009: 146) and transformed into coachable or therapeutic categories and entities by the coach.

23. However, according to Selting (2010: 231), the display of affectivity in storytelling is a complex matter: "The affect that is being displayed by the storyteller will most commonly not be an 'in-situ' affect, i.e. an affect experienced in the here-and-now of the time of the telling, but a 'reconstructed affect', i.e. an affect in the storyworld that is being represented and told by the storyteller to and for the story recipients." Yet, as she continues to argue the storyteller concurrently displays emotively involved assessments of the events narrated, which represent true in-situ displays of affect and which function as empathic opportunities for the recipient of the story.

Clients' explicit or implicit verbalizations of emotions and emotional experiences in the form of narratives, etc. are not the only manifestations of emotions. Non-verbal activities such as silence, crying or laughter are other significant communicative means for clients to express and release their emotional states (cf. Pawelczyk 2011: 253ff). Given the primary focus on verbal interaction in the current analysis, such non-verbal means will only be dealt with where necessary for an interpretation of the material.

Feelings-talk then is a central component of professional encounters such as psychotherapy and (Emotionally Intelligent) coaching. The sequential practice of such discursive co-constructions of emotions is strongly molded by the institutional and professional framing; feelings-talk is predominantly initiated, channeled and directed by the professional via thematic and structuring agenda moves. The discursive co-construction of emotions centers on invitations, displays of emotional experience and their processing via particular emotional support strategies or other devices which pursue the underlying professional agenda of the encounter. Important aspects of this agenda in the context of feelings-talk are to validate clients' experiences and to bring into the open so far hidden emotions as a basis for clients' development and change.

Yet, exactly how the discursive co-construction of emotions and emotional experience truly unfolds in authentic coaching interaction and what the coaching-specific resources are on the part of the clients and coaches remain to be analyzed in Part II. The categories and research foci from surrounding professional contexts must be adapted for the current purpose for the following reasons:

1. Clients may enter coaching with primarily business or factually oriented concerns based on their institutional expectations of coaching as a kind of management consultation process. What kind of discursive emotion work must coaches engage in to (re-)focus these clients on feelings instead of facts? It is hypothesized that in such cases, it will be the coaches who initiate the constitution of emotions as a conversational topic in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, i.e. the ones who initiate the transformation of external issues into internal experiences. Moreover, the co-construction of (an) emotional concern(s) must be interactively and discursively prepared for and embedded in a particular type of relational and situational framing – again interactively and discursively co-constructed by coach and client (Graf and Jautz under review).
2. Given the managerial context of executive coaching, a relevant question addresses the referents of clients' emotional experiences as well as a possible retrospective or prospective focus on emotions. Coaching as an organizational intervention is embedded in a professional, executive context and the executive clients' emotional experiences will initially and primarily cover interpersonal

relations with their own clients, colleagues, line managers, etc., i.e. with external referents. Concurrently, while the prototypical therapeutic focus when dealing with a client's emotional experiences lies in the past with special attention paid to his or her family history, the coaching focus when dealing with a client's emotions is expected to lie primarily in current and future incidents from his or her professional realm.

3. The larger socio-cultural and organizational context of feelings-talk in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* materializes in the agenda in the (additional) goal of facilitating the executive clients' situation- and organization-adequate control of emotions or emotion regulation for organizational purposes. To functionalize the executives' emotional behavior for the sake of self-optimization, increased personal productivity and high-performance and thus – eventually – for the sake of the organization requires particular discursive strategies on the part of the coach: not only must clients be (re-)focused on their emotional experience, but learning about one's emotions is expected to be discursively linked back to the organizational purposes of the coaching encounter (cf. Graf and Pawelczyk 2014; Graf under review).

The Basic Activity Model of executive coaching

The overall goal of this book is to provide systematic linguistic insights into the discourses of executive coaching. Therefore, a model for the description of executive coaching as well as its discourses is needed. In what follows the theoretical and methodological framework, within which the Basic Activity Model of executive coaching is developed, is outlined. A special focus will be on the transition from ‘phases of coaching’, the established praxis model of coaching that also informed the preliminary case study (see Graf in press), to ‘basic activities of coaching’, the empirically based applied linguistic model of coaching established here.

4.1 Theoretical framework

In what follows, executive coaching is conceptualized from three theoretical perspectives and is theorized as an activity type and discourse type, as an interaction frame and as professional and institutional discourse.

4.1.1 Coaching as activity type and discourse type

Executive coaching is conceptualized here first of all as an activity type in Levinson’s (1979, 1992) sense; i.e. as “a fuzzy category whose focal members are goal-defined, socially constituted, bounded events with constraints on participants, settings and so on, but above all on the kind of allowable contributions” (1979: 368). Activity types are of a gradual, more-or-less character that center around a common core of basic activities which are established over time due to recurring experience: “the regular exchange [...] will, through this process of constant renewal and reinforcement, lay down sedimentary layers of talk that, over time, give shape to a distinctive interactional landscape” (Richards 2006: 14). Such a ‘distinctive interactional landscape’ acts as a knowledge resource for the participants and as a point of orientation against which the appropriateness and meaning of activities is assessed. Concurrently, the distinctive interactional landscape displays a sequential structure of its communicative and interactional practices, and context models also inform participants about the anticipated trajectory of activities along the interaction, i.e. the sequential

organization of the interaction (cf. Schegloff 2007: 135). Such a routinized and recurring interactional layout is a characterizing feature of any profession.

The overall functional description of the activity type ‘executive coaching’ happens via its four basic activities (see Vehviläinen 1999 in the context of career counseling), defined here as an amalgam of (recurring) communicative tasks or goals and a common core of discursive practices which participants engage in to solve these tasks, i.e. the communicative strategies they apply to do so. A communicative task is a goal-oriented activity participants must engage in to reach a particular (sub-)goal. Each communicative task or goal-oriented activity thereby entails various core components, the thematic content, volume, structural positioning and discursive realization of which account for the variation in basic activities within and across the coaching processes. Communicative strategies may be understood as broad plans or choices for social action and are realized locally via concrete linguistic tactics; tactics, in turn, may be understood as particular verbal and non-verbal actions or choices used to realize these abstract strategies at the level of social action (cf. Berger 1997: 6).

Professional agents such as coaches orient their actions to a particular and pre-established underlying institutional agenda that serves the institutional goal(s) and they use their power and authority to (re-)focus clients’ actions – should these themselves not orient to what is institutionally relevant and expected – towards such institutional agendas. As a consequence, professional and institutional interaction follows a pre-established action schema that transpires along and within consecutive phases, i.e. “stretch[es] of joint actions with a unified function and identifiable entry and exit time” (Clark 1996: 83).²⁴ Yet, interactional reality in the professional context has it that these structural components of action schemata are rarely if ever clearly demarcated entities in their temporal succession, thematic orientation and interactional realization. Thus, to functionally describe a particular professional practice such as executive coaching, the transpiring interaction is better conceptualized as a collection of communicative tasks that participants need to tackle co-operatively in order to accomplish the overall purpose of their doing, i.e. in our case to do ‘coaching’ (cf. Becker-Mrotzek 1992: 5; see also Sator 2011).

Like psychotherapy, counseling or supervision, executive coaching transpires in and through verbal (and non-verbal) communication, with very few accompanying or parallel actions such as taking notes, externalizing ideas on sheets of paper,

24. For action schemata and phases in professional interaction see, for example, Byrne and Long 1976; Kallmeyer 1985, 2000; Spiegel and Spranz-Fogasy 2001; Maier-Gutheil 2009; Lalouschek 2013. But see Spranz-Fogasy (2005: 18f) on the flexible handling of the medical action schema and the practice of adding or leaving out certain components according to the local needs of a particular interaction (Spiegel and Spranz-Fogasy 2001; Lalouschek 2013).

etc. that often function as framing or structuring activities. The non-existence of a physical examination or physical constellation work turns the coaching session into an array of blurring communicative actions without clear phasal boundaries. What is more, the interactional morphology of coaching as result-oriented self-reflection (Greif 2008: 116) and its person- and process-orientation (see Chapter 2) imply both a circular, consecutive and at times ad-hoc emergence of tasks, the flexible handling of which transpires according to the local needs of a particular coach-client interaction, yet not within a pre-established and discernible phasal structure with chronological obligatory and facultative components.

The quasi-conversational character of coaching interaction (Drew and Heritage 1992) also speaks for a conceptualization of coaching as activity type based on basic activities instead of an action schema based on individual phases: coaching theory stresses the egalitarian relationship between coach and client and envisions coaching as the meeting of two experts, the coach as the expert for the coaching process and the client as the expert for the coaching content (Jautz 2017). Such a (theoretically) de-hierarchized relationship results in more interactional freedom on the part of the client and an upgrade of their interactive rights as regards implementing their own agenda, i.e. what type of interaction they aspire to with the coach, what thematic orientation they pursue in a particular session, etc.. This interactive and thematic flexibility may result in a structural flexibility difficult to capture in a primarily phasal description.

The basic activities are developed abductively from the data (see Graf in press), from the professional stocks of interaction knowledge (Peräkylä and Vehviläinen 2003) as laid out in the praxis literature on coaching and from discourse studies of surrounding professional formats such as psychotherapeutic talk, counseling talk or health-care communication (Meyer 2001; Kelle and Kluge 2010). The following four basic activities are established according to this abductive methodology: 'Defining the Situation', 'Building the Relationship', 'Co-constructing Change' and 'Evaluating the Coaching'. They center on the following core communicative tasks: 'Defining the Situation' embraces those tasks, predominantly tackled explicitly, that aim to give clients orientation as regards the overall purpose and layout of their interaction with the coach, i.e. to set up the interaction frame of 'coaching'. 'Building the Relationship' refers to the relational practices that participants engage in to discursively define their identities and roles and thereby to establish their coaching relationship. 'Co-constructing Change' discursively defines the client's concern and goal and subsumes tasks that deal with working on these according to the underlying coaching agenda and according to the client's wishes in order to co-construct solutions and thus allow for learning and development in the client. Finally, 'Evaluating the Coaching' refers to the participants' assessment as regards the thematic, i.e. the concern, the relational, i.e. the relationship between coach and

client, and the procedural, i.e. the applied methods and procedure, dimensions of their interaction.

Analogous with psychotherapy or counseling, in coaching “the discourse itself is [the] treatment” (Ainsworth-Vaughn 2001: 458). As a linguistic practice, the ‘discourse of executive coaching’ refers first of all to the concrete communicative interaction the participants engage in and through which the very action of coaching is constituted, i.e. discourse is regarded as a particular way of acting and interacting linguistically (cf. Fairclough 2003: 17). Embedded in this overall discursive interaction, the four basic activities are realized in and through particular language-based practices that evolve around the repetitive tackling of the activity-specific communicative tasks and whose local functions are contextually determined. These “specific manifestations of language form in their interactional contexts” (Sarangi 2000: 1) or particular patterns of recurring and endemic linguistic and specific contextual features are termed ‘discourse types’²⁵ (see also Fairclough 1992: 85). As a result of the various communicative tasks that need to be tackled via such patterns of linguistic practices, it can be assumed that the overall ‘discourse of coaching’ is a discursive amalgam based on an array of various discourse types. As basic activities – due to their endemic communicative tasks and the discursive practices participants engage in to solve them – predispose particular discourse types on the one hand and result from the very activity type on the other, discourse type and activity type merge in coaching:

The overlap between activity types and discourse types [...] is most apparent when we deal with counselling and therapy, as they constitute both a type of activity and a form of discourse. In other words, what we regard as counselling talk or therapy talk may occur in a number of activity types and, similarly, therapy and counselling sessions will draw on different discourse types (e.g., advising, troubles telling).

(Sarangi 2000: 2; see also Sarangi 2011: 277)

Relevant to the conflation of ‘activity type’ and ‘discourse type’ is the concept of ‘interactional or discursive hybridity’ (Fairclough 1992; Sarangi 2000). Such hybridization or colonization contains both an element of locally, ad-hoc amalgamating discursive practices as interactive potential or as a resource to meet the special requirements of a particular discursive event by the participants (cf. Lalouschek 2005a: 272) and an element of a more naturalized, conventionalized and stable

25. A closely related, yet not identical concept, is ‘professional genre’ as discussed e.g. by Bhatia in his latest book *Critical Genre Analysis* (2017). However, for the current purpose ‘discourse type’ represents the more appropriate concept as a) it directly links up with ‘activity type’ according to Sarangi (2000, 2011) and b) it is defined both according to its thematic scope and purpose, its socially constitutive and constituted nature and according to its discursive practices, a cluster of context-dependent, recurrent linguistic strategies that help solve discourse type specific communicative problems.

combination of such discursive practices or types into new forms of discourse. Of interest in the latter context is the question as to which discourse types thereby become dominant and prolific in a particular activity type, i.e. what order of discourse in Foucault's sense we encounter in specific discursive events or what type(s) of discourse occupy focal positions in particular activity types such as executive coaching (cf. Sarangi 2000: 12ff).

4.1.2 Coaching as an interaction frame

Executive coaching is next conceptualized as an interaction frame. The global interaction frame of executive coaching entails the following dimensions as outlined by Goodwin and Duranti (1992: 6ff):

- the extra-situational context;
- the physical and social setting;
- the participants' non-verbal and bodily behavior;
- the participants' verbal behavior, i.e. their use of particular contextualization cues or discursive modes.

Whereas the first three dimensions are only considered in the analysis when implicitly or explicitly oriented to in the talk that transpires between coach and client, the dimension 'participants' verbal behavior' is the core focus of the current analysis. Participants' verbal behavior then refers to their discursive co-construction of the local interaction frame of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*. According to Ensink and Sauer (2003: 7),

- (i)nteractive frames are those frames which pertain to our behaviour of what we do whenever we speak with one another in different social situations. Participants in interaction need to share a sense of which kind of activity they are engaged in. This is warranted by the mutual orientation toward interactive frames.

This conceptualization is useful as it "focuses on the definition which participants give to their current social activity – to what is going on, what the situation is, and the roles which the interactants adopt within it" (Drew and Heritage 1992: 8; see also Prego-Vázquez 2007: 296). This shared sense is based on past experience with similar situations and is represented in mental models that contain those aspects of the structure of the (communicative) situation relevant for the production and reception of the social activity or the discourse (cf. Lalouschek 2005b: 61; van Dijk 2008: 16ff). Moreover, the shared sense accounts for participants' assumptions and expectations as regards the transpiring social or discursive activity. Yet, "(f)rame [...] organizes more than meaning; it also organizes involvement. During any spate of activity, participants will ordinarily not only obtain a sense of what is going

on but will also (in some degree) become spontaneously engrossed, caught up, enthralled” (Goffman 1974: 345). Participants do so by adopting a particular ‘participation status’ within the relevant ‘participation framework’ and signal that via their footing (Goffman 1981). What is more “(a) change in footing implies a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance” (ibid.: 128). A change in footing thus serves to indicate a change in how participants frame the ongoing (discursive) event and their role therein. More generally, the different roles that participants adopt within the ongoing social activity concurrently imply different perspectives as to how the ongoing social activity is viewed and how the content or topic of a discourse is presented. Due to the fickle state of coaching as regards its professional and institutional status, a relevant question revolves around notions such as ‘structures of expectations’, or the ‘shared sense’ that participants bring (or do not bring) to coaching based on their prior experiences with similar situations and on their expectations relating to the coach, appropriate topics to be dealt with and the procedures, etc.

The concept of an interaction frame allows the linking of the global and the local levels of executive coaching discourse as “(a) key element in framing is the use of identifiable linguistic registers” (Tannen and Wallat 1993: 63): how participants frame the ongoing situation is reflected in their discursive behavior, e.g. in their use of particular contextualization cues (Gumperz 1992a/b, 1995; Levinson 1997). Contextualization cues invoke frames and scenarios within which the current utterance or sequence is to be interpreted. By signaling interpretively significant aspects of the social context, they enable interactants to make inferences about one another’s communicative intentions and goals. Thus, “participants negotiate frames and communicate changes in footing through ‘cues and markers’ in speech” (Drew and Heritage 1992: 9).

Within coaching as a concrete interaction frame, coach and client communicatively open up various ‘interaction fields’²⁶ on which they interact with each other. Interaction frame and interaction field(s) are related in the following way: within a particular interaction frame certain interaction fields are prototypically opened up while others remain outside such an interaction frame. On these interaction fields, coach and client take on different roles and engage – in changing constellations – in various interactions according to the particular communicative tasks. On the one hand, the various communicative tasks result from the local goals or the overarching theme of the interaction of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, such as the need to (re-)focus clients on their emotional experiences; on the other hand

26. Hutchby (2007) talks about ‘inter- and intrapersonal spheres or domains’ in this context.

they result from the more global situation of coaching as not yet professionalized and institutionalized practice. All of these tasks are tackled via specific (inter-) actions in the form of recurring discursive practices.

In 'Defining the Situation' coach and client negotiate and set the interaction frame of '*Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*' and determine its interaction rules. The interaction frame is thereby both globally set apart by the coach from other interaction frames such as 'psychotherapy' or 'management consulting' and locally defined by the coach according to the underlying agenda of the particular approach, i.e. its focus on the client's emotions. Each individual coach-client dyad and the experiences, expectations and concerns of the client influence the negotiation and setting up of the particular interaction frame and its rules. Establishing a particular interaction frame in the basic activity 'Defining the Situation' concurrently entails the communication opening up of prototypical interactions fields on which the participants interact with each other in various constellations. I.e. coach and client determine the interaction frame 'coaching' and its interaction fields along a methodological, procedural, thematic and temporal line.

In 'Building the Relationship' coach and client, as the primary participants of the in-situ coaching interaction, discursively establish their respective roles and the dimensions of their relationship. Due to these roles and dimensions, the participants hold different interaction rights and obligations within the coaching interaction frame, i.e. they have a different share in initiating and responding to particular actions and in pursuing their agenda by exerting thematic and interactive control over the interaction. To reframe it, they have a different share in opening up the available interaction fields.

The following interaction fields are prototypically opened up in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*:

- 0 coach – client – client's organization
 - implicit
 - explicit
- 1 coach – client (real-time / concrete / *ad oculos*)
 - (= inter-personal interaction field)
 - implicit
 - explicit
- 2 coach – client – client's professional relations (*am phantasma*)
 - (= inter-personal interaction field)
- 3 coach – client – client's personal relations (*am phantasma*)
 - (= inter-personal interaction field)
- 4 coach – client – client's personality parts (*am phantasma*)
 - (=intra-personal interaction field)
- 5 coach – coach's professional and personal relations – client

Figure 1. Interaction fields in executive coaching

The interaction field '0', 'coach – client – client's organization' determines the global interaction field (and triadic relationship) in which the coach-client dyad is embedded. The organization or its representative in the form of a HR manager or the client's line manager are not physically present in the coaching session; they are, however – at times – explicitly invoked in the talk that transpires between coach and client. While interaction fields 1–4, 'coach – client', 'coach – client – client's professional relations', 'coach – client – client's personal relations' and 'coach – client – client's personality parts' all represent the core fields on which *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is acted out, the intra-personal interaction field with its focus on the client's feelings, emotions, experiences (i.e. his/her personality parts) is the one predominantly pursued in the coach's transformation work. Finally, interaction field 5, 'coach – coach's professional and personal relations – client' is not opened up routinely in professional encounters as their asymmetry has it that it is the client's interaction fields, not the professional's, which are opened up and worked on. However one particularity of how coaches relate with their clients in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is by passing on personal information, an interactive practice that functions to add a particular emotional coloring to their relationship and to de-hierarchize it.

The interactants on these various interaction fields in coaching – the paying organization in the form of the client's HR or line manager, the coach, the client and the client's professional and personal relations – are thereby either bodily present in the here-and-now of the coaching session or are explicitly referred to in the coach's or client's accounts. Instead of being explicitly referred to, the interactants can also be implicitly invoked in the talk that transpires between coach and client.

The concrete discursive practices or interventions that underlie the co-creation of change in the context of the basic activity 'Co-Constructing Change' are determined by the mutually agreed upon interaction frame, by the interaction fields that have been opened up / constituted by coach and client and by the constellations among the interactants on these interaction fields. It is here that the underlying coaching agenda of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, i.e. (re-)focusing clients on their emotional experiences, is most explicitly acted out in the coach's discursive practices.

Finally, the interaction or basic activity 'Evaluating the Coaching' takes place in relation to interactions on those interaction fields that have previously been opened up communicatively by coach and client. Only interactions on those interaction fields can be evaluated.

4.1.3 Coaching as professional and institutional discourse

Executive coaching is finally theorized as professional²⁷ and institutional discourse. The primary (analytic) focus as regards professional discourse lies in the display of the distribution of knowledge and power, while the primary focus as regards institutional discourse lies in the display of its goal and task orientation as well as in the inferential processes due to the institutional framing of the interaction (cf. Koester 2010: 6). Yet, in the local transpiring of the communicative business at hand, we witness the merging of these two frames as, for example, the professional pursues the institutional goals with the help of professional knowledge and expertise and in pursuing the underlying agenda exerts control over both the content and process / structure of the conversation.²⁸ The potential asymmetry between the professional and the layperson primarily centers on the notions of ‘knowledge’ and ‘expertise’ with respect to the task at hand, how these are distributed and how much power is associated with this distribution (Heller 2007). Such epistemic asymmetries in professional-lay contexts in turn entail particular professional and institutional identities, roles and tasks as well as participants’ orientation to them. Although coaching is not (yet) a profession in its own right, its interactive characteristics are discourse-analytically subsumed under ‘professional interaction / discourse’: the coach acts according to certain acquired skills and methods and the client turns to the coach for these acquired skills and methods. Concurrently, coaching is not (yet) institutionalized. Yet, its interactive characteristics can nevertheless be subsumed under ‘institutional interaction / discourse’: coaching is defined as an organizational intervention and as such is embedded in the larger institutional context of organizations that pursue particular goals and follow particular norms and regulations via coaching.

This professional and institutional background is consequential for the interactants, i.e. for coach and client, and for their communicative behavior. As professional and institutional interaction, coaching takes place between a professional expert and representative of an institution and a layperson, both of whom take on different

27. According to Linell (1998b), discourse in the professions or professional discourse can be further differentiated into ‘intraprofessional discourse’, i.e. discourse within specific professions, ‘interprofessional discourse’, i.e. discourse between individuals from different professions, and ‘professional-lay-discourse’, i.e. the interactions of professionals with lay people.

28. Professional and institutional characteristics of talk are thus often discussed together given that “(p)rofessional practices are institutionally and organizationally embedded” (Sarangi and Candlin 2011: 5). Professional and institutional talk is thereby contrasted with ‘mundane or ordinary conversations’ due to its goal orientation, constraints on participation rights and inferential practices (cf. Drew and Heritage 1992: 25).

interactive roles and enact different identities. There are the institutional (or social) roles and identities of ‘coach’ and ‘client’ or ‘professional’ and ‘layperson’ as well as discursive identities such as ‘questioner’ and ‘answerer’ or more generally ‘initiator’ and ‘respondent’ (Greatbach and Dingwall 1998).²⁹ Due to their roles and identities, participants carry different communicative and interactive responsibilities in line with the institution’s requirements. This is closely linked to bringing diverging and, at times, even opposing, perspectives to the interaction and thus framing situations differently (Mishler 1984; Sarangi 2002b; Brünner 2005): professionals apply their professional vision (Goodwin 1994) based on their knowledge, professional experience and institutional perspective, while clients bring their life-world perspective and frame their experience as something subjective, individual and unique. This divergence of perspectives is an endemic prerequisite and constitutive characteristic of any kind of therapeutic, consulting, coaching or counseling interaction (Pick 2017). On the discursive level, these different frames and perspectives materialize in different modes of talk, i.e. the professional, institutional and life-world mode. For professionals, clients’ cases represent routine cases and a large part of their doing consists of institution- and profession-based acts of categorization, i.e. of turning these subjective accounts into coaching or therapeutic objects through a set of discursive practices (Hutchby 2007). “Recontextualization practices” (Sarangi and Candlin 2011: 7f) such as reformulations or reinterpretations represent a core communicative task where the professional’s institutional and professional roles overlap. Yet, given that clients’ accounts of their experience function as evidence in therapy, counseling, coaching and similar (Sarangi 2001), these reformulation and reinterpretation processes require a delicate balancing act between inviting clients’ personal knowledge and experiences, as well as respecting and validating it, and offering and adding the specialized know-how of one’s professional training and background, i.e. avoiding territorial transgressions at all costs (Kamio 1997; Graf 2007a; Graf and Spranz-Fogasy 2018a).

A central element of manifesting and doing power in professional and institutional interaction is ‘agenda setting’ (Holmes et al. 1999; Chiles 2006; Lalouschek 2008; Koester 2010). Unlike mundane or everyday conversations, executive coaching is characterized by conventional constraints on the evolving communicative interaction between coach and client. And although the emerging speech exchange at times resembles ordinary conversations, i.e. shows a “continuum of institutionality” (Hutchby 2005; Heritage and Greatbach 1991), the asymmetry between the participants due to their respective status as professional / representative of the

29. See Graf (2011) on explicit and implicit strategies that coaches apply to construct their professional identity against the backdrop of the un-professionalized and un-institutionalized context of coaching.

institution and layperson is interactively determined by the constraints on what, when and how to participate. The participation framework, i.e. the production and reception roles, show a clear orientation to the non-conversational, professional and thus asymmetrical character of the coaching interaction. Coaches' actions thereby always reveal a clear task orientation, guided by the underlying professional agenda of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* in turning clients towards their emotional experiencing in the context of their concerns and goals, i.e. eliciting talk about feelings and emotions.

While neither power, knowledge, participants' roles and identities nor the overall participation framework are preordained notions in professional and institutional settings (Sarangi 2001; Gülich 2003; Koester 2010), this is even less the case in coaching. Likewise, the discursive practices applied by the participants do not fulfill preordained functions, but accomplish different actions according to the local context of their application. We thus witness a specializing and re-specifying of the particular functions of the available activities such as small talk (cf. Heritage and Greatbach 1991: 95). None of these concepts exists in a vacuum; instead, they need to be interactively and locally constructed in the particular interaction according to the respective institutional frame (cf. Sarangi and Roberts 1999: 11). Instead of "being brought along", then, these notions are "brought about" in the concrete interaction (Sarangi 2001: 6) via the application of particular professional and layperson strategies, by the coordination of these strategies and, finally, by the participants' orientation towards the emerging overall pattern of the ongoing coaching interaction. The institutionality or professionalism of the interaction is thereby not determined by its setting; instead the interaction is institutional insofar as the participants' institutional or professional identities are somehow made relevant to the work activities in which they are engaged.

In the health-care sector and other professional realms, we have lately witnessed a general shift in the conceptualization of the participation framework based more on clients' empowerment and autonomy and a mutuality and shared decision making among the participants (Sarangi 2004; Lalouschek 2013). Coaching is a case in point as the idea of the client as an egalitarian partner and expert for the content is an important credo across the practice literature. This client-centered approach is considered vital for – *inter alia* – the quality of the relationship between professional and layperson and for an active and aligning participation of the latter in the process (Jautz 2017; Graf and Jautz under review; Graf and Scarvaglieri in prep.). Yet, following Silverman (1997: 9), "it would be naïve to assume that such 'client-centered' counseling [or other forms of professional interaction, EG], while less obviously authoritarian than the more medically oriented models, is necessarily free from the effects of power" as any form of professionalism is related to exercising power and authority. What is more, this exercising of power and authority is, at times

and in the right amount, considered appropriate and useful by the participants and a lack thereof may be experienced as more confusing than empowering (*ibid*). Asymmetry then is relevant with respect to how it is displayed in the social action by the participants. It is also relevant how it is negotiated and thereby emerges as an interactional achievement of the participants in the local context of the concrete interaction (cf. ten Have 1991: 162).

The professional and institutional framing (of coaching) not only influences the communicative interaction; the very communicative interaction (re-)creates the profession or the institution, or, to speak with Heritage (1984: 290), institutions are “talked into being”. Institutions thus owe their existence to a particular type of communicative interaction and are made up of shared habitual (communicative) practices as a consequence of their history and tradition (cf. Sarangi and Roberts 1999: 3). This core of communicative practices usually evolves in repetitive, recognizable episodes that exhibit a similar overall structure, while at the same time allowing for some constrained range of variation. Here then we come full circle: Executive coaching is conceptualized as an activity type that transpires in and through the basic activities of ‘Defining the Situation’, ‘Building the Relationship’, ‘Co-Constructing Change’ and ‘Evaluating the Coaching’, which in turn evolve around repetitive and recognizable communicative tasks and the relevant discursive practices for their solution; specific discursive practices thereby underlie particular discourse types.

4.2 Methodological framework

4.2.1 Integrative discourse analytic framework

Language and other social practices are interdependent. Knowing something about the ethnographic setting, the perception of and characteristics attributed to others, and broader and local social organizational conditions become imperative for the understanding of linguistic and non-linguistic aspects of communicative events.

(Cicourel 1992: 294)

To come up with a functional description of executive coaching in the context of the Basic Activity Model, the current book applies an integrative discourse analytic framework primarily drawing on Theme-Oriented Discourse Analysis along with Activity Analysis, but also including tools and insights from Conversation Analysis, Critical Discourse Studies and Interactional Sociolinguistics.

Such an integrative discourse analytic framework allows to bridge the gap between focusing on the ‘institutional order’ and the ‘interaction order’ of the specific professional and institutional communication. According to Sarangi and Roberts (1999: 6), studies of workplace discourse are situated on a continuum: at

the one end there are studies that focus on the institutional order that take the larger socio-cultural and institutional context into account, as found in studies located in Interactional Sociolinguistics and at the other end there are studies focusing on the interaction order, as found predominantly in CA-based analyses. An integrative methodological perspective is also necessary as conducting the communication interaction in counseling involves three distinct ontological levels (cf. Arndt and Janney 1987: 113; Ensink and Sauer 2003: 1; Levinson 2006: 91), i.e. the (intra-)personal, the interpersonal and the socio-cultural dimension. Although this holds true for any kind of human interaction, successful coaching depends on a delicate balancing act between these levels – pursued by the coach – which in turn brings this dimensional interplay to the center stage of attention for the analysis. At the same time the particularity of this dimensional interplay accounts for the interactive and communicative differences between coaching and other forms of counseling.

The current integrative discourse analytic perspective on coaching encounters draws on Theme-Oriented Discourse Analysis as put forth in Roberts and Sarangi (2005) and on Activity Analysis (Sarangi 2005, 2008), two closely linked approaches to analyzing how language constructs professional practice (cf. Sarangi 2010). Situated between ‘sequential description’ and ‘extra-situation explanation’ of social encounters as pursued by Conversation Analysis and Critical Discourse Studies, respectively, it provides the following relevant analytic tools for the current purpose: while a “theme-oriented approach links analytic themes from linguistics and sociology to focal themes relevant to a professional domain” (Roberts and Sarangi 2005: 633), activity analysis aspires to an overall mapping of the structural, interactional and thematic trajectories of a given encounter to identify its activity-specific interactional patterns in relation to its primary content or theme (Sarangi 2010). Theme-oriented Discourse Analysis, with its concentration on focal themes, defined by Roberts and Sarangi (2005) as what is talked about, written about, drawn on in professional development and featured in professional schemata, lends itself perfectly to the current coaching approach of Emotionally Intelligent Coaching and its underlying professional agenda of (re-)focusing clients on their emotions in the local context of feelings-talk. ‘Personality parts’, ‘self-reflection’ and ‘mindfulness’, etc. are its focal themes and their discursive co-construction needs to be traced along the structural, thematic and interactional levels of the professional practice of ‘coaching’. Activity analysis, in turn, allows for the uncovering of activity-specific patterns of interaction or discursive practices in relation to the focal themes of an encounter. As discursive practices or repetitive forms of talk evolve around the various activities that underlie an encounter, activity analysis also allows for the uncovering of the discourse type(s) that characterize that particular encounter. As expounded by Sarangi (2010), this kind of analytic approach thereby permits the capture of the communicative flexibility at the levels of activity type and discourse

type. Approaching executive coaching talk from a theme-oriented and activity analytic perspective also serves the larger interprofessional framework:

For the purpose of realizing an applied linguistic research programme, these [...] focal themes must be aligned with particular discursive practices. Indeed, the manner in which they are accomplished and aligned in and through discourse [...] renders them key objects of our collaborative professional and applied linguistic / discourse analytic study. (Sarangi and Candlin 2011: 22f)

While the key analytic focus lies on coaching specific themes and activities, the local management of the interactive tasks in coaching is considered, too, and analyzed with categories from Conversation Analysis (CA) (see e.g. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974; Schegloff 2007; Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008). These are: the overall activity focus as regards the joint co-construction of interaction in and through the talk that transpires between the participants and within this activity focus, the sequential organization of turns at talk as well as the preference organization of second actions.³⁰ Next, there are the notions of recipient design, defined as a “multitude of respects in which the talk by a party in conversation is constructed or designed in ways which display an orientation and sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are the co-participants” (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974: 727) and the more general focus on the participants’ own orientation to the business at hand. Finally, a highly relevant issue for the current analysis is the interest of CA studies in the interactional differences between ‘ordinary or mundane conversation’ and ‘professional and/or institutional talk’ (Drew and Heritage 1992).

Given that the macro-level situatedness of interactional practices are germane to understanding how institutional and professional power relations, the role of ideologies and the influence of cultural norms manifest themselves locally in coaching discourse and how they eventually form and influence the various discursive practices, a critical perspective frames the current analysis. Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough 1989, 1992; Wodak and Meyer 2001; van Dijk 2008, 2009) and the more recent Critical Discourse Studies (Wodak and Meyer 2016; Reisigl and Wodak 2016) regard discourse as a form of social practice and assume a dialectic relationship between particular discursive activities and the context in which these are embedded, i.e. the situational, institutional and social structures. These wider contexts shape and influence discourse while, at the same time, discourse affects social reality (van Dijk 2001; Wodak 2008; Reisigl and Wodak 2016). These views inform the current approach to e.g. unveil how and to what extent coaches – in their professional and institutional role and dependence on the paying organization – exert power and

30. See also the study by Spranz-Fogasy et al. (under review) on the sequential and supra-sequential organization of requesting examples in coaching and psychotherapy.

control over the evolving structural, interactional and thematic map of the coaching process against the backdrop of the (idealized) conceptualization of the co-activity of coach and client and the role of the coach as mainly accompanying the client in his/her journey to self-discovery and self-management as laid out in the coaching practice literature and the training manuals. Furthermore, a critical assessment of the functionalization of emotions in the organizational context (Graf and Pawelczyk 2014; Graf under review) becomes possible and the way the discursive practices of emotion talk in executive coaching reflect and at the same time corroborate the norms of our therapeutic culture and the tenets of soft capitalism as socio-cultural ideologies can be addressed. However, while the critical perspective adopted here serves to identify and evaluate executive coaching as discursive and societal action, it does not serve to remedy, improve or change it. Instead, the critical perspective aims to uncover and demystify the paradoxes and dilemmas of the helping format executive coaching.

Finally, the following concepts from Interactional Sociolinguistics play a role for the current analysis of coaching discourse: Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS) is concerned with how interactants signal and interpret meaning in social interaction or speech events in and through communicative practices. The overall goal of IS is to monitor these communicative practices of meaning making. As explicated by Gumperz (2001: 218), communicative practices are the site where societal and interactive forces merge. To speak with Goffman (1981), the ‘interaction order’ of a particular (professional) encounter is regarded as a distinctive level of discursive organization that bridges the linguistic and the social. The participants’ primary means for signaling and interpreting meaning in interaction is accomplished via their framing activities in discourse: a ‘frame’ in Goffman’s (1974) sense (see also Tannen 1993) is a structure of expectations that underlies the participants’ signaling and interpreting the meaning they attach to the interactive business at hand. A frame is also an abstract representation of the interactants’ actions as they strategically plan and position their moves in order to accomplish communicative ends in real-life encounters. How participants frame the ongoing situation and how they align themselves to the social interaction and to their co-participants, i.e. their footing, is reflected in their discursive behavior. Via the use of particular contextualization cues participants actively construct and constantly update the context of the situation: “(c)ontextualisation [...] is crucial to social involvement and links detailed linguistic understanding to cultural knowledge through the idea of framing and inferencing” (Roberts 2000: 106). The lack of a stable institutional and professional frame for ‘executive coaching’ renders the question as to how the participants define and update the context of situation according to their expectations, etc. highly relevant in order to gain informed and comprehensive insights into the discourses of executive coaching.

4.2.2 Data collection and analysis

The linguistic analysis of the discourses of executive coaching is based on authentic German data from face-to-face dyadic *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* processes. These were video-recorded and linguistically transcribed. Gaining access to such a research site to collect authentic data represents one of the biggest challenges for any (applied) linguistic analysis of professional discourse. The intimacy of the setting of the dyadic coach-client interaction along with the sensitivity of the data, i.e. executive clients' self-disclosure on a professional and personal level, and their making public of business-internal practices, render this access particularly difficult. However, the call for (more) academic research and conceptual underpinning by the coaching industry represents a relatively favorable climate in which to motivate practitioners to take part in a study on coaching. More specifically, to participate in the first linguistic study of coaching interaction and to have their coaching approach validated academically is an additional selling point on the highly competitive coaching market for the participating coaches. The clients were informed about the research project and its implications, i.e. being filmed and their conversations being transcribed, used for linguistic analyses and reproduced in excerpts for reasons of publication; all prospective clients gave their written consent. In addition, they had the opportunity throughout the process to have a look at the recorded data after each individual session and to either release it or withdraw the material from the project; despite the often sensitive and personal matters that were discussed during these sessions, none of the clients withdrew any of the recordings. The coaches themselves filmed the data and thus no on-site presence of the researcher was necessary that would further interrupt the intimate setting. The video camera was clearly visible to the participants throughout their interaction, which at times had to be interrupted in order to change tapes or check whether the camera position was actually catching both participants. At times, both coach and client displayed their orientations to the presence of the camera. The participants actively integrated the recordings of the sessions into the coaching process as part of their situated interactional work of coaching: they sometimes discussed the videos and treated them as an additional resource in their mutual work on clients' concerns and as such the research project and the fact that the sessions were recorded on video were frequently topicalized in the data (see also Hutchby 2007 and Hutchby, O'Reilly and Parker 2012 on the presence of video cameras in counseling and therapeutic contexts).

Given the diversity of genres and contexts of coaching interaction (see Chapter 2) and the lack of linguistic research, it is paramount for the current endeavor to restrict this first systematic analysis of coaching to one particular coaching approach. The selected coaching approach complies with the already established

norms and standards of professional coaching and is based on theoretical and methodological traditions which are as widely recognized and practiced as possible at this point. The data stem from *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, an executive coaching approach practiced by *Dietz Training & Partner* in Germany (see 3.1). It is listed by the *Deutscher Bundesverband Coaching* (DBVC; German Association of Coaching) both as a coaching provider and as a coach training program with certification procedures in accordance with the professional standards established by the DBVC (2012). While concentrating on one particular coaching approach is suggested here as a necessary strategy to cope with the challenging diversity of coaching as a professional format or interaction type, a sufficiently large corpus of authentic coaching data is essential to trace the emerging communicative practices across a wide variety of instances. Such a procedure helps to focus on recurrent, endemic coaching practices and to set them apart from idiosyncratic and singular instances of communicative behavior.

The whole corpus comprises nine complete one-on-one, face-to-face coaching processes with one female coach (CO1) and one male coach (CO2) with a total of nine clients. The data were recorded between 2007 and 2009. Each coaching process involves between 3 and 9 individual sessions, one session usually lasting between 2 and 3 hours. All in all, the corpus consists of 46 individual coaching sessions and amounts to 115 hours of coaching material. Only 7 processes were used for the final analysis, while the remaining two processes were only consulted in passing.

The coaches are seasoned practitioners, who have both been working as coaches for more than 20 years. They have a background in psychotherapy, medicine and sales and are married to each other. Together with their business partners, they offer – in addition to their coaching service – a coach training program on *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* and training on *Emotionale Intelligenz* (further on referred to as ‘Emotional Intelligence’). The male coach is listed as ‘senior coach’ by the DBVC.

All seven clients (four male and three female) whose processes were transcribed are executives working for (internationally operating) DAX-listed companies in Germany from the insurance, banking and consulting sectors, thus representing a socio-culturally relatively homogeneous group. The coaching is paid for by each client’s organization, a characteristic feature of executive coaching; the impulse for coaching came in equal measure from the clients and their bosses or HR person. In the great majority of cases the client’s line manager or someone in the HR department chose the coach, based on prior personal experience with *Dietz Training & Partner*. Yet, the final decision as to whether a suggested match between coach and client is promising or not was taken by client and coach together after they had got to know each other during a preliminary telephone conversation, where the client’s primary concern and the coach’s methodology were discussed and an initial working relationship was established. Once the coaching process had finished,

the coach passed on feedback on the results achieved to the client's boss or the HR department but this information was always passed on to the client first, who could add, delete or accept the evaluation as is.

4.2.2.1 *The coaching processes*

Some of the clients had participated in the Emotional Intelligence training held by the coaches and their partners³¹ prior to the coaching process. During the training, clients were both familiarized with the tenets of EI and the concepts of the personality parts or internal family and mindfulness, the focal themes of Emotionally Intelligent Coaching (see Section 3.1). Moreover, at times short coaching sequences were included in the training and clients thus entered the coaching process with both the terminology and some semi-professional knowledge or lay expertise as regards the underlying coaching agenda and conceptualized their concerns accordingly.³² The initiation of the coaching process lay either with the client's HR or line managers or with themselves. Some clients received coaching as a kind of incentive on entering a new job or taking on a new position. Table 1 gives an overview of the coaching data.

4.2.2.2 *Data analysis*

The functional linguistic description of the coaching data required a linguistic transcription of the recorded material. Thematic and structural patterns across larger stretches as well as repetitive interactive patterns become visible and thus comparable across the various coaching sessions. The original German data were transcribed with the help of the HIAT method (Halbinterpretative Arbeitstranskription) (semi-interpretative working transcription) at a rate of 1:25 (Ehlich 1992; Rehbein et al. 2004).

For the current purpose the data were translated into English as the focus of the analysis does not lie on language-specific realizations of executive coaching, but on coaching-endemic recurring patterns and discursive practices. What is more, given the underlying integrative discourse analytic framework with its primary focus on a thematic and action-based description, the primary focus does not lie on linguistic and language-specific micro-phenomena, but on larger structural, thematic and interactional phenomena characteristic for the discourses of executive coaching. Instead of an interlinear translation and presentation of the material, only the

31. The training was held by the coaches and their partners in changing constellations. Sometimes, the clients had one coach as trainer and the other one as coach in the proper coaching process.

32. Frequent references to this training are found in the data; to integrate clients' insights from this training into the coaching interaction is thus a relevant interactive task for the participants (see Chapter 5, 'Defining the Situation').

Table 1. Coaching data

Code	Sex coach (CO)	Sex client (CL)	Number of sessions*	Training in Emotional Intelligence	Concern**	Coaching initiated by client	Company
CO1CL1	f	f	3	yes	burn out / emotional breakdown	yes	consulting
CO1CL2	f	f	9	yes	problematic emotionality	no	insurance
CO1CL3	f	m	5	no	orientation / leadership questions	no	banking
CO1CL4	f	m	4	no	problematic emotionality	yes	insurance
CO2CL5	m	m	8 (2/5/8)	no	orientation / leadership questions and emotionality	no	insurance
CO2CL6	m	m	5 (1/3/5)	no	orientation	yes	insurance
CO2CL7	m	f	3	yes	burn out / emotional breakdown	yes	consulting

* Only the sessions in parenthesis were transcribed for these processes.

** 'Concern' is not specified here in more detail as the concerns are illustrated in their co-construction in Part II of this book. The current gross classification only aims at giving an initial insight into the importance of emotionality for coaching in the context of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*.

English translation is presented in the excerpts (see Vehviläinen 2008 for a similar procedure in the context of original Finnish therapeutic data). The transcripts in the monograph are also adapted to a vertical transcript layout following the cGAT conventions (Schmidt et al. 2016) for readability. The original data in its original transcription form can be accessed via the web links in the relevant chapters.

4.2.3 The issue of double competencies: The role as discourse researcher and coaching practitioner

The fact that I have trained as a coach myself (with Dietz Training & Partner) and am part of the scientific board of the *Deutscher Bundesverband Coaching* (German Association of Coaching) did not only facilitate the data acquisition. My professional contacts allowed me easier access to the research site than a linguistic outsider would have had and my discourse analytic background offers the opportunity

to explicate the advantages of working with authentic coaching data and thus to convince practitioners to participate in the study. Moreover, due to my own professional coaching experience I have the relevant ethnographic or tacit knowledge of the research site to understand the emerging professional practice in the data and to come up with an ecologically valid interpretation: “coding and interpreting talk / text data of another profession requires [...] adequate insider knowledge of the professional practice we are investigating” (Sarangi 2002a: 7). Due to my own insider knowledge, participant observation or non-participant observation of the setting and during data collection were not necessary to become part of the social world under scrutiny and to learn about its professional practices. The data were collected by others, in this case by the coaches themselves, without losing the relevant ‘insider’ knowledge indispensable for exploring and explaining the practices of the coaching setting under investigation. This guaranteed the highest possible authenticity of data:

...reducing the intrusiveness of observers can help reduce damage to the research processes and outcomes. [...] any rupture in the sphere of participation will jeopardise the authenticity of what one gets to observe and the impact such observation might have on what is being observed. (Sarangi and Candlin 2003: 281)

Given that my practical and linguistic background provides the necessary link between observational communicative practices and the professional activity’s tacit knowledge systems, another gain in the current double function lies in the dissemination and uptake of research findings (cf. Sarangi 2004: 148). As a member of the coaching community, discussing and spreading the findings is an easier endeavor for me than it is for researchers who have entered the field as professional “outsiders”.

Although the situation of ‘discourse researcher as coaching practitioner’ guarantees easier access to the data, offers (at least) one professional practitioner’s insights for the data analysis from the onset and thus aligns the participant’s and the analyst’s perspective in one person (i.e. combines the perspectives of ‘know how’ and ‘know that’ (cf. Ryle 1949: 32)), this familiarity with the communicative ecology of coaching interaction also bears some challenges. In analogy to Sarangi’s (2002b) differentiation between the ‘observer’s paradox’, ‘participant’s paradox’ and ‘analyst’s paradox’, “the ‘analyst as practitioner’s paradox’” hints at the additional dilemma of a possible mixing-up of professional visions (Goodwin 1994) and of the professional terminology or coding system. What is more, there is the danger of losing the necessary distance from the research object while categorizing and interpreting the data (cf. Sarangi 2006: 580). A heightened awareness of this predicament of mixing up instead of aligning the perspectives is imperative, along with a critical dialogue with other coaching practitioners, but also with discourse analysts, on

the selection of research foci, the critical interpretation of data and the implementation of the findings. The critical dialogue with other discourse researchers also serves the purpose of pointing out the dangers of being professionally blinkered and under-critical with respect to assumptions about the coaching business and procedures of which I myself am part (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999; Taylor and White 2000).

4.3 Transition from ‘phases of coaching’ to ‘basic activities of coaching’

Across the board, the coaching practice literature conceptualizes coaching as transpiring in sequentially and temporally organized phases. The idealizing character of such a phase model, i.e. its linearity and normativity, is nicely captured in the following quote from Grant (2006: 153):

The core constructs of goal-directed self-regulation [i.e. coaching, EG] are a series of processes in which the individual sets a goal, develops a plan of action, begins an action, monitors their performance, evaluates their performance [...] and based on this evaluation changes their actions to further enhance their performance and better reach their goals.

Yet, as Grant (ibid.) further expounds, “(i)n practice, the steps in the self-regulatory cycle are not discrete, or with clearly separate stages; rather, there is significant overlap between each stage”.

In a preliminary case study (see Graf in press), such a phase model was applied on one exemplary coaching process of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*. This phasal arrangement in ‘Entering the (Coaching) Frame’, ‘Diagnosing’, ‘Intervening’, ‘Evaluating’ and ‘Closing the (Coaching) Frame’ offered first valuable insights into the structural, thematic and interactive morphology of the discourse of executive coaching.

Empirically backing up Grant’s realistic assessment, the case study however revealed that the relational dynamics and interactional complexity as well as the thematic and communicative loops of the discourse-based professional interaction of ‘executive coaching’ cannot be satisfactorily captured in such a phase model: both the quantitative and the qualitative set-up of the phases showed such a varying character across the four sessions that the particular discursive morphology of coaching could not be satisfactorily captured. What is more, the study evinced a number of longer or shorter sequences that did not fit the overall communicative function of the surrounding phases, but clearly tackled different communicative tasks. These phase-defying components or “insertions” (Graf in press) were, however, part and parcel of the internal layout of the coaching process.

The thematically, interactively and discursively looping character of ‘executive coaching’ then calls for an alternative model for its analysis and description. Such an alternative model is based on action units (= basic activities) instead of structural or temporal units (= phases). These action units center on ‘what’ the participants, i.e. coach and client, do under the label of ‘executive coaching’ and ‘how’ they discursively and interactively realize this ‘what’ whenever the ‘what’ arises, i.e. whenever they have to solve a particular communicative task along the process. The action units do not focus on the ‘when’ of their occurrences in the sense of a temporal sequence of action.

The suggested activity focus pays tribute to the particularities of coaching as follows:

- *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* or executive coaching in general transpires in communicative loops. These loops are not only thematically conditioned, but are an inherent consequence of how the professional interaction is arranged: coaching is organized as a process that encompasses various individual sessions; learning and development takes place between sessions, too, and these new insights and experiences must be discursively integrated into the ongoing process. The participants thus ‘organization-endemically’ must return to and re-engage in certain discursive and thematic elements. Their description and analysis is more rewarding from the point of view of ‘what happens?’ and ‘how does it happen?’ than ‘where during the process does it happen?’.
- Executive coaching transpires in and through the particular communicative interaction or discursive practices coach and client engage in; i.e. coach and client ‘do coaching’ while they talk and interact with each other. Due to this discursive character, coaching as an interaction type lacks clear boundaries in its internal morphology such as those marked, for example, by the onset and the finalization of a physical examination in doctor-patient interaction. A more detailed and meticulous analytic focus on what coach and client ‘do’ discursively is more beneficial than a temporal and structural framing of events.
- Executive coaching is a very adaptive professional format, i.e. it is an activity type that oscillates between more reflexive, experientially oriented and more informative, factually oriented practices to work on the client’s concern from his/her professional realm. This discursive hybridity and flexibility is format-intrinsic and results from the particular dynamics between an executive client and a professional coach and the idealization of coaching as dialogue-at-eye-level and help to self-help, which both give clients (theoretically) a bigger say in the set-up of the coaching interaction; yet coaching discourse is still expert-lay discourse, with the coach acting as expert and the client acting as lay-person. The normativity of a structurally focused phase model does not allow for truly reproducing this elasticity.

- While particular circumstances or characteristics of executive coaching are theoretically discussed in the discourse ON coaching (such as its lack of institutionality and professionalism), the current model translates them into the participants' solutions, i.e. communicative tasks and core components, and thus illuminates how they form a constitutive element of the discourses IN coaching. Again the focus is on 'what participants do and how they do it' instead of 'when do participants do it'.

The Basic Activity Model captures both the core constituents of executive coaching, i.e. those larger discursive elements or basic activities which account for the coaching character of the interaction, and the internal set-up of these basic activities, i.e. the communicative tasks and core components which account for the flexibility and adaptiveness of the overall activity type of 'coaching'. The Basic Activity Model of executive coaching consists of the following units: 'Defining the Situation', 'Building the Relationship', 'Co-constructing Change' and 'Evaluating the Coaching'.

The participants, i.e. coach and client, must engage in all of the four basic activities in order to be doing 'coaching'. The individual discursive and interactional morphology of each coach-client dyad and their 'coaching work' results from the local in situ realization of these four basic activities along their communicative tasks, core components and applied communicative strategies.

While the phase model approach, in its chronological set-up, also includes the beginning and ending of coaching conversations such as the formulaic greeting and parting sequences (see Graf in press), the basic activities focus only on the coaching-endemic discursive acts (cf. West 2006: 380). Initiating or ending items are thus only considered as part of a particular basic activity when their function is coaching specific (see also Pick 2017, who discusses these issues from a general perspective in her typology of counseling). As such, this activity model includes actions such as 'Arranging Dates for Next Meeting(s)' or 'Explaining Methods and/or Procedures' and their discursive realizations and interprets them as endemic to coaching.

The order of appearance of the basic activities in the chapters to follow is chronological only to the extent that 'Defining the Situation' and 'Building the Relationship' set the interaction frame of 'coaching', 'Co-constructing Change' entails the 'proper' coaching work and 'Evaluating the Coaching' follows the coaching work as such according to the internal logic of action. Yet, one major argument in favor of the activity model of coaching is its chronological flexibility and concurrence that must be born in mind irrespective of their ordered discussion in what follows. A case in point here is the communicative and interactive loops due to the conversation-in-a-series character as well as the interactive and discursive set-up of coaching, characterized by a constant mixture of meta-pragmatic, retrospective and prospective actions. Moreover, 'Building the Relationship' is an activity the

participants constantly (implicitly and explicitly) engage in, i.e. whatever coach and client do in their coaching interaction, at the same time does something to, with, or in their relationship. As claimed by Miller and Considine (2009: 410) as well as Graf and Spranz-Fogasy (2018a), in discursively based helping professions such as executive coaching, establishing and maintaining the relationship between helper and the person being helped represents the central element. The communicative tasks that are included in this activity thus have the character of “permanent tasks” (“Daueraufgaben”, cf. Spranz-Fogasy 1992: 71).

In Part II, the four basic activities – ‘Defining the Situation’ (Chapter 5), ‘Building the Relationship’ (Chapter 6), ‘Co-constructing Change’ (Chapter 7), ‘Evaluating the Coaching’ (Chapter 8) – are first theoretically framed and then described and illustrated along their communicative tasks and core components with the help of excerpts from the coaching data. In order to portray the thematic and interactive morphology of the basic activities in their richness, the following discussion will (at times) portray seemingly small details to conjure up the big picture. The chronological ordering and discussing of both the basic activities and their communicative tasks thereby only partly reflects their sequential and interactional ordering. Carving out the four basic activities and their communicative tasks and core components is an analytic act of structuring a highly complex interactive and discursive formation. The activities help to describe coaching data of both inter- and intra-processual diversity across lengthy and numerous encounters. In a first step, this complexity must be reduced for the purpose and success of the current endeavor of offering systematic linguistic insights into *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* in particular and executive coaching in general. In a second step, this complexity is reintroduced by reflecting on the existing variation and multi-dimensionality of the activities, both as regards their intra-activity dimension in the context of the communicative tasks and core components of all four activities and as regards their inter-activity dimension in the context of the interactional recurrence and variation of the basic activities in their discursive realizations within the processes. This is achieved with the help of discussing a large number of excerpts.

PART II

Emotionally Intelligent Coaching

A theme-oriented linguistic description

Defining the situation

‘Defining the Situation’ establishes the common ground for coach and client as regards the professional situation or speech event they are engaging in. The extensive and explicit framing practices as regards the local and global situation of ‘coaching’ on the part of the coaches necessitates their consideration as a proper basic activity in coaching. ‘Defining the Situation’ thereby sets – together with the basic activity ‘Building the Relationship’ (Chapter 6) – the (interaction) frame of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*.³³ The principal function of ‘Defining the Situation’ is to orient the participants, namely the executive clients, as regards the local and global layout of the coaching encounter, i.e. to establish a “common fund of knowledge relevant to interaction goals” (Berger 2000: 161). Such orientation happens along the methodological, procedural, thematic and temporal line. Coach and client thereby need to (constantly) negotiate and discursively set and re-adjust the interaction frame of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*.

In contrast with formal contracts, which can usually already be concluded in first interviews, the negotiation of processes and definition of situations are fixed components of the entire coaching process. In principle, they can be carried out from the initial contact on the phone up until the coaching process comes to a close.

(Schreyögg 2012: 348, translated HH; see also Müller 2006: 34)³⁴

In establishing their interaction frame via engaging in the basic activity of ‘Defining the Situation’, coach and client open up prototypical interaction fields on which they (will) interact with each other in various constellations. The interaction frame of ‘coaching’ is thereby both globally set apart from other interaction frames (such

33. While Maier-Gutheil (2009: 88ff) in her analysis of the start-up consultation subsumes the social, temporal and thematic level under “constituting the situation”, the current analytic reconstruction of the activity type of ‘coaching’ calls for a separate classification of the discursive practices that define the temporal and thematic level under the label ‘Defining the Situation’ and those that constitute the social level under the label ‘Building the Relationship’.

34. While the importance of defining the situation is thus recognized in the coaching practice literature, the question as to how coach and client interactively and communicatively ‘do’ defining the situation is analyzed qualitatively and discursively for the first time here and the findings are illustrated in the current chapter.

as psychotherapy) and locally defined according to the underlying agenda of the particular approach, i.e. *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* and its focus on the client's emotions. Yet, each individual coach-client-dyad and the experiences, expectations and concerns of the latter influence the negotiation and setting up of their particular interaction frame, its rules and thematic dimensions, in particular as regards the depth of the process or coaching work. To put it differently, coach and client negotiate whether the primary focus of their coaching interaction lies on an inter- or intra-personal perspective.

While establishing common ground for one's communicative doing is always relevant to guarantee the smoothness and success of the interaction, such acts of defining the situation rarely happen explicitly (cf. van Dijk 2008: 19; Sarangi 2000: 19). Yet, the analytic reconstruction of the discursive practices that underlie 'executive coaching' evince 'Defining the Situation' as an endemic and explicit coaching activity and not first and foremost as a local consequence of interactional trouble. Instead, to speak with Roberts and Sarangi (1999: 227), "defining the speech activity [coaching, EG] is part of the problem in getting the work done". Given the fuzziness that (still) surrounds coaching as an organizational intervention and its lack of institutionality, the extensive and explicit situation constitution work (predominantly, but not exclusively initiated by the coach) can be interpreted as a local solution of such a global lack of familiarity with coaching and its interaction rules: "the uncertain nature of the activity leads to more explicit negotiation as in [...] meta-communicative comments" (Roberts and Sarangi 1999: 228; Geißler 2013; Graf 2017b). That is, giving orientation as regards methods and procedure not only informs the client about the upcoming event, but also functions as a normalizing and unburdening strategy due to the general lack of common ground. This is nicely captured in the following quote from the data (CO1CL3_1): *Now, as for how I proceed. Because you said you're also wondering what will happen. Completely normal. We talk to each other.*

What is more, the very nature of coaching as an individualized and personalized intervention for (executive) clients allows for an individual definition and adaptation of the interactive layout of the encounter between a coach and a particular client with his or her experiences, apprehensions, personality, etc.. Hence, each coach-client dyad may also engage in framing practices to co-construct their common definition of coaching: coaching is thereby interactionally conceptualized as a training or practice field, as a safe haven to verbalize less-dominant discourses, etc..

The discursive framing practices of 'Defining the Situation' are embedded in and supported by the outer framing practices, i.e. the outer setting of the coaching interaction. This outer setting is as follows: coach and client engage in talking as

their primary form of interaction and do so in a rather narrow spatial frame, in the coaching room on the coach's premises, i.e. their private house. A video camera is set up in one corner of the room to record their interaction. The room is furnished with a red couch and a red rocking chair and some small wooden tables. It is decorated with flowers and a red-and-golden painting. The warm and cozy (i.e. rather therapeutic) atmosphere of the room seems to encourage and foster the emerging of feelings-talk.³⁵

'Defining the Situation' in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* entails different communicative tasks. These communicative tasks are: 'Establishing the Coaching Realm', 'Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching' and 'Temporal Framing of Coaching' (see Table 2). In addition – yet only due to the current research situation – there is the communicative task of 'Topicalizing the Research Project'. Given its idiosyncratic character, its discursive realizations are described and analyzed here as part of 'Defining the Situation', yet it does not represent a coaching-endemic communicative task and is thus not listed in the following table and discussed at the end of Section 6.1. The various discursive forms and realizations of these communicative tasks will now be described, discussed and differentiated with the help of additional material from the corpus.

Table 2. Basic activity 'Defining the Situation' – Communicative tasks

Establishing the Coaching Realm
Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching
Temporal Framing of Coaching

In what follows, the discursive realizations of the communicative tasks are illustrated and discussed with the help of examples from the data.

35. See Martens-Schmid's (2015) iconic analysis of coaching spaces and the rooms of leading business and executive coaches in Germany: via iconic representations of coaching rooms and interviews with the coaches, the author convincingly and succinctly illustrates the tension between the business and the therapeutic world and how this is manifest in such outer spaces and the cozy or business atmosphere these spaces transmit.

5.1 Establishing the coaching realm

The first coaching-endemic communicative task that coach and client tackle as part of the basic activity of ‘Defining the Situation’ is ‘Establishing the Coaching Realm’.³⁶ The analysis of the coaching processes will thereby include communicative actions of seemingly minor importance, such as offering something to drink; however, the analysis will also show that these actions or core components of ‘Establishing the Coaching Realm’ are of coaching-relevant communicative and interactive significance and meaning.

5.1.1 Offering drinks

The first excerpt illustrates how ‘Offering Drinks’ helps to take the executive client out of his/her business context or frame into the more intimate and private coaching frame and also how clients (to a greater or lesser degree) ingest and celebrate, but also functionalize, this intimate and private setting.

Excerpt1_CO1CL1_2³⁷

As part of their introductory small talk,³⁸ the client – at the onset of their second session – states that she is tired because she visited her sister over the weekend and they

36. It must be borne in mind that the video camera is installed in the coaching room, while coach and client meet and greet each other – and say their final good-byes – at the front door. Thus, the proper greeting and opening (as well as closing) sequences are mostly not found in the transcripts; nor would they be considered as coaching-endemic core components of the communicative task ‘Establishing the Coaching Realm’.

37. The presentation of the excerpts in each of the following four chapters takes the following form: ExcerptNumber_Process_Session.

38. As was argued elsewhere, only those discursive practices are considered here as part of the basic activities that contribute to turning the communicative interaction between participant 1 and participant 2 into ‘coaching discourse’. There is, of course, small talk at the boundaries of the coaching encounters and, as such, small talk represents an endemic constituent of the opening and closing phases of the interactions. Concurrently, “(p)hatic talk may happen sequentially at the margins of conversations, but it is does work relevant for the whole interaction” (Coupland 2000: 5); it thereby fulfills not only relational functions, but also helps to “further [...] the instrumental and transactional goals of the institution” (ibid.: 6). In *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, small talk in particular smoothenes the transition between the densely packed, fast, performance-oriented executive (outside-coaching) world and the emotions and experientially oriented inside-coaching world. At the same time, via small talk the participants balance issues of power and dominance. This is a particular case in point with executive clients, who are professionally used to being in command, but also with executive coaching in general, which is conceptualized as ‘dialogue-at-eye-level’, yet endemically represents an asymmetric interaction.

were partying. Prior to that, she was offered a cup of coffee by the coach, which she is holding in her hands and sipping with obvious pleasure. The coach first reacts to the client's tiredness with *enjoy it. Coffee's just the right thing* (not in transcript) and then initiates the shift to the core coaching work by inviting the client's opinion on how to start, yet explicitly timing the beginning of their proper coaching work via *when you've finished your coffee*:

```

001 CO1  erm
002      (0.75)
003 CO1  we can also see whether you_d
004 CO1  (0.5)
005 CO1  like to start off by talking a bit
006 CO1  about the review or whether
007      (0.25)
008 CO1  what we also did here last time
009 CO1  whether you would like to start off just get into it with
        when you've had a
010 CO1  coffee with m[indfulness ((laughs)) yes to start with y]es
011 CL1  [as soon as i've got through my coffee of course to start
        with]
012 CL1  if there_s one thing i don_t like at all that_s cold coffee i
        know
013 CL1  that it makes you beautiful bu[t (.) ((laughing))that_s why i
        drink]
014 CO1  [((laughs)) well and is it] is it warm
015 CO1  [enough]
016 CL1  [it_s war]m enough but
017 CO1  ye[s]
018 CL1  [th]at_s why i always drink my coffee quite fast
019 CO1  yes yes
020 CL1  no it_s warm it_s [quite hot] actually
021 CO1  [yes okay]

```

The coach initiates the transition from the pre-coaching talk to the coaching talk via an agenda offer for the client that entails two options: she offers CL1 to start out with some kind of review (*talking a bit about the review*, lines 005f) or with practicing mindfulness (*get into it with ... mindfulness*, lines 009f). However, the coach explicitly frames both ways of starting their proper coaching work as options once the client has had her coffee (*when you've had a coffee*, lines 009f). The client – instead of taking up the agenda offer by the coach and opting for one or the other action alternative – marks 'drinking coffee' as relevant and elaborates on the topic of 'coffee': how she likes it best and how and why she drinks it (lines 011ff). In doing so, the client is setting the agenda and the pace on the interactive level; concurrently, the client is staging her private and softer personality, who is very sensitive and loves to indulge in pleasure.

5.1.2 Discussing seating arrangements

An important aspect of feeling at ease and being able to relax and open up emotionally is a comfortable seating position. To this end, the coaching room is furnished with a rocking chair and a couch and in general conveys a cozy atmosphere.

Excerpt2_CO1CL4_2

In the following excerpt from the beginning of second session, the coach addresses the client's complaint from the questionnaire that he was not seated comfortably during their first meeting.

```
001 CO1  so last time you wrote that the seating arrangements
002 CO1  weren_t so comfortable now
003      (0.25)
004 CO1  you can try it out
005 CO1  ((laughs)) there again after all or on the chair
006 CL4  (.) there are (.)
007 CO1  or two
008 CL4  or two
009 CO1  ((laughs))
010 CL4  (yes another one)
011 CO1  is that okay because you
012 CO1  said (.)
013      (1.0)
014 CL4  ye[s it_s fine]
015 CO1  [because th]at is an important the important par[ameter]
016 CL4  [precisely]
017 CO1  parameter
```

In re-focusing on the client's comments as regards the seating arrangements, CO1 orients to the client's sensitivity via explicitly topicalizing and sanctioning the importance of feeling comfortable (line 015: *because that is an important parameter*).

The data also evince more matter-of-fact forms of establishing the coaching realm, as illustrated in the following excerpt from an initial session.

Excerpt3_CO1CL3_1

```
001 CO1  and if you want right
002 CL3  ((clears throat))
003 CO1  [here_s
004 CL3  [okay
005 CO1  another apple juice]
006 CL3  that_s fine thanks]
007      (0.5)
008 CO1  are you sitting comfortably
009      (0.25)
010 CO1  mister ((unintelligible) on the (.)
011 CL3  erm
012      (0.5)
013 CL3  yes
```

014 (0.25)
 015 CO1 yes [((laughs)) at the mom]ent good okay
 016 CL3 [for the moment yes precisely]

After coach and client have taken their seats, CO1 offers the client something to drink and also inquires about whether or not he is sitting comfortably (lines 001ff). The client, who defines coaching for himself as an additional source to optimize his performance as a manager (see Section 6.3.2), is very straight to the point and sees his relationship with the coach as a service encounter rather than a deeper going personal relationship. Concurrently, his qualifying answer *for the moment*, yes (line 016) to the coach's polar question as to whether he is seated comfortably or not, already hints at his more general apprehension as regards coaching due to his experience with both in-depth group-dynamic seminars and the general lack of sustainability as regards HR measures. CL3's expansion on his answer to *are you sitting comfortably?* (lines 011ff) implicitly topicalizes his insecurity as regards their coaching interaction – terming it *certain expectations, interest, suspense* (not in transcript). The coach orients to the client's insecurity by affiliating it (*I can understand that well*) and sanctions it by topicalizing the existing unfamiliarity with coaching as a professional format (as opposed to seeing a doctor).

5.1.3 Offering and using tissues

The emphasis on the clients' emotionality in the current coaching approach causes very intimate and emotionally intense moments for the clients. Crying is thus – at least in the female clients³⁹ – one way of both expressing and regulating their emotions in their interactions with the coaches.⁴⁰ According to Hepburn and Potter (2012: 208), “crying is something that typically inflects talk, sometimes interferes with it, dramatizes, or underscores talk, and sometimes replaces talk, rather than appearing as an action or set of actions in its own right”. Thus, it is discussed here as a particular discursive practice to establish the coaching realm. Such non-verbal actions by the clients and the resulting reactions by the coach may appear along the process; they are contextually embedded and discursively tackled wherever they appear.

39. The data evinces many instances of gendered practices in how the participants ‘do’ coaching (see Graf 2016; Graf and Abdul-Hussain in prep.).

40. See Pawelczyk (2011: 253), who argues that “(a)mong the various aspects of non-verbal communication, silence and crying appear to function as the most significant means through which clients are able to manifest and/or voice their emotional states and/or release them”.

Excerpt4/1_CO1CL1_1

In presenting her concern, i.e. during the ‘proper coaching’ work of defining, establishing and processing the concern, the female client starts to cry.

```
001 CO1 have you got a tissue or should i
002 CL1 i've still got one
003 CO1 [yes]
004 CL1 [came prepared just in case]
005 CO1 [yes yes]
006 CL1 [because i]
007 (0.75)
008 CL1 because i knew that
009 CO1 yes
010 CL1 ((laughs)) that it would happen
```

As an answer to the coach's question whether she needs a tissue or has one herself, the client declines the coach's offer and replies *I came prepared, just in case* (line 004). She accounts for equipping herself with tissues with the fact that she foresaw her emotional reactions due to her experience from the training context *Emotional Intelligence*. Her laughing thereby is “an implicit way of indicating the speaker's awareness of the possible delicacy of a situation” (Haakana 2001: 213f). The coach emphatically reacts to the client's indexed emotionality and validates it by repeated agreement tokens *yes* (lines 003ff.)

Excerpt4/2_CO1CL1_1

During the same session, the client – her voice choking with tears – offers the following explanation as to why she allows her tears to show. The coaching space is experienced as a safe space or haven, where less-dominant discourses can be verbalized and organizationally less-accepted forms of behavior, i.e. strong emotions, may show:

```
001 CL1 well it
002 CO1 yes yes
003 (2.0)
004 CL1 it is good here i h i have a feeling of trus[t it_s]
005 CO1 [yes]
006 CL1 like a cosmos in which
007 CL1 i i
008 CO1 yes
009 (1.0)
010 CL1 it
011 (0.25)
012 CL1 is like th[is]
013 CO1 [yes]
014 CL1 i assume that it
015 (0.25)
016 CL1 happens quite frequently people with
017 (0.25)
018 CL1 paper hankies sitting [on th]e couch ((sniffs))
019 CO1 [yes]
```

```

020 CL1  that means
021      (0.75)
022 CO1  so [firstly]
023 CL1  [hopeful]ly it won_t
024 CL1  bother you
025 CO1  and you have trust as well (so) especially because there_s a
026 CO1  framework where trust is involved so it_s okay i[sn_t it]
027 CL1  [yes] ((blows nose)) i have to be
028 CL1  strong often enough
029 CO1  yes yes

```

The client positively evaluates her interaction with the coach *it is good* (line 004) and addresses the issue of trust in their interaction, i.e. in the coaching space *I have a feeling of trust* (line 004). She elaborates the deictic adverbial 'here' and reformulates it as *it's like a cosmos* (lines 004ff), thereby defining the coaching as a cosmos on its own. Concurrently, the client needs to relativize her own weakness and her crying by putting forth an assumption that invites the coach's positive agreement: *I assume that it happens quite frequently, people with paper hankies sitting on the couch* (lines 014ff). The coach positively agrees with this assumption and reformulates the client's topicalizing of showing her tears in their trustful interaction *a framework where trust is involved, so it's OK* (lines 025f) as an invitation to elaborate further. The client does so and contrasts *the cosmos*, i.e. the safe space of their coaching interaction, as a space, where she can allow her weakness to show, also because in her professional life outside coaching *I have to be strong often enough* (lines 027f).

Excerpt4/3_CO1CL1_1

In another instance of the same session, the client starts crying again, but at this point has no tissues left. The coach thus needs to leave the room to fetch some more.

```

001 CO1  should i look for another tiss[ue for you
002 CL1  [have you] got some more
003 CO1  ye[s]
004 CL1  [i] think
005 CL1  i may be
006 CO1  ye[s]
007 CL1  [ah] i_ve got one too
008 CO1  yes i_ve got some more as well yes
009      (0.25)
010 CO1  it_s just a
011 CO1  brief interruption but i_ll stay in touch right [((laughs))]
012 CL1  [((laughs))] good
013 CO1  they_re upstairs
014 CO1  you see unfortunately ((laughs))
015      (80.0)
016 CO1  so [((laughs)]
017 CL1  many thanks
018 CL1  [((unintelligible, 2.0s))]
019 CO1  [((laughs))]

```


In an emotionally very intense moment during their work on the client’s feeling of loneliness, the client is crying a lot and runs out of tissues. The coach offers to fetch her some, which means she must leave the room and interrupt their feelings-talk (lines 010f: *it’s a brief interruption*). Yet, she assures the client that she will stay in emotional contact, which already alleviates the situation. She next accounts for having to leave the room (lines 013f: *they’re upstairs, you see, unfortunately*), leaves the room, comes back and hands the client the tissues. The client thanks her and they continue their work.

The fact that there are no tissues in the coaching room – despite its general, therapeutic atmosphere both as regards the setting and the explicit invitation of the client’s emotionality as a major intervention of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* – may be interpreted as a strategic and intentional distancing on the part of the coaches from creating too therapeutic an atmosphere right from the start. Instead, as a symbol of in-depth emotion work, the tissues are left in an adjoining room, from where they can easily be fetched and thus literally and physically integrated into the coaching space.

Résumé – Communicative task ‘Establishing the Coaching Realm’

The analysis has evinced ‘Offering Drinks’, ‘Discussing Seating Arrangements’, and ‘Offering and Using Tissues’ as core components of the communicative task ‘Establishing the Coaching Realm’. Although of seemingly minor importance for the professional encounter between professional coach and executive client and unnoticed in the practice literature on coaching, these components and their discursive realizations help to establish the particular character of the coaching realm for the participants.

Table 3. Communicative task ‘Establishing the Coaching Realm’ – Core components

Communicative task	Core components
Establishing the Coaching Realm	Offering Drinks Discussing Seating Arrangements Offering and Using Tissues

5.2 Methodological and procedural framing of coaching

The primary function of the communicative task ‘Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching’ is to pre-emptively give orientation to avoid interactional trouble and to compensate for the lack of security and common ground as regards the speech event or activity type of coaching. To this end the communicative task is high on the coaches’ professional agenda at the very beginning of coaching interactions with their clients, i.e. it is interactionally relevant during the onset of first sessions.

5.2.1 Explaining methods and/or procedures (of Emotionally Intelligent Coaching)

Clients’ potential unfamiliarity with coaching as an organizational intervention requires lengthy and detailed information-delivery sequences (Silverman 1997) initiated by the coach as regards the methods and/or procedure of coaching.

Excerpt5_CO1CL3_1

Clients’ unfamiliarity with coaching and their resulting insecurity is captured in the quote by the female coach CO1, who sanctions and emphatically meets her client’s feeling of suspense as regards their interaction as follows: *In that sense, I can really appreciate that, it’s something new. Going to the doctor’s is familiar,*⁴¹ *I think. You don’t have to go to a coach every day* (not in transcript). The excerpt, following the quote, illustrates how the coach further meets the client’s insecurity.

001 (0.25)
 002 CL3 hmhm
 003 (0.75)
 004 CO1 now as for how i proceed because you said you_re also
 005 CO1 wondering what what will happen right completely normal we
 006 (0.25)
 007 CO1 talk to each other
 008 CL3 hmhm

41. The context model of ‘doctor-patient interaction’ is frequently conjured up as reference model by the coaches in the data. The data show that both coach and client implicitly and/or explicitly draw on context models from neighboring professional formats such as psychotherapy and management consulting, but also doctor-patient interaction, etc. to make up for their lack of common ground. As expounded by Ruusuvuori (2005: 133): “(t)his comparison has also revealed several ways in which conventional expectations concerning the patient’s role and the course of the consultation inform the participants in the consultation. It seems likely that common institutional norms exist for a myriad of service encounters, and that people use them as resources in situations that are new to them”.

009 CO1 and there will probably also be times
010 (0.5)
011 CO1 erm when we start to go into the topics in more detail
012 (0.25)
013 CL3 hmhm
014 (0.75)
015 CO1 er when i will ask you to just
016 (0.25)
017 CO1 sense your feelings more closely
018 (0.25)
019 CO1 or to
020 (0.25)
021 CO1 replay situations inwardly
022 (0.5)
023 CO1 which we then so to speak look at
024 CO1 like in slow motion what exactly is happening [there]
025 CL3 [hmhm]
026 (1.1)
027 CO1 so one
028 CO1 key word
029 (0.5)
030 CO1 work life balance when you say there_s
031 (0.5)
032 CO1 maybe too much
033 CO1 going on or
034 (0.25)
035 CO1 you don_t take the time the we could
036 CO1 look at situations where
037 (1.0)
038 CO1 your head [would sa]y
039 CL3 [hmhm]
040 CO1 that_s
041 CO1 a situation where i could actually let g[o but i do]n_t do so
042 CL3 [hmhm] hmhm
043 CO1 and we
044 CO1 could just take a closer look what [actually] happens then
045 CL3 [hmhm]
046 (0.5)
047 CL3 hmhm
048 (0.75)
049 CO1 yes
050 (0.25)
051 CL3 yes good

She accounts for her topicalizing the method *Now, as for how I proceed* (line 004) via quoting the client's lines (lines 004f: *because you said you're also wondering what will happen*) and unburdens the client via semantically framing her *how I proceed* (line 004) rather vaguely as *completely normal* (line 005) and as *we talk to each other* (lines 005ff) or *go into the topics in more detail* (line 011). Yet, she also – although in a less explicit form than in other processes – introduces her professional focus on the client's intra-personal or emotional experiences by using the EI vocabulary

sense your feelings more closely (line 017) and by opposing rationality or reflection as in *head* (line 038) and emotionality or experiencing *what actually happens* (line 044). The client confirms the coach's elaborations explicitly via *yes, good* (line 051), i.e. he ratifies the procedure himself.

The coach personalizes her information delivery via frequently using the personal pronouns *I, we* and *you*, by inserting direct questions (line 024: *what exactly is happening there?*), by quoting the client (lines 004f: *because you said you're also wondering what will happen*), and as part of the overall recipient design (Drew 2013), she orients to the client's implicitly announced apprehensions concerning coaching and psy-measures in general.

A less personalized and more scientific and professionally distant way of 'Explaining Methods and/or Procedures' is illustrated in the following excerpt.

Excerpt6_CO2CL6_1

The male coach explains the method and coaching approach of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* in his interaction with CL6 by borrowing from scientific discourse.

```

001      (0.5)
002 CO2  so an
003 CO2  essential aspect which we
004      (0.25)
005 CO2  also offer
006      (0.5)
007 CO2  is practicing a mindful
008 CO2  self perception
009      (0.5)
010 CO2  [(so)]
011 CL6  [hm]hm
012 CO2  that means adding
013 CO2  something to a normal perception
014      (1.6)
015 CO2  which
016      (2.4)
017 CO2  originally comes rather from
018      (0.5)
019 CO2  eastern
020      (0.5)
021 CO2  or also buddhist traditions
022      (0.5)
023 CL6  hmhm
024 CO2  something getting close to mediation °h
025      (0.75)
026 CO2  which also
027 CO2  exists in the west
028      (0.25)
029 CO2  but in the west
030      (0.25)
031 CO2  well if you take
032 CO2  classical buddhism °h it wasn_t so ((unintelligible)) there

```

033 CO2 classical buddhism is actually a
 034 (0.25)
 035 CO2 kind of
 036 CO2 psychology not a religion
 037 (0.5)
 038 CO2 it doesn't have a god in that sense either

The coach embarks on this factual, impersonal information-delivery sequence as regards his coaching method at a rather advanced stage in their coaching encounter⁴² by first of all framing his work as a service (lines 003ff: *which we offer*) and by qualifying his 'product' *mindful self-perception* (lines 007f) as both beyond the normal (lines 012f: *adding something to a normal perception*) and exotic and old (and trendy!) (lines 015ff: *which originally comes rather from Eastern or also Buddhist traditions*) and contrasts it with Western practices (line 029: *but in the West ...*). He adds – as part of his scientific and philosophical discourse that presents him as a knowledgeable expert – further details on Buddhism, philosophy and religion (not in transcript) and then focuses on current scientific trends:

Excerpt6/2_CO2CL6_1

001 (1.4)
 002 CO2 °h erm
 003 (0.75)
 004 CO2 and something that brain research
 005 CO2 is working on really intensively at the moment is that
 006 (0.5)
 007 CO2 that there is a
 008 (0.25)
 009 CO2 kind of
 010 (0.5)
 011 CO2 perception and concentration and fitness training °h which
 012 (0.25)
 013 CO2 the buddhists in particular have been perfecting
 014 (0.5)
 015 CO2 erm
 016 (0.5)
 017 CO2 for the last two thousand five hundred years
 018 CL6 hmhm

The coach thereby (indirectly) frames his method as top on the agenda of neurosciences (lines 004f: *something that brain research is working on really intensively at the moment*) by introducing a kind of *perception and concentration and fitness training*

42. As part of the overall context dependency of the communicative tasks and their core components, 'Explaining Method and/or Procedure' can take place during later stages of the coach-client encounter. In the current example, this rather late methodological and procedural framing acts as a repair in the context of the client's lack of orientation as regards the usual procedure of executive coaching.

(line 011) as synonyms for his method or product, i.e. *mindful self-perception* (Excerpt (6), lines 007f) or mindfulness. He finalizes this excursion into the scientific discourse by thematically linking up these latest scientific trends with old traditional knowledge which the Buddhists in particular have been perfecting for the last 2,500 years (lines 013ff). Throughout this informing sequence, the coach uses an impersonal style and does not invite the client's participation by inquiring about his understanding, etc.. Thus, the client maintains his receptive and passive role of listener. The issue must be raised here as to whether or not the coach's strategy of not pursuing mutual agreement and ratification as regards the suggested method (unlike e.g. the female coach's client-integrating strategy in Excerpt (5)) is supportive as regards the client's cooperation and alignment. The coach finalizes this first part of his methodological framing sequence via the summarizing gist statement *mindfulness improves the concentration* (not in transcript).

During his methodological information-delivery sequence, the coach also informs the client about his step-wise procedure and classifies *practicing being able to concentrate mentally* (not in transcript) as the first step (*that would be the first step*) and then names, again speaking from the professional mode, *attempting to objectify subjective perceptions* as the second step. He reformulates this technical buzz word by using less technical language, including verbs of perception as part of EI vocabulary such as *listening inwardly*, *sensing* and by detailing and granulating the method *how one's own organism works physically, mentally and emotionally*. Yet again, he does not personalize the method and instead uses the impersonal *one* or leaves out the personal pronoun all together.

Excerpt7_CO2CL6_1

In the following excerpt, a continuation of the excerpt above (Excerpt (6)), the coach applies a metaphor, 'football', as illustration strategy to explain his method and procedure:

```
001 CO2 let_s take football as an example
002 CO2 well sort of
003 (0.25)
004 CO2 to take a closer look at how the team works
005 CO2 and how they take the time off the pitch in peace and quiet
006 CO2 °h not just to think about it but also to take account of the
007 CO2 emotional
008 (0.5)
009 CO2 interactive level hey what_s the (.)
010 CO2 the team spirit like actually what makes us a team what
011 CO2 does it take
012 (0.75)
013 CO2 °h erm
014 (2.2)
015 CO2 to take a look at that
016 (0.75)
017 CO2 °h and
```

018 (0.25)
019 CO2 then (.) and that is then the
020 (0.25)
021 CO2 the goal
022 (1.8)
023 CO2 °h to anchor that
024 CO2 in a tournament
025 (0.5)
026 CO2 in every player who
027 (0.25)
028 CO2 is on the pitch °h
029 CO2 like a feeling
030 (0.75)
031 CO2 and a certain sense of security
032 (0.5)
033 CO2 about the
034 CO2 identity of the team in order to know
035 (0.25)
036 CO2 what context
037 (0.25)
038 CO2 i_m operating in
039 CO2 °h which inner and now i_m deliberately saying inner
040 CO2 which personality part or which which players do i still have
041 CO2 °h who are also authentic but who represent a different side
of my
042 CO2 personality and are then in a better position with the ball

The coach meta-pragmatically frames his explanation sequence as a metaphor or comparison *let's take football as an example* (line 001). He compares coaching with *taking time off the pitch* (line 005) and introduces the concepts of inner family and personality parts via the metaphors *team* and *player* throughout this passage. Concurrently he also addresses the issue of the output orientation of executive coaching (lines 021ff: *the goal in a tournament*) as well as the idea of successful coaching, where the client knows all his personality parts, understands their needs and acts according to his newly development mindful self-awareness (lines 023ff: *to anchor that ... in every player who is on the pitch, like a feeling and a certain sense of security about the identity of the team in order to know what context I'm operating in*).

In addition to these pre-emptive instances of 'Explaining Methods and/or Procedures' as part of the clients' global orientation predominantly towards the beginning of coaching encounters, the data also evince instances where coaches locally engage in informing clients about next possible steps or an upcoming procedure via short, individual meta-pragmatic agenda moves or via (often) lengthier information-delivery sequences interspersed with putting the method / procedure into practice.

Excerpt8_CO2CL5_5

During their prior meetings, coach and client have worked on managerial questions as regards the latter's first 100 days as a newly established executive, i.e. they have focused in their coaching work on the client's inter-personal interaction field with the help of particular interventive acts (to quote the client: *the starting point was rather a formal, strategic one ... I'm new, I have to find a new position for myself, I have to find my bearings in a group of managers*, not in transcript). Inspired inter alia by the coaches' book (explaining their method in the context of self-coaching) *Selbst in Führung (Take Charge)* and the coach's prior global methodological framing practices during their second session, the client has become more interested in the intra-personal topic of 'automatisms' and presents that as his current concern. As the coach already offered methodological and procedural framing procedures concerning such intra-personal topics during their second meeting in a very general, abstract form (see Excerpts (6) and (6/2)), he embarks on intra-personal methodological orientation in the concrete context of the client's interest in his personality parts, etc.:

```

001      (0.5)
002 CL5   to consider how how do i maybe deal
003      (0.75)
004 CL5   appropriately with such
005 CL5   automatisms
006      (1.0)
007 CL5   [right becaus]e they are already
008 CO2   [hmhm hmhm]
009      (0.75)
010 CL5   on my mind [now]
011 CO2   [yes]
012 CL5   [so]
013 CO2   [yes]
014      (0.5)
015 CO2   °h
016      (0.5)
017 CO2   good have you clearly got a an automatism or (so)a
018 CO2   kind of automatism where you_d say you would like to (.) °h
           because the er (.)
019 CO2   [it is] so mh
020 CL5   [hm]
021      (0.5)
022 CO2   here it is good
023      (0.25)
024 CO2   to take a concrete episode and in relation
025 CO2   [to that]
026 CL5   [well]
027 CO2   concrete thing then [°h] to
028 CL5   [hm]
029      (0.5)
030 CO2   not so much mh like we_ve done so far
031      (0.5)
032 CO2   to see

```


033 CO2 what can be done in the outer world
034 CL5 hmhm
035 CO2 but rather to see what
036 CO2 can be done to manage one_s own behavior

The coach validates the client's (follow-up) concern of 'automatisms' via agreement tokens *yes, yes* (lines 011ff) and next inquires whether or not the client has such automatic reactions (line 017: *Have you clearly got an automatism ...*) as an implicit invitation to present one. He accounts for inviting concrete examples *because here it is good to take a concrete episode* (lines 022ff) via further methodological and procedural information that contrast their working together so far *not so much like we've done so far to see what can be done in the outer world* (lines 030ff.) with the new method of intervening *but rather to see what can be done to manage one's own behavior* (lines 035f).

Next, after the client has reported on such instances where he has automatic reactions in his professional encounters (such as losing confidence in meetings with certain people), the coach introduces the next procedural step:

Excerpt8/2_CO2CL5_5

001 CO2 hmhm hmhm °h what we could do now
002 (0.25)
003 CO2 if you want
004 CO2 to [is]
005 CL5 [yes]
006 CO2 well to really °h take a closer look at it what kind of
007 CO2 personality parts are
008 CL5 hmhm
009 CO2 involved in such an autom[atism] °h and what
010 CL5 [hmhm]
011 CO2 would it take for them °h um
012 (2.0)
013 CO2 well, as you put it, to deal with them more
014 CO2 [confide]ntly
015 CL5 [hmhm]
016 (1.5)
017 CL5 °h
018 (0.75)
019 CL5 [well th]e peculiar thing is that it_s not always like that
020 CO2 [because]
021 CL5 we[ll i]t_s
022 CO2 [yes]
023 CL5 not actually (.) well er i i can also react absolutely
confidently
024 CL5 in these situations
025 CO2 what_s different about it then when you react [confiden]tly
026 CL5 [that is]
027 CL5 erm
028 (1.5)
029 CL5 °h

030 CL5 that is er (.) well it_s diff
 031 (0.25)
 032 CL5 it_s then different
 033 (2.0)
 034 CL5 have to think what what really is different it is °h well
 035 (1.5)
 036 CL5 i

The coach – via a meta-pragmatic framing strategy (line 001: *what we could do now*) and via inviting the client's agreement (line 003: *if you want*) – explains the next procedural step (as an option in the conditional form), namely inquiring deeper into the personality parts that are involved in these automatic reactions and to find out what they would need in order to allow the client to feel more confident, via the method *to take a closer look* (line 006). In his answer, the client does not orient to the coach's suggested next steps on the meta-discursive level; instead he orients to the introduced thematic focus of 'automatically losing his feeling of confidence', which he relativizes via the qualifying comment *the peculiar thing is that it's not always like that* (line 019) and a claim *well, I can also react absolutely confidently in these situations* (lines 023f). The coach follows the client's thematic agenda and invites the client's self-reflection as regards the difference in those situations where he does not lose his confidence via an open question *what's different about it then when you ...* (line 025). The client, in an aligning manner, offers explanations and ideas, which are re-interpreted by the coach via *the message that I'm getting is that the main difference is whether you also feel inwardly ashamed or humiliated* ((1.5s)). *Or maybe also guilty or potentially guilty* ((1s)) *or not* (not in transcript), a re-interpretation which is met by the client's agreement and elaboration *yes* ((1s)). *That is certainly what triggers it off*. In offering these explanations and ideas, the client is then putting the coach's methodological step of *to take a closer look* into practice here.

Once coach and client have mutually agreed on certain feelings in the client (*feeling ashamed, humiliated or guilty*), the coach returns to his methodological and/or procedural framing strategies:

Excerpt8/3_CO2CL5_5

001 CO2 so what i would now
 002 (0.25)
 003 CO2 suggest to you also in the
 004 CO2 sense [of]
 005 CL5 [hm]hm
 006 (1.0)
 007 CO2 personality
 008 (0.25)
 009 CO2 dealing with personality parts
 010 CO2 °h is to take a close look in such a situation at which inner
 011 (0.5)
 012 CO2 parts are involved

013 CO2 [°h]
014 CL5 [hm]hm
015 CO2 and then to see what they need
016 (1.0)
017 CL5 hmhm
018 CO2 and er
019 (2.0)
020 CO2 actually
021 (0.5)
022 CO2 the most sensible or the best thing to do here °h
023 CO2 would be to conjure up
024 CO2 a typical situation where something like that [happens]
025 CL5 [hmhm]
026 (0.5)
027 CO2 or has happened °h
028 CO2 and we_ll bring it into the present and [so to] speak in the
present we_ll really
029 CL5 [yes]
030 CO2 take it step by step
031 (0.5)
032 CL5 hmhm
033 CO2 and look at it and see which parts are
034 CO2 there °h and then we_ll see what the parts need °h [it_s at]
actually
035 CL5 [hmhm]
036 CO2 often really like a team development
037 (0.25)
038 CO2 you [look] at
039 CL5 [yes]
040 CO2 a process more carefully °h and see
041 (0.5)
042 CO2 which team member contributed
043 CO2 what to which part of this process °h and what does this or
that part need
044 CO2 °h
045 (0.5)
046 CO2 in order to deal with it better next time
047 (0.5)
048 CL5 hmhm

The coach meta-pragmatically frames this next part of the information delivery sequence again as a suggestion in the conditional form (lines 001ff: *so what I would now suggest to you*) and first repeats the already introduced thematic and methodological focus *in the sense of dealing with personality parts is to take a close look, in such a situation, at which inner parts are involved and then to see what they need* (lines 003ff). He then suggests the next step, which he concurrently frames in the conditional form and as an extreme case formulation: *the most sensible or the best thing to do here would be to conjure up a typical situation where something like that happens* (lines 022ff). He further details this next step (e.g. from *conjure up* (line 023) to *bring it into the present* (line 028)), frames it as a common endeavor (line

028: *we'll bring it into the present* or *[we'll] look at it* (line 033)) and uses illustration practices such as comparisons that home in on the client's professional world (lines 034ff: *it's actually often really like a team development*). The coach is once again introducing a metaphor here in the context of 'Explaining Methods and/or Procedures' of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*.

The coach finalizes this sequence of concurrently explaining and working with the method by eliciting, once again, a concrete situation or moment from the client to further explore the underlying intra-personal dynamics: the client – after a 2 second pause for reflection – offers the following incident with a colleague:

Excerpt8/4_CO2CL5_5

```

001      (2.0)
002 CL5  hmhm i can describe
003 CL5  a situation
004 CO2  hmhm
005      (1.0)
006 CL5  in which this colleague from
007      (0.5)
008 CL5  well the one who_s
009 CL5  responsible for germany asked me
010      (0.5)
011 CL5  (so to speak) t to go for a coffee
012 CL5  with him [°h]
013 CO2  [hmhm]
014 CL5  as he had something to discuss with me
015 CO2  hmhm
016      (1.5)
017 CL5  and er we went (.) so we met up in the cafeteria
018 CL5  [there are]
019 CO2  [hmhm hm]hm
020 CL5  little tables °h and er
021      (1.0)
022 CL5  and i went there with him
023 CL5  quite unsuspecting
024      (0.5)
025 CO2  hmhm so at that point you didn_t feel at all stressed

```

The client embarks on reporting a concrete professional situation (lines 002f: *I can describe a situation*) where he was invited by a colleague to have coffee with him as he needed to discuss something with the client. CL5 describes the encounter and situation both as regards the external facts (lines 017ff: *so we met up, in the cafeteria, there are little tables*) and as regards his emotional state (lines 022f: *I went there with him, quite unsuspecting*). The coach reformulates the client's situation description into *so at that point you didn't feel at all stressed* (line 025). He thereby narrows down the thematic scope of the client's report according to their agreed on thematic focus, i.e. the client's emotional experiences on the intra-personal level.

Coach and client further explore the reported situation with the client's colleague, and the coach – time and again – refocuses the client on his emotional experiencing during that encounter (*And when you conjure up this moment, when you re-live it again in the present, what's your inner feeling about it? So what happens inside?*, not in transcript) and engages him in feelings-talk (via a re-interpretation *you have been shown up*, validations, etc.).

As the next act of methodological and procedural framing, the coach offers the client two options on how to proceed with a point where they have thematically defined the client's relevant personality parts in these situations: *now there are two very different ways of proceeding with that point* (not in transcript). The coach lists the two options: *either seeing whether a part or a mode of behavior can be found which works better there, or helping them so that they don't feel so ashamed*, then explains their purpose and coach and client pursue their feelings-talk or explorations on the intra-personal interaction level via intervening strategies, such as creating a hypothetical world, etc.:

This 'Explaining Methods and/or Procedures' during the fifth session happens in a step-by-step procedure, whereby coach (and client) switch(es) back and forth between explaining the method and applying the method in the context of intervening acts. This is acted out in a very individualized personal way, i.e. via a constant reference to the client and his concern (see the use of first person pronouns), which adds to the good thematic and interactive contact between coach and client.

Yet, the methodological and procedural framing practices also emerge ad hoc during later stages or even sessions along the process, where they function as 'interactional solutions' (Silverman 1997) or re-adjustment mechanisms. This function is illustrated in the next (very long) excerpt, which is presented and detailed in five chunks to illustrate the back and forth movement by coach and client in their re-defining of methods and/or procedure.

Excerpt9_CO2_CL5_2

In what follows, the coach initiates a meta-discourse (Penz 2011; Graf 2017b) on his way of interacting with the client up to that moment during both the first and the current session, namely by talking a lot and giving a lot of input, i.e. doing consulting with him: *I talked quite a lot and gave you advice* (lines 008ff).

001 (3.4)
 002 CO2 something which struck me and that_s why i_d like to go back
 to it again
 003 CL5 for a bit
 004 (2.1)
 005 CO2 in this one
 006 (2.0)
 007 CO2 maybe it was also the same in our first (.) meeting
 008 CO2 i
 009 (0.25)

010 CO2 talked quite a lot and
 011 (1.4)
 012 CO2 gave you advice [in oth]er words i gave
 013 CL5 [hm]
 014 CO2 a l[ot of] input
 015 CL5 [hm] hm
 016 (1.0)
 017 CO2 which is rather a function of consulting and not
 018 CO2 really a function of coachi[ng]
 019 CL5 [hm] hm

The coach initiates a readjustment sequence: accounting for his doing by an ego-referential epistemic expression *something which struck me* (line 002) (Spranz-Fogasy 2014), he pre-announces his next procedural step via an agenda statement *I'd like to go back to it again for a bit* (lines 002f). He offers a description of his past interaction with the client and thereby explicitly contrasts coaching with management consulting, another HR intervention. In doing so he defines management consulting as a format where the professional talks a lot, i.e. gives a lot of input.

This definition of management consulting motivates the client to inquire about a definition of coaching via an open w-question: *coaching. What would be the function of coaching then?* (lines 001f in Excerpt (9/2) below):

Excerpt9/2_CO2_CL5_2

001 CL5 coaching
 002 CL5 what would be the function [of coaching then]
 003 CO2 [coaching is more a]bout helping people to help themselves
 004 CO2 the function of coaching and th[at wou]ld possibly really be
 something for future sessions
 005 CL5 [yes]
 006 CO2 together is to look into that more closely and to let you
 find out for yourself
 007 CO2 who you are
 008 CL5 h[m]
 009 CO2 [h]ow do you come acros[s]
 010 CL5 [h]m
 011 CO2 and where are your starting points for
 012 CO2 bringing about chan[ge]
 013 CO2 [h]m

The coach, in an aligning manner latches onto the following definition of coaching as found across the coaching manuals: *coaching is more about helping people to help themselves* (line 003). Next, he details *helping people to help themselves* as follows: he pre-empts their further interaction as a more detailed looking at things (line 006: *to look into that more closely*) and as the client's job (lines 006ff: *to let you find out for yourself who you are. How do you come across? And what are your starting points for bringing about change?*). In what follows next (not in transcript), the client asks the coach whether or not certain actions (e.g. *that I try to tell you more about how I see certain self-observations in relation to myself*) belong to coaching and the coach

positively assesses the client's understanding of coaching or coaching actions (*precisely, precisely, that's more about coaching*). In his role as professional expert, the coach finishes this sequence via his professional assessment and definition of their future interaction of 'coaching': *so that we work a lot more on your self-reflection and monitoring yourself*. In this sequence then, the client does not passively accept the coach's definition of coaching but initiates a negotiation process in order to arrive at a mutually shared definition of coaching.

Next, coach and client discuss what they have topicalized so far (lines 008ff in Excerpt (10) below: *your strategy at first level management in the system into which you have moved*) and the coach categorizes the topic of 'Strategic Behavior as Executive in New Position' as a topic of management consulting, which requires a different type of interaction between professional and client: *I have also told you a lot about ... what I would do in that situation*. The coach finalizes this retrospective assessment as regards their methodological and thematic orientation via the gist formulation: *the pendulum has just swung a bit towards management consulting* (not in transcript).

The coach keeps up the image of the pendulum and continues to define *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* by explicitly referring to his professional expertise as coach (lines 002ff, Excerpt (9/3): *what I can actually do well would be to swing back towards self-reflection, self-management, personality development*), i.e. concurrently, the coach (and client) here explicitly engage(s) in 'Negotiating Knowledge and Expertise' as part of the basic activity 'Building the Relationship' (see Chapter 6):

Excerpt9/3_CO2_CL5_2

```

001      (1.5)
002 CO2  and what i
003 CO2  can actually do well would be to swing back towards
004      (0.25)
005 CO2  self reflection
006      (0.25)
007 CO2  self manageme[nt]
008 CL5  [hm]
009      (1.0)
010 CO2  personality development
011 CL5  yes
012      (1.6)
013 CL5  and i_d like to
014 CL5  get to that too that was more or less the external reason now
015 CO2  precisel[y]
016 CL5  [wh]ich i
017 CL5  brought up again and ^h because for me now that is naturally
        already i_d say
018 CL5  immediately relevant to my daily wo[rk]
019 CO2  [of] course you have to find a position for yourself

```

The client positively assesses their future coaching focus (lines 013f: *and I'd like to get to that too*) and accounts for his prior focus on external issues with his new job situation: *that was more or less the external reason now ... because for me now that is naturally already, I'd say, ... relevant to my daily work* (lines 014ff). This account is met by the coach's professional agreement *of course*, further elaborated via *you have to find a position for yourself* (both line 019).

Initiated by the paraphrase *so your personal impact against the background of your inner world* (lines 001ff in Excerpt (9/4)) (for his initial terms *self-reflection* and *self-management* (lines 005 and 007 in Excerpt (9/3))), the coach both maintains and pursues his professional agenda (re-focusing clients from the external to the internal, experiential perspective) and pays tribute to the client's needs as an executive in a new position, who must clearly position himself:

Excerpt9/4_CO2_CL5_2

```

001 CO2  so your [person]al impact
002 CL5  [hm]
003 CL5  hm
004 CO2  against the background
005 CO2  of your inner w[orld b]ecause one_s impact on the outer world
         is very closely connected
006 CL5  [hm]
007 CO2  with what happens internal[ly]
008 CL5  [hm]
009 CO2  or what guides you
010 CL5  hm
011 CO2  and when you can already
012 CO2  do that something like observing yourself from the outside
         like a camera
013      (0.8)
014 CO2  when
015 CO2  we take both these aspects namely how do you beha[ve]
016 CL5  [hm]
017 CO2  and what aspect of your
018 CO2  inner world causes you to behave like [that]
019 CL5  [hm]
020 CO2  if we would reflect on [them]
021 CL5  [yes]
022 CO2  together a wonderful starting point

```

By using illustration practices such as comparisons (line 012: *observing yourself from the outside like a camera*) and professional (psy-)terminology (line 005: *inner world*), he describes the method of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* and their future way of interacting (lines 020ff: *if we could reflect on them together*). He thereby links the inner and outer perspective (lines 017f: *what aspect of your inner world causes you to behave like that?*) and thus maintains the output or performance orientation which was marked as important by the client (lines 014ff in Excerpt (9/3): *the external reason ... in my daily work*).

The readjustment sequence as regards the methods and procedures of coaching is finalized by the coach re-focusing on his new role via discursive practices which concurrently do explicit relational work, i.e. coach and client negotiate responsibilities and participation rights:

Excerpt9/5_CO2_CL5_2

001 CO2 and in that case i would then
 002 (0.25)
 003 CO2 pull back more again
 004 CL5 hm
 005 CO2 and er rather let you
 006 (2.5)
 007 CO2 well because my role
 008 CO2 would be more like something of a companion
 009 (2.0)
 010 CO2 on your adventure trip into your
 011 CO2 own inne[r self]
 012 CL5 [hm]

Presented in the conditional form indicating the future orientation of their new form of interaction, CO2 explains his new role as less engaged (lines 001ff: *I would then pull back more again*) and finishes off via a professional assessment of his role in the form of a fairy tale comparison: *well, because my role would be more like something of a companion on your adventure trip into your own inner self* (lines 007ff). The client's uptake and agreement as well as his inquires, etc. throughout this readjustment sequence turn this negotiation and co-construction process as regards methods and procedures into a true interactive project by coach and client.

Explaining the method and/or procedure of their interaction concurrently functions as a strategy to perform and index the coach's professional identity as an expert who comes equipped with the necessary professional knowledge (cf. Graf 2011: 145). In other words, in and through 'Explaining Methods and/or Procedures', coaches do relevant relational work and engage in the basic activity of 'Building the Relationship' (Chapter 6). However, as the indexing of professional expertise happens implicitly here (as in most other actions by coaches, such as reformulating or reinterpreting clients' verbalizations in the context of diagnosing and intervening), it is discussed in the context of the basis activity of 'Defining the Situation'.

5.2.2 Sketching out the thematic scope

While the executive dimension of the current coaching approach implies a discussion of the clients' peak performance and leadership skills on their inter-personal interaction field, its *Emotional Intelligence* dimension emphasizes the clients'

emotionality or emotional experiences on their intra-personal interaction field (predominantly, but not exclusively, in the professional context). The thematic scope of the individual coaching interaction, i.e. the ‘what’ of coaching is inextricably linked to particular methods, i.e. the ‘how’ of coaching, in particular during the intervening actions as part of the basic activity ‘Co-constructing Change’ (Chapter 7). The general opacity of coaching as an intervention format thereby makes an explicit topicalization of topics which are appropriate for or expected in coaching or allowable contributions by the client relevant, too. Given the underlying professional agenda of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, a case in point in the current data is feelings-talk. This thematic focus requires reflexive or therapeutic interventions such as eliciting, refocusing and evoking emotions in the client (Graf and Pawelczyk 2014). To this end, coaches in more or less explicit ways invite verbalizations about the client’s inner or personal states (*in this area, in which it’s more about developing further personally in dealings with oneself*, not in transcript) and about their (problematic) emotionality, both from the clients’ private and professional lives.

The following excerpt illustrates the above-mentioned close interrelation between the thematic and the interactive morphology of coaching, i.e. how the thematic dimension (here: factual or managerial issues) correlates with a particular interactive procedure (here: discussing concrete strategies for the client).

Excerpt10_CO2CL5_2

In a retrospective assessment, the coach comments on the thematic focus of their interaction so far:

```

001 CO2  so far
002 CO2  we have talked more
003      (0.25)
004 CO2  about strategy and
005      (0.25)
006 CO2  we_ve also spoken about
007 CL5   hm
008 CO2  your
009      (0.25)
010 CO2  strategy at first [level] management so
011 CL5   [hm]
012 CO2  t[o speak]
013 CL5   [hm]
014 CO2  in the system into which you have
015 CO2  moved to the si[de and] up
016 CL5   [yes]
017 CL5   yes
018 CO2  of course that_s a topic of coaching
019 CO2  but it_s more on the level of consulting
020 CL5   hm

```

The coach summarizes their procedure so far both as regards its thematic scope (*your strategy at first level management; in the system into which you have moved*, lines 008ff) and as regards its interactive, methodological dimension, i.e. how they ‘have done coaching’ together so far (*we have talked about ...; we’ve also spoken about ...*, lines 002ff and 006). He summarizes this procedure, both as regards the thematic and the interactive dimension via *of course that’s a topic of coaching, but it’s more on the level of consulting* (lines 018f). In so doing, the coach implies that neither the topic of external strategies nor talking about things is ‘core’ coaching as envisioned by *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*.

This short excerpt is part of the larger re-adjustment sequence (as regards methods and/or procedures) discussed and analyzed in Excerpt (9) above. The following table thus only paraphrases the thematic scope that CO2 and CL5 refer to in their moving from outside, factual issues and their talking about it to the client’s inner experiences and the focus on his self-reflection (= methodological and procedural framing). The quotes are taken from Excerpts (9) and (10):

Thematic scope	Methodological and procedural framing
<i>Strategy at first level management, external reason, topic on a consulting level, positioning oneself, conflict resolution</i>	<i>I talked quite a lot, also about what I would do, management consulting</i>
<i>Self-reflection, self-management, personality development, your personal impact against the background of your inner world</i>	<i>I would then pull back more again, my role as a companion on your adventure trip into your own inner self</i>

As outlined above at the onset of ‘Sketching out the Thematic Scope’, *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* explicitly invites the clients’ emotional experiences on the intra-personal interaction field, especially as regards their professional lives, yet also as regards their private lives. There are instances in the data where the coach explicitly prompts verbalizations from the client’s private life alongside his/her professional realm. This is illustrated in the next excerpt:

Excerpt11_CO1CL4_1

001 CO1 and erm just like now when you already described a specific
situation
002 CO1 the next important step °h in our coaching session here could
be to look at
003 (0.25)
004 CO1 situations together which
005 (1.5)
006 CO1 you are familiar with that can be in a
007 (0.25)
008 CO1 professional cont[ext] or also from your private life
009 CL4 [hmhm]

Inserted in her methodological and procedural framing practices, the coach explicitly prompts the client to narrate or report experiences or incidents from his private life alongside incidents from his professional field (*that can be in a professional context or also from your private life*, lines 006ff). Such explicit inviting or pre-empting a client's (emotional) experiences also from the private realm both attests to the under-defined thematic scope of executive coaching and prepares the stage for particular intervening practices during the basic activity 'Co-constructing Change', to be more precise for processing client's intra-personal experiences in his/her private realm (Chapter 7).

Another function of the coach's 'Sketching out the Thematic Scope' in the current data is also to narrow it down.

Excerpt12_CO1CL3_1

Just prior to the excerpt, the client asked the coach whether it is necessary, as an executive, to be always perfectly prepared in one's weekly meetings:

```
001      (1.3)
002 CO1  erm
003      (1.0)
004 CO1  that_s an issue where i am maybe not in a position
005      (0.75)
006 CO1  to be able to say so much about [it]
007 CL3  [hmhm]
008 CO1  right you remember that on
009 CO1  the phone i said when you_ve got really classical
010      (0.5)
011 CO1  management
012 CO1  issues right [then it] may be that i cannot answer the one or
013 CL3  [hmhm]
014 CO1  the oth[er questi]on
015 CL3  [hmhm]
016 CO1  so precisely and so well
```

The coach explicitly states her lack of knowledge as regards leadership questions (lines 004ff: *That's an issue where I am maybe not in a position to be able to say much about it*) and thereby indirectly attempts to close this thematic strand opened up by client and the question he has put forth. Yet, by referring back to their prior-to-coaching telephone conversation (lines 008f: *you remember ...*) and by directly quoting herself during that conversation (lines 009ff: *when you've got really classical management issues then it may be that I cannot answer the one or the other question so precisely and so well*), she accounts for her lack of knowledge and frames it as something pre-announced and thus not within her sphere of responsibility.

5.2.3 Differentiating coaching from therapy

The focus on emotions or emotion regulation in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is executed via reflexive practices similar to those found in a therapeutic context, i.e. there is a methodological, procedural and thematic closeness between *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* and therapeutic interaction.⁴³ As executive coaching is explicitly solution and goal oriented due to its organizational embedding, this represents an interactional dilemma:

Whereas the discursive practice of coaching is heavily permeated by therapeutic terminology, procedures and interventions as its core work centers on refocusing clients on their emotional experiencing via therapeutic interventions, [...] we witness an explicit and decided distancing from psychotherapy on the discursive meta-level, i.e. the coaching practice literature, HR programs as well as in coaches' self-description of coaching in the concrete interaction with their clients.

(Graf 2012: 27)

Given that both the coaches' explanations as regards their method and procedure (via technical terms such as *in-depth work*, *sensing*, *inner world*, *automatism*, *mindfulness*, etc.) and their explicit focus on feelings-talk as part of their defining and framing strategies of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* may cause moments of (great) insecurity and ultimately lead to resistance in performance-oriented executive clients, 'coaching work' on emotions is meta-discursively and explicitly set apart from therapy and the boundaries are explicitly marked:

Numerous unfortunate impressions of therapy linger in the management world, and many still attach a stigma to therapy. Therapy is seen as appropriate for Woody Allen types who would rather sit around and whine than go out and make things happen. This is hardly an attractive image for the corporate executive charged with the task of moving 'market mountains'.

(Peltier 2010: xxxvii)

As a local consequence of this challenge for executive coaching, we observe a delicate balancing between focusing on the client's emotionality and pursuing an internalization of the client's problems via therapeutic interventions such as re-interpretations, re-formulations and questions that enhance the client's self-reflection, concurrently stressing the goal-and-business-oriented character of the professional activities of coaching and distancing them from psychotherapy. This is illustrated in the following excerpt:

43. See Graf and Pawelczyk (2014) for a detailed analysis of feelings-talk in therapy and executive coaching, Spranz-Fogasy et al (under review) on elicitation and processing strategies of requesting examples in therapy and executive coaching and Graf and Scarvaglieri (in prep.) on doing relationship in therapy and coaching.

Excerpt13_CO1CL4_1

In her methodological and procedural framing practices, in the following excerpt the coach sets out to differentiate coaching from therapy:

```

001         (2.5)
002 CO1  °h the second thing is um that maybe it_s also very very
003 CO1  important for you to know that erm
004         (0.75)
005 CO1  that i will coordinate closely with you
006 CO1  on the procedure so
007         (0.25)
008 CO1  you're sitting here on a couch yes even on
009 CO1  a red one so i always think a red couch right well it is a
        couch in itself
010 CO1  ((laughs)) and red is even more has even more implications °h so
011         (0.25)
012 CO1  you
013 CO1  decide where you want to go
014 CL4  hmhm
015 CO1  what you want to achieve °h um
016 CO1  i won_t lead you anywhere in your emotional life where you
        would later say
017 CO1  whoops where have i ended up now i didn_t want to get the[re
        at all] you can be
018 CL4  [hmhm]
019 CO1  absolutely sure about that
020 CL4  hmhm
021 CO1  i can do in depth work in the sense of °h
022 CO1  doing good depth psychology
023 CL4  hmhm
024 CO1  i can do that °h i
025 CO1  only do it if you want me to and above all when it_s purposeful
026 CL4  yes
027         (0.75)

```

The coach differentiates coaching from therapy by marking one aspect of her procedure (lines 005f: *that I will coordinate closely with you on the procedure*) as particularly relevant for the client (lines 002f: *maybe it's also very, very important for you to know*). While she orients to the external situational similarity between coaching and psychotherapy (lines 008ff: *you're sitting here on a couch ... even on a red one ... Well, it is a couch in itself. And red has even more implications*), the coach on the whole dis-oriens from the context model of “psychotherapy” or “psychoanalysis” and the implications of a dominating therapist who steers the client into emotional depths against his/her will. She reformulates aligning her procedure with the client as *you decide where you want to go ...* (lines 012f) and as *I won't lead you anywhere ... you can be absolutely sure about that* (lines 016ff). In doing so, she again implicitly orients to the differences between coaching and therapy and to the underlying professional coaching theory (Peräkylä et al. 2005) that states that the client is in charge of the content. The coach rounds off her elaborations as regards aligning

her procedure with the client by self-positioning (for the second time in this initial sequence) as a competent, and at the same time, responsible professional expert (lines 021ff: *I can do in-depth work ... I can do that. I only do it if you want me to and ... when it's purposeful*). Her reference to *purposeful* concurrently attests to the underlying business orientation of their executive coaching interaction.

During the coach and the client's work on the latter's emotions and intra-personal issues, the participants may reach a point where their feelings-talk touches upon too personal or even traumatic experiences from the client's past. These issues cannot and must not be addressed in the context of coaching: "psychological issues [...] or contemplation of the entire life history of a coachee resides exclusively with suitably qualified psychotherapists, doctors or medical institutions; they are not part of a coach's scope of duties" (Rauen 2003: 5, translated by author). As part of their professional responsibility and expertise, coaches may pre-emptively inform the client about possible risks and side effects of coaching. This other communicative function of differentiating coaching from therapy is illustrated in the following excerpt taken from the first session of the coaching process CO2CL6.

Excerpt14_CO2CL6_1

001 (1.3)
 002 CO2 if you were now hm let_s say from a (.) psychological
 003 (0.25)
 004 CO2 or
 005 (0.25)
 006 CO2 physical you_d say
 007 (0.25)
 008 CO2 from a physic
 009 (0.5)
 010 CL6 hmhm
 011 (0.25)
 012 CO2 not
 013 (0.5)
 014 CO2 not as
 015 CO2 stabili stable as both of us now believe you to be °h then
 such emotional
 016 CO2 instability can lead to one noticing that
 017 (0.5)
 018 CO2 well now something different
 019 CO2 like psychotherapy
 020 (0.5)
 021 CO2 would be more useful or [more helpful]
 022 CL6 [hmhm]

By introducing the client to the methodology and procedure of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, i.e. focusing on one's emotionality or emotional experiences, coach CO2 also topicalizes the danger of becoming emotional instable (lines 015f: *emotional instability*) and the resulting necessity to undergo therapy.

The communicative task ‘Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching’ also entails processing the experiences which the executive clients bring to coaching: as part of their professional development as executive managers, executive clients in general participate in a great variety of HR measures such as leadership seminars, team-building formats, etc. What is more, the clients may have received coaching on another occasion. All of these experiences form part of their knowledge as regards professional formats and as such are a relevant issue to clarify during ‘Defining the Situation’. How this is tackled interactively is illustrated and discussed in the following:

5.2.4 Integrating clients’ experience with coaching or other intervention formats (such as emotional intelligence training)

As part of their methodological and procedural framing practices to establish a common ground for their coaching work, possible prior experience with coaching or other HR intervention formats on the part of the client must be integrated. A particular case in point in the current data is clients’ experience with the *Emotional Intelligence* training which is offered by the coaches (together with other colleagues) for organizational clients. This training is also theoretically informed by Richard Schwarz’s *Internal Family Systems Model*, by mindfulness and the general principles of *Emotional Intelligence* (see Section 3.1). Clients who have participated in this training prior to their coaching are semi-professionals as regards the particular method and the procedure and have also gained insights into their personality due to integrated coaching sequences in the training (see the processes CO1CL1, CO1CL2 and CO2CL7). Such experience is interactionally and thematically consequential and is an essential element of how the participants co-construct the situation as the matrix against which the other basic activities ‘Building the Relationship’, ‘Co-constructing Change’ and ‘Evaluating the Coaching’ are acted out.

Excerpt15_CO1CL3_1

Via a closed question, the coach invites the client’s experience with coaching:

```

001      (0.5)
002 CO1  is it the first time that you've obtained
003      (0.25)
004 CO1  some advice
005      (0.5)
006 CO1  in th this field in
007      (0.25)
008 CL3  yes (.)
009 CL3  from an
010 CL3  external yes it is of course we had internal erm trainers
      several times

```


With her closed question *is this the first time now that you've obtained some advice in this field?* (lines 002ff) that influences the client's answering behavior, the coach prompts a (short) yes or no answer as the preferred second part, instead of an extensive description of his experiences with coaching as a possible and acceptable answer to an open question. In her closed question inquiring about the client's experience with coaching, the coach substitutes 'coaching' with *some advice in this field* (lines 004ff), and thus leaves both the thematic scope and the way of interaction rather vague. Her use of semantically vague language with CL3, i.e. her recipient design, may be interpreted as a local adaption to both the client's vague or unspecific primary concern, namely where he stands at present, and his implicitly communicated insecurity or apprehension as regards coaching due to issues with sustainability. The client positively affirms the coach's closed question by distinguishing between external and internal HR measures *from an external, yes* (lines 009f) and then elaborates on his experience with other, related formats (not in transcript).

The following excerpt illustrates how clients' experience with *Emotional Intelligence* training – both as regards the methods and procedures and their first insights into their personality parts – are integrated into the methodological framing practices by the coach.

Excerpt16_CO1CL2_1

The coach initiates this sequence – after the client has presented first aspects of her concern – by pre-announcing her methodological and procedural framing *I would like to say a bit about how we work here* (lines 003f). She accounts for this agenda move by assuring the client her understanding (via the ego-referential experiential verb *I have the feeling* (lines 004ff)) and by assuring the client that she has enough information to move on to the next procedural step (lines 006ff: *we've also touched on the most important things*). Right from the onset she frames their work as a common project e.g. via the use of the first person plural pronoun *we*:

```
001 CO1  yes
002      (0.5)
003 CO1  once again i would like to
004 CO1  say a bit about how we work here because i have [the]
005 CL2  [yes]
006 CO1  feeling i understand where you are [and i] believe that we_ve
          also touched on
007 CL2  [okay]
008 CO1  the most important
009      (0.5)
010 CO1  things
011 CL2  aha
012      (2.0)
013 CO1  erm
014      (0.75)
```

015 CO1 so
 016 CO1 it seems to me that this that this very strong performance
 linked
 017 CO1 part plays a very very very important role and that it °h
 018 CO1 as the next thing probably also requires
 019 (0.25)
 020 CO1 that we enter into a dialogue with it here
 021 CO1 as you already
 022 (0.25)
 023 CO1 experienced it °h in the seminar

Unlike in cases where clients have no experience with EI and IFS, the coach can re-interpret the client's verbalizations right from the start via her professional terminology, i.e. the language of the different parts: *it seems to me that this very strong performance-linked part plays a very important role* (lines 016f); yet, although she marks this part as relevant in her professional assessment, she concurrently mitigates her professional assessment via the ego-referential epistemic verb *it seems to me* (line 016). What is more, the coach can explain her method and procedure via reference to already discursively established personality parts (lines 016f: *strong performance-linked part*). Next in her professional assessment of the situation, she defines the next procedural step as *we enter into a dialogue with it here* (line 020), yet again she both mitigates her professional assessment or expertise via *probably* (line 018) and explicitly refers to the client's personal experience with this method from the seminar *as you already experienced it in the seminar* (line 021ff).

Besides explaining her next methodological steps, the coach also embarks on explaining her coaching approach on a more global level, yet again concretely basing it on the client's first insights into her personality parts:

Excerpt16/2_CO1CL2_1

001 (0.25)
 002 CL2 hmhm
 003 CO1 i can really imagine that it_s important
 004 CO1 to be told °h by that part °h and where it_s not about
 005 (0.5)
 006 CO1 that_s also true of my
 007 (0.25)
 008 CO1 coaching approach right
 009 CL2 aha
 010 CO1 coaching (.) first of all it_s certainly not a question of of
 011 CO1 changing something about that but of understanding deep
 inside
 012 CO1 even better on an emotional level why °h such a part
 013 (0.25)
 014 CO1 has such
 015 CO1 strong convictions right
 016 CL2 hmhm

Again she frames the relevance of her (implicitly) suggested next step *to be told [...]* and *understand deep inside even better ... why such a part has such strong convictions* (lines 004 and 011ff), not as a neutral professional assessment, but as her personal belief *I can really imagine that it's important* (line 003). In qualifying this step – to understand the personality part better and more deeply – as relevant and important, she concurrently defines her coaching approach *ex negativo*: *it's certainly not a question of changing something about that* (lines 010f). In so doing she pays tribute to the client's apprehensions against coaching or against accepting coaching, given that her company is paying for it and may expect something in return, i.e. changed emotional behavior.

5.2.5 Negotiating the individual definition of coaching

'Negotiating the Individual Definition of Coaching' by the participants represents another component of the communicative task 'Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching'. Irrespective of the overall interaction frame of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, with its thematic and interactive focus or agenda on clients' emotional experiences, there is scope for each coach-client dyad to co-define their particular form of 'doing coaching' together in more or less explicit ways.

In the following excerpt from the first session of CO1CL3, this negotiation process as regards their individual definition of coaching or their individual way of acting out coaching is initiated by the client, who explicitly expresses his wish to receive the coach's 'subjective opinion'.

Excerpt17_CO1CL3_1

The client's wish follows right after the coach has finished her explanation sequence as regards method and procedure.

001 CL3 hmhm
 002 (2.5)
 003 CL3 that would also be really okay
 004 CL3 with me if if you could tell me
 005 (0.5)
 006 CL3 where you would subjectively say
 007 CL3 that that would be a good result
 008 (0.5)
 009 CO1 hm

In his performance and success orientation and functionalization of coaching as an additional source to improve his leadership skills (see Section 6.3.2) the male client explicitly states his wish (presented in the conditional form) to receive the coach's subjective opinion or assessment as regards his changed behavior as an executive *that would be a good result* (line 007).

The coach positively ratifies the client's expressing the wish (lines 001ff, Excerpt (17/2): *it's good that you are telling me that*) and embarks on detailing her usual behavior as coach:

Excerpt17/2_CO1CL3_1

```
001 CO1 so it_s good that you
002      (0.25)
003 CO1 are telling me that I er i i rather ask questions i_ve got
004 CO1 a questioning stance now right and that could be seen as
005      (0.75)
006 CO1 yes
007 CO1 maybe as a
008      (0.25)
009 CO1 coach or counselor
010      (0.25)
011 CO1 stance right
012 CL3 hmhm
013      (0.75)
014 CL3 erm and
```

She thereby contrasts her usual professional behavior as a coach as a *questioning stance* (line 004) with her client's expressed wish to have her opinion and input, and accounts for her professional behavior:

Excerpt17/3_CO1CL3_1

```
001 CO1 very often as a result of this questioning stance and also as
002      a result of the
003 CO1 exploratory stance
004      (0.5)
005 CO1 a lot of
006      (0.25)
007 CO1 maybe also of one_s own knowledge of what
008 CO1 is there or the wishes needs [longing]s right
009 CL3 [hmhm]
010      (0.75)
011 CO1 er
012      (0.5)
013 CO1 is revealed quite clearly
```

She classifies her professional behavior of a *questioning ... and exploratory stance* (lines 001f) as successful as regards finding out about one's own inner knowledge, one's human wants, desires, etc.; in other words she clearly frames the success of her method in terms of the underlying professional agenda and its focus on emotional experiences and the client's intra-personal interaction field.

After the coach has once again confirmed that she will comply with his wish to have her opinion and ideas, the client further explains why he considers this important:

Excerpt17/4_CO1CL3_1

001 CL3 well to er reflect on yourself and to look inside is good but
when you
002 CL3 really want to make something change in yourself then that
also includes for me
003 CL3 having
004 (0.5)
005 CL3 a different [situation or a different perspective]
006 CO1 [i do that so that you (.) right preci]sely
007 (0.5)
008 CL3 whether
009 CL3 i take that on one to one i[s somethi]ng else but the fact that
010 CO1 [yes yes]

He partly agrees with the coach's positive assessment and importance of self-reflection (line 001: *well, to reflect on yourself and to look inside is good*), yet, introduced by a concessive *but*, presents his own opinion as regards really successful measures, i.e. someone else's opinion or perspective, in order to really change (lines 001f: *when you really want to make something change in yourself*). In so doing the client not only (again) indexes his performance orientation but also his understanding of coaching as a service encounter where he, as an autonomous client, both co-determines the setting and decides on what is valuable for him and what not (lines 008f: *whether I take that on one to one is something else*). The coach once again ratifies and agrees with the client's wish and the participants finalize this negotiation sequence as regards their individual definition of coaching via a mutual agreement of this particular form of interaction and via the coach's summarizing gist: *so I'll also get it to you* (not in transcript).

In the next excerpt, we witness an instance of individual definition of coaching, where coach and client do not come up with a mutually agreed on definition of their interaction together.

Excerpt18_CO2CL6_3

Already way into the second session, coach and client still have not clearly defined the client's primary concern, i.e. the reason why he initiated coaching in the first place. This undefined situation is topicalized by the coach at the onset of the excerpt, who – based on what they have been talking so far – presents the client with his professional assessment of the client's concern:

001 CO2 is that actually the
002 (0.25)
003 CO2 main reason
004 (0.25)
005 CO2 why you_re here so what do you have to do °h in order to
006 CO2 be noticed °h so that the impact you have
007 (0.25)
008 CO2 upwards to the side
009 CO2 and downwards °h erm well let_s say also boosts
010 CO2 your career or

011 (0.5)
 012 **CL6** hmhm
 013 (1.0)
 014 **CO2** is good for you professional
 015 **CO2** advancement
 016 (1.2)
 017 **CL6** °h [°hh]
 018 **CO2** [i can remember similar]
 019 **CL6** oh
 020 **CO2** [formulations
 021 **CL6** [hm] hmhm °hh
 022 (5.2)
 023 **CL6** °h
 024 (0.5)
 025 **CL6** i don_t
 026 **CL6** know whether it is so instrumentalized now
 027 (2.4)
 028 **CL6** but °h
 029 (0.5)
 030 **CL6** when
 031 **CL6** i think about the question of impact [and] also er er
 032 **CO2** [yes]
 033 (3.5)
 034 **CL6** and
 035 **CL6** also about this this more conscious dealing with
 036 **CL6** disruptive signals
 037 **CO2** hmhm
 038 (0.5)
 039 **CO2** hmhm
 040 (0.25)
 041 **CO2** [yes]
 042 **CL6** [yes]
 043 (0.5) we_re speaking about that
 044 (0.5)
 045 **CL6** so
 046 **CL6** your having interpreted it so narrowly
 047 (0.75)
 048 **CL6** er
 049 (0.5)
 050 **CL6** what is
 051 (0.25)
 052 **CL6** good
 053 (0.25)
 054 **CL6** for the
 055 **CL6** career in terms of of ah
 056 (0.5)
 057 **CL6** °h er
 058 (0.25)
 059 **CL6** the tool [box]
 060 **CO2** [consc]io[us] impact
 061 **CL6** [or]
 062 **CL6** whatever (.) ph yes well I didn_t interpret it so so narrowly
 063 (0.25)
 064 **CL6** now somehow (.)

The coach tentatively classifies the client’s concern – aligning with the performance and output orientation of executive coaching – as *in order to be noticed so that the impact you have boosts your career or is good for your professional advancement?* (lines 005ff) and invites the client’s agreement with his definition of the client’s concern as *is that actually the main reason why you’re here?* (lines 001ff). The client, after pauses, hesitation markers and deep inhaling that pre-announce his dis-preferred second turn, turns the coach’s definition down via the negative epistemic self-reference *I don’t know* (lines 025f) and his assessment *whether it is so instrumentalized now* (line 026). He then offers his own version of his concern *the question of impact* (line 031) and *dealing with disruptive signals more consciously* (lines 035f) and returns to the coach’s definition, which he again rejects as a negatively connotated perspective *your having interpreted so narrowly what is good for the career in terms of the tool box* (lines 046ff). While the coach orients to a performance and output definition of coaching, the client has no clear goal in coaching and thus defies the professional’s straightforward definition. The marked dis-preference from line 025 onwards not only displays the challenging moment of disagreeing with one’s conversational partner, but also attests to the hierarchical relationship between a layperson and a professional and to the even more challenging situation of disagreeing with (the opinion of) an expert.

Résumé – Communicative task ‘Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching’

To sum up, the communicative task ‘Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching’ as part of the basic activity ‘Defining the Situation’ entails the following core components: ‘Explaining Methods and/or Procedures’ (of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*), ‘Sketching out the Thematic Frame’, ‘Differentiating Coaching from Therapy’, ‘Integrating Client’s Experience with Coaching or other Intervention Formats’ as well as ‘Negotiating Individual Definition of Coaching’.

Table 4. Communicative task ‘Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching’ – Core components

Communicative task	Core components
Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching	Explaining Methods and/or Procedures (of <i>Emotionally Intelligent Coaching</i>)
	Sketching out the Thematic Scope
	Differentiating Coaching from Therapy
	Integrating Client’s Experience – with Coaching or other Intervention Formats (such as <i>Emotional Intelligence</i> training)
	Negotiating Individual Definition of Coaching

As regards the core components, the coaches outline the particularities of the current coaching approach of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* with its explicit focus on clients' emotional experiences and its specific interventions of turning their attention from external theorizing about problems to their internal experiencing. Coaches both globally (as regards their overall interaction) and locally (as regards a particular session or moment in their interaction) explain their particular method and procedure, envision and theoretically open up the various interaction frames by differentiating coaching from therapy and other intervention formats and by opening up possible thematic spaces. More locally, each coach-client dyad works on their individual definition of coaching within the larger frame of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*. This function is succinctly captured in the following finalizing summary of CO1's framing sequences during the onset of her first meeting with client CL3: *so coaching, as we put it, is very detailed, differentiated work on something that the client wants to make progress with* (not in transcript). What is more, integrating possible experiences on the part of the client as regards coaching or other organizational intervention formats is also part of the more local framing of coaching.

5.3 Temporal framing of coaching

The last communicative task in the context of 'Defining the Situation' is the 'Temporal Framing of Coaching'. Again, this communicative task entails various core components which will be carved out from the data in the following excerpts.

5.3.1 Arranging dates for next meeting(s)

'Arranging Dates for Next Meeting(s)' often transpires in lengthy sequences, predominantly at the boundaries of the coaching encounters; where possible next dates are negotiated between coach and client. While in other professional contexts, this task is either outsourced to the administrative staff, or the professional – as is the dominant case in psychotherapy – offers a few options as possible next dates, in coaching we witness arranging dates for next meetings as truly interactive projects. The interaction partners thereby both present themselves as busy professionals with tight schedules and as such these temporal negotiation processes concurrently negotiate issues of hierarchy in an endemically asymmetrical professional relationship. Meeting as equal status interaction partners, coach and client temporarily establish a non-hierarchical relationship in the overall context of their asymmetrical relationship. Arranging dates for next meetings also orients to the character of coaching as a conversation-in-a-series and in this context the participants "testify to, elaborate

upon and invoke as relevant a relationship between them that is '*standing*' (Button 1991: 272; emphasis in original). In other words, these situation-defining items are another case in point for the inseparability of relational work from any other 'coaching work' the participants engage in.

'Arranging Dates for Next Meeting(s)' is usually initiated by the coach and as such Excerpt (19) represents a default case in the corpus; the coaches in their role as primary speakers (Quasthoff 1990) are responsible for initiating the arrangement of dates.

Excerpt19_CO1CL4_1

```
001 CO1 °h yes um and the second thing to come back
002 CO1 to the timing i thought that we had °h already talked about
    an approximate time
003 CO1 frame for our appointments but we haven_t arranged anything i
    think
004 CL4 precisely
005 CO1 well we definitely have to do that today then
006 CL4 hmhm pre[cisely]
007 CO1 [good]
008 CO1 okay
009 (0.25)
010 CL4 yes
```

In this example, the coach in her professional responsibility takes the initiative and introduces the topic 'Arranging Dates for Next Meeting(s)' as part of her initial framing and orientation practices at the onset of their first meeting. She puts this topic meta-discursively on their 'to-do list' of the current meeting and thus controls both the thematic and interactive level. Both the fact that they were talking about next dates during their pre-coaching telephone conversation, and the fact that agreeing on next dates is necessary is mutually acknowledged and agreed on by the participants via the assessment tokens *good*, *precisely*, *okay*, *yes* (lines 006ff).

However, there are also a few instances in the corpus where the clients take the initiative, as illustrated in the following excerpt.

Excerpt20_CO1CL3_1

Towards the very end of their first meeting, the client introduces the topic of 'Arranging Dates for Next Meeting(s)':

```
001 (0.5)
002 CL3 great
003 (1.1)
004 CL3 then i_d only have one more point to talk a[bout] and
005 CO1 [yes]
006 CL3 that is
007 (1.4)
008 CL3 the date
009 CO1 yes
```

010 (0.5)
 011 CL3 we already arranged hang on what did we have
 012 CL3 the
 013 (0.25)
 014 CL3 thursday the
 015 CO1 precisely
 016 CL3 thirteenth
 017 CO1 yes
 018 (3.1)
 019 CL3 that_s a bit
 020 CL3 problemat[ic for] me now
 021 CO1 [yes]
 022 (0.25)
 023 CL3 because i have to do something with my son
 024 CL3 in the morning
 025 CO1 hmhm
 026 (0.25)
 027 CL3 and i didn_t want to bring him along
 028 (0.5)
 029 CO1 yes
 030 CL3 the
 031 (0.25)
 032 CO1 no ((laughs))
 033 CL3 what would it look like for you in
 034 CL3 that week
 035 (1.4)
 036 CL3 would wednesday be
 037 (0.25)
 038 CL3 possible
 039 (0.5)
 040 CO1 [((huffing))]
 041 CL3 [but you are]
 042 CO1 [unfortunately not that_s really stupid]
 043 CL3 [that_s just before your holiday i believ]e isn_t it
 044 CO1 precisely [yes]
 045 CL3 [you]
 046 CL3 are on holiday after that i believe aren_t you
 047 CO1 hmhm
 048 (1.0)
 049 CL3 okay but in that
 050 CL3 week there aren_t any alternatives i think you_re on a
 seminar or something
 051 CL3 before that you said aren_t you
 052 CO1 well it_s like this the twelfth is
 053 CO1 now booked up on the eleventh we_ve maybe got that_s
 completely
 054 (0.25)
 055 CO1 stupid
 056 CO1 somehow some visitors i_ll just take another look to see if
 there are any other
 057 CO1 alternatives
 058 (0.5)
 059 CO1 erm
 060 (0.5)

Via pre-announcing the topic ‘dates’ (line 004: *then I’d only have one more point to talk about*), the client initiates a negotiation sequence as regards finding a(n) (alternative) date for their next meeting. First, the client summarizes their prior temporal arrangement (lines 011ff: *we already arranged – hang on, what did we have? – the Thursday, the 13th*), which is confirmed by the coach (lines 009ff: *yes, precisely, yes*). Next, the client frames this prior arrangement as difficult (lines 019f: *that’s a bit problematic for me now*), and accounts for his difficulties with a private situation (lines 023f: *I have to do something with my son in the morning*). In what follows and (again) initiated by the client’s inquiry about the coach’s timetable during that same week (lines 033f: *What would it look like for you in that week?*) the participants engage in a negotiation process as regards a possible date for their next coaching, with both partners presenting themselves as busy professionals and at eye level as regards the planning dominance of their interaction. It is worth noting here that the client is actively leading this process by e.g. posing a question to the coach (e.g. in lines 043 and 050f) and factually argues for and against possible dates, while the coach seems to justify herself for her lack of time (e.g. *that’s really stupid, that’s completely stupid*).

However, as regards the whole sequence, the following interpretation must be added: by introducing his topic ‘dates’ in the form of a concern, the client conforms to his role repertoire as a ‘client’ who – unlike the professional coach – cannot simply introduce an agenda point without a meta-pragmatic framing or pre-announcement. Despite the theoretical conceptualization of coaching as an encounter between two experts, the coach for the process and the client for the content, the data evinces obvious differences as regards the interactive freedom of action at the participants’ disposal due to their relative roles.

5.3.2 Temporal framing of the individual session

‘Setting Time Frame of Individual Session’ allows for some flexibility within the pre-determined time frame of 2 to 2 1/2 hours to adapt to the current (professional) needs of the client such as returning to the office after the coaching session, etc. and functions as an orientation for the participants as regards the remaining time of the current session.

Excerpt21_CO1CL2_1

Towards the very end of their first session, the coach inquires about the client’s opinion as regards the length of their (current and future) sessions:

```
001 CL2  yes
002 CO1  yes °h it_s like this now for today we_ll now
003 CO1  yes
004      (0.5)
```

005 CL2 so i_ve now ((unintelligible))
 006 CO1 come to to a close ((unintelligible)) now
 007 CO1 two h[ours ri]ght do you feel that we_re getting along with
 well with two
 008 CL2 [yes]
 009 CO1 hours enough (.) you feel that it_s enough
 010 (0.25)
 011 CL2 yes
 012 CO1 enough
 013 CL2 well i think that any longer is just too exhausting for me as
 well
 014 CO1 i i think
 015 CO1 so too two hours at a time is a really good rhythm
 016 CL2 yes
 017 CO1 ri[ght]
 018 CL2 [we]ll
 019 CL2 i [thin]k
 020 CO1 [we]
 021 CO1 [have]
 022 CL2 [the tim]e went past very quickly
 023 CO1 yes hmmm [today it was]
 024 CL2 [well i think] one
 025 CO1 (only)
 026 CL2 hour would be too short
 027 CO1 yes one hour is very short °h only

The coach pre-announces the closing of their current encounter via *for today we'll now come to a close* (lines 002ff) and next invites the client's opinion as regards the duration of their (current and future) sessions via *do you feel that we're getting along well with two hours?* (lines 007ff). The participants mutually weigh up the options of two hours (*enough. You feel that it's enough* (coach) and *yes* (client), lines 009ff) vs. one hour (*one hour would be too short* (client) and *yes, one hour is very short* (coach), lines 024ff); the coach finalizes and summarizes their negotiation process via *I'd start off with two hours*, which is met with the client's agreement and elaboration *yes, that's er okay alright* (not in transcript).

This negotiation process as regards the length of their individual sessions empowers the client as she is given a certain say (in particular in view of her answer that *I think that any longer is just too exhausting for me as well*, line 013).

Excerpt22_CO1CL2_2

Very often in the data, it is the clients who set the time frame for the current meetings as shown in the following excerpt:

001 CL2 (precisely) and returning on the train which leaves
 002 CL2 at ten forty eight i really have to catch that one
 003 CL2 as i_ve go[t a jo]ur
 004 CO1 [yes]
 005 CL2 fixe afterwards so (.)
 006 CO1 and that will be okay timewise
 007 CO1 (when the)

008 (0.5)
009 CL2 almost
010 CO1 forty eight right okay
011 CL2 well i already
012 CL2 wrote to my colleagues that i will definitely be coming too
late
013 CL2 they should already start without me
014 CO1 yes okay
015 CL2 because then i arrive
016 CL2 at a quarter to twelve a[nd it start]s at half past eleven
017 CO1 [yes yes]
018 CO1 okay and
019 CO1 that_s okay for you now
020 CL2 yes
021 CO1 good [((unintelligible))]
022 CL2 [they_ll have to colpe with
023 CL2 that
024 CO1 we_ll stop at half past on the dot
025 CL2 yes
026 CO1 well good
027 (4.0)

The client – in an affirmative mode – sets the time frame for the current meeting, i.e. names the time when she has to take the local train (lines 001f: *and returning on the train which leaves at 10:48*). She accounts for this time frame by informing the coach about a professional appointment she has back in her company (lines 003ff: *as I've got a jour fixe afterwards*).

Concurrently, the client's actively pursuing her time frame attests to her professional role of 'executive manager' outside-the-coaching realm: given that such temporal framing acts demarcate the boundary between the coaching realm and the outside-the-coaching-realm, the client acts here in between her roles as 'client' and 'executive manager' as well.

In addition to negotiating or setting the overall time frame pre-emptively or retrospectively, yet with a focus on the overall length of an individual session, coaches also, during intermediate steps during the sessions, inform clients about the current or the remaining time. Knowing how much time is left in an ongoing session influences the thematic and interactive design of the remaining session (cf. Maier-Gutheil 2009: 97) as the clients can prepare themselves for introducing additional topics, etc.

Excerpt23_CO1CL2_1

The following excerpt illustrates how the coach's reference to (the remaining) time is highly functional as regards the overall performance and success orientation of coaching.

001 (0.25)
002 CO1 erm
003 (0.5)
004 CO1 let_s just take a moment or two again

005 CO1 quick look at the clock we_ve got j just under an hour
 006 CO1 left
 007 (0.75)
 008 CO1 erm
 009 (0.25)
 010 CO1 (for one) on the one hand
 011 CO1 to see what when we say good bye for today right
 012 (0.5)
 013 CO1 er what
 014 CO1 would be useful to discuss so the one thing we_re talking about
 015 CO1 now is the big picture what what it_s all about
 016 CL2 hmhm
 017 CO1 ^h er
 018 (0.25)
 019 CO1 what would be
 020 (0.25)
 021 CO1 a good result for so for today for you

In taking temporal stock during the session via a meta-discursive framing *we've got just under an hour left* (lines 005f), the coach orients the client towards the remaining time and gears her towards a functional 'usage' of the remaining time: *when we say good-bye for today ... what would be useful to discuss* (lines 011ff) and *what would be a good result so for today for you* (lines 019ff).

5.3.3 Discussing the length of the coaching engagement

Finally, in the component 'Discussing Length of Coaching Engagement' the participants negotiate the option to extend the originally set number of coaching sessions, i.e. to extend the overall time frame of their coaching interaction. Given the organizational framing of executive coaching, this implies that the client must turn to his/her HR manager for their consent.

Excerpt24_CO1CL4_4

001 C14 precisely
 002 CO1 and then of course it would also be important to see as you said close to
 003 CO1 my goal if this is the last session what about another one
 004 (0.5)
 005 CO1 or (.) no so what
 006 CO1 shall we do then
 007 C14 precisely the idea was (.) i already spoke to
 008 (0.25)
 009 C14 mister [NAME]
 010 C14 [about it]
 011 CO1 [hmhm]
 012 (0.5)
 013 C14 erm
 014 (0.25)

015 C14 before the last session
016 (0.25)
017 CO1 yes
018 C14 and he
019 C14 suggested
020 (0.25)
021 C14 erm keeping the options open for another appointment
022 CO1 hmhm
023 (0.5)
024 C14 for example in half a year
025 (0.25)
026 CO1 hmhm
027 (0.5)
028 CO1 hmhm

The coach introduces the topic ‘Discussing Length of Coaching Engagement’ and invites the client’s opinion as regards the continuation of their coaching engagement, i.e. whether or not the current meeting is the last meeting. Although it is the coach who topicalizes the prolongation of their coaching arrangement, the client presents himself as equally active in this respect: as the final decision whether or not to prolong it must be backed up by the paying organization, the client has already consulted the responsible HR manager, who suggests an optional additional meeting (lines 007ff: *I already spoke to Mr. (NAME) about it*).

Résumé – Communicative task ‘Temporal Framing of Coaching’

The communicative task ‘Temporal Framing of Coaching’ as part of the basic activity ‘Defining the Situation’ entails the following core components: the participants engage in ‘Arranging Dates for Next Meeting(s)’, ‘Setting Time Frame of Individual Session’ and ‘Discussing Length of Coaching Engagement’.

Table 5. Communicative task ‘Temporal Framing of Coaching’ – Core components

Communicative task	Core components
Temporal Framing of Coaching	Arranging Dates for Next Meeting(s)
	Setting Time Frame of Individual Session
	Discussing Length of Coaching Engagement

All three core components of the communicative task ‘Temporal Framing of Coaching’ give the clients a certain say in the shaping of the outer boundaries of the coaching process and thus de-hierarchize the relationship between coach and client (to a certain degree) and also attest to their busy professional life as executives in leading managerial positions (clients as consumers!).

5.4 Summary – ‘Defining the situation’

To summarize, the basic activity ‘Defining the Situation’ entails the following communicative tasks ‘Establishing the Coaching Realm’, ‘Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching’ and ‘Temporal Framing of Coaching’; in addition, the current analysis has evinced ‘Topicalizing the Research Project’ as another communicative task the participants have to tackle; however as this task is the local consequence of the current linguistic research project and the fact that coaching encounters were filmed for this purpose, this communicative task does not represent an endemic constituent of the basic activity ‘Defining the Situation’. Table 6 summarizes the communicative tasks and core components of the basic activity ‘Defining the Situation’ as they have emerged from the data.

Table 6. Basic activity ‘Defining the Situation’ – Communicative tasks and core components

Communicative tasks	Core components
Establishing the Coaching Realm	Offering Drinks Discussing Seating Arrangements Offering and Using Tissues
Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching	Explaining Methods and/or Procedures (of <i>Emotionally Intelligent Coaching</i>) Sketching out the Thematic Scope Differentiating Coaching from Therapy Integrating Client’s Experience – with Coaching or other Intervention Formats (such as <i>Emotional Intelligence</i> training) Negotiating Individual Definition of Coaching
Temporal Framing of Coaching	Arranging Dates for Next Meeting(s) Setting Time Frame of Individual Session Discussing Length of Coaching Engagement

As regards their structural, thematic and interactive layout, the following recurring structures and principles of interaction have emerged as patterned, yet contextually applied communicative problem-solving strategies to communicatively establish and maintain the participants’ overall interaction frame for *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*.

As regards the overall thematic scope, the data evinces two different interactive trajectories that depend on whether clients are familiar with the concepts and methods of *Emotional Intelligence* or not. In the former case, clients have participated in *Emotional Intelligence* training and are semi-experts as regards both the work with personality parts (i.e. the particular way of re-enacting emotionally challenging situations and exploring their underlying feelings) and their personality parts

or feelings. In these cases, a global orientation is not interactively relevant. What becomes interactively necessary instead is an integration of the clients' knowledge or insights from their training background. In the latter case, coaches engage in lengthy and detailed informing sequences to create a common ground of methodological and procedural knowledge as well as a shared understanding of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* as an organizational intervention that primarily orients to clients' emotions and experiences on the intra-personal level. The focal themes in the coaches' explanations are 'self-reflexivity', 'mindfulness', 'slow-motion', 'sensing', 'inner world', etc. Coaches thus thematically and interactively prepare the ensuing feelings-talk during 'Co-constructing Change' (Chapter 7) while engaging in defining and framing practices. To put it differently, the various interaction fields on which change-relevant diagnostic and interventive practices are acted out in the interactional context or frame *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* are discursively opened up or at least pre-installed.

The primary communicative format in the context of framing coaching methodologically and procedurally is the 'information-delivery format' as defined by Silverman (1997). The coach as the professional and knowledgeable agent initiates and discursively designs it – amongst other things – according to how the client has presented himself or herself during the 'prior-to-coaching telephone conversation' as well as during the onset (and course) of their face-to-face encounter. Concurrently, clients take on the complementary, responsive and passive role of mere information recipients. The overall interactive purpose is to account for the difference of knowledge between coach and client and to allow for its transfer (in both directions in the context of integrating the clients' experience with coaching). To this end, the relevant knowledge as regards coaching as a helping format and the particular methods and procedures of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is processed and transformed according to the local needs of each coach-client dyad (cf. Brünner 2005: 91); the quality of this transformation process secures mutual understanding and alignment on the part of the client and lays an important foundation for the interactive trajectory of the other basic activities 'Building the Relationship', 'Co-constructing Change' and 'Evaluating the Coaching'.

While the overall or global orientation as regards the methods and procedure of (*Emotionally Intelligent*) coaching is introduced by the coaches at the onset of the coaching process, i.e. during the onset of the first session, a more local orientation is acted out by the coaches in the long run over the individual sessions. These local informing sequences are usually meta-pragmatically framed, too, and zoom in on single aspects such as possible next procedural steps or methodological options instead of outlining the coaching approach and its methodology as such.

As regards the structural positioning of the global orientation about *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* and its methods and procedures, the data has evinced the

necessity to engage pre-emptively in these defining actions. Once coach and client have physically and mentally entered and established the coaching realm, the coach must engage in acts of orientation and information due to clients' insecurity resulting from the general opacity of the interaction frame of 'coaching'. Such pre-emptive unburdening strategies are, however, interactionally not relevant in those cases where clients have had experiences with the coaches' work. Here, the clients must be honored in their roles as semi-experts. In those instances where the coach, irrespective of the client's unfamiliarity with coaching, has not laid out their (future) way of interacting with each other, this is made up for at a later stage in the context of a methodological and procedural repair or retrospection and re-definition due to interactional trouble, misunderstanding or misalignment, etc..

The basic activity 'Defining the Situation' is dominated by the coach as the primary speaker, the knowledgeable expert and the one responsible for the process overall. The coach initiates and dominates the defining and framing practices, thereby engaging primarily in information-delivery formats or question-and-answer formats (the latter especially in the context of integrating the client's experiences with coaching or other intervention formats). In these framing and defining actions, the coach as expert has both the authority and the defining power to introduce the relevant professional concepts and interaction rules (cf. Brünner 2005: 90).

One exception to this otherwise dominating distribution of roles, namely 'coach – initiator and primary speaker' and 'client – respondent and secondary speaker', is the interactive trajectory that has emerged in the communicative task of 'Temporal Framing of Coaching'. Here the data also evinces some instances where the client functions as initiator, while the coach takes over the responding part: in at times lengthy sequences, the participants discuss possible dates for next sessions. This (marked) role distribution fulfills an important relational function in executive coaching as it helps to balance the delicate relationship between clients' identity as successful executives in leading managerial positions and as emotionally shaky solicitors of help. Often at the boundary of the coaching conversations, such extensive negotiations of possible dates for next meetings allow them to re-establish their professional identity as executives by presenting themselves as busy and successful executives. This also restores the hierarchy with their coaches or at least allows for less-hierarchical moments in an endemically asymmetrical encounter. However, as these instances have also evinced, the participants never have – due to their institutional roles of 'coach' and 'client' – the same discursive practices at their interactive disposal.

Throughout the basic activity of 'Defining the Situation', the participants predominantly engage in 'talking about coaching' instead of 'talking coaching'. The discourse type in and through which these framing and informing practices transpire is defined here as coaching meta-discourse (see Penz 2011; Graf 2017b).

Building the relationship

The coaching relationship is considered an extremely important factor in the coaching process... and the coaching outcome [...] The coaching and coaching psychology literature repeatedly attest to the need to establish and maintain a meaningful relationship between coachee and coach [...], the research literature database on the coaching relationship remains at a relatively early stage in its development.

(O’Broin and Palmer 2010: 12)

As already stated above, ‘Building the Relationship’ – together with ‘Defining the Situation’ – frames the professional (helping) interaction between coach and client. While the official dimension of the coach-client relationship is documented in the written coaching contract, signed either by coach and client, or – as is the case here – in addition by a representative of the contracting organization, the focus here is on its discursive and interpersonal dimension as it transpires in the here-and-now of the coach-client interaction. It is thereby assumed that “(t)he [...] coaching alliance is not a preordained entity but rather an interactional phenomenon that needs to be performed and accomplished in the actual conversation between [...] coach and client” (Graf and Pawelczyk 2014: 67).

The relationship between coach and client, i.e. their coaching alliance, is both the immediate context or matrix for the coaching interaction and as such functions as an affective frame that creates the necessary stability and security for dealing with insecurity and challenge on the thematic level (cf. Martens-Schmid 2009: 69), a medium of intervention and a means to an end (cf. O’Broin and Palmer 2010: 15), i.e. initiated and maintained for the purpose of solving the client’s professional concerns (in the company’s interest). The relationship is established purposefully for a particular, pre-determined period of time, defined in a contract and financially motivated.

Given the helping professional character of coaching, developing and maintaining a good and confident relationship is the *sine qua non* for the coach-client interaction and decides on its success or failure (Miller and Considine 2009: 410; Graf et al. 2014; Graf and Spranz-Fogasy 2018a; Graf and Jautz in prep.; Graf and Scarvaglieri in prep.). ‘Building the Relationship’ thereby serves as the matrix against which all other activities transpire: while we find discursive practices in the data that solely serve this basic activity, discursive practices that serve the basic

activities ‘Defining the Situation’, ‘Co-constructing Change’ and ‘Evaluating the Coaching’ concurrently function as agents of relationship constitution (as such, all excerpts discussed in the context of these three other basic activities could also be, and sometimes are, analyzed from the relational perspective). In other words, whatever the participants do when they do ‘coaching’, they do so in and for the relationship with their interactive partner. To speak with Miller (1976: 15), there is a “symbiotic relationship between communication and relational development: communication influences relational development, and in turn (or simultaneously), relational development influences the nature of the communication between parties to the relationship.” And according to Watzlawick et al. (1974: xv): “(i)t is difficult to imagine how *any* behavior in the presence of another person can avoid being a communication of one’s own view of the nature of one’s relationship with that person and how it can, therefore, fail to influence that person”.

Such prominence of a (good) professional relationship is, of course, not unique to the ‘coaching’ format (see e.g. Streeck 2004 and Pawelczyk 2011 for psychotherapy and Lalouschek 2005b for doctor-patient interaction). Yet, the specific socio-cultural and organizational context of executive coaching in general and *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* in particular frames the interactive trajectory of ‘Building the Relationship’. Above all, the following outer aspects influence coach and client’s relational work:

1. Prior to their first face-to-face encounter, coach and client have a telephone conversation during which their relationship as well as their respective roles and identities are discursively pre-established. In the initial coaching session (and throughout their coaching engagement), participants implicitly or explicitly orient to these pre-established positionings.
2. The coach-client dyad is embedded in a professional interaction frame that is characterized by “an opacity of the general frame of the activity” (Peräkylä 1995). In other words, the relationship between the participants and their particular identities needs to be established against the background of an unfamiliar, and thus, disconcerting institutional setting for the client. At the same time, the coaches also need to establish their professional identity without a pre-established outer frame that presupposes their status as professional experts.”
3. The coach-client dyad faces the paradox of an inherent asymmetry due to the professional and institutional frame of the interaction of ‘executive coaching’ and the underlying coaching theory of an equal standing for the participants with shared responsibilities (see Schütz 1996): the coach being responsible for the process and the client being responsible for the content co-actively design the interaction. What is more, coaching is idealized as a dialogue-at-eye-level.

4. The coach-client dyad is embedded in and dependent on a larger, triangular relationship between coach – client – client's organization. The coach is paid for by the organization and supports a change process in the client, whose optimized performativity ultimately serves the organization's larger (economic) interests. This functionalization of coaching as well as the dependency of the coach may threaten clients' willingness to open up, turn towards their emotional experiences and also trust their coach.
5. The coaching clients in the data are executives in leading positions, who expect to be respected in their workload, their managerial responsibility and their fast changing and demanding day-to-day work life.
6. The length of 2 to 2 1/2 hours for individual coaching sessions offers a generous time frame for the communicative and interactive unfolding of the coach-client relationship. Moreover, coach and client meet for several sessions, which allows for a more confident and intimate atmosphere to emerge in their relationship over time; this, however, may represent a distance-involvement dilemma in the construction of intimate self-other relations: the discussion of intimate and highly emotional experiences remains embedded in a (timely limited) professional relationship (Raymond & Heritage 2006; Heritage 2011).

'Building the Relationship' in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* entails the following communicative: 'Establishing the Roles and Identities of 'Coach' and 'Client', 'Negotiating Hierarchy in an Asymmetrical Relationship' and 'Topicalizing the Coach-Client Dyad within the Triadic Coach – Client – Organization Relationship'.

Table 7. Basic activity 'Building the Relationship' – Communicative tasks

Establishing the Roles and Identities of 'Coach' and 'Client'

Negotiating Hierarchy in an Asymmetrical Relationship

Topicalizing the Coach-Client Dyad within the Triadic Coach – Client – Organization Relationship

6.1 Establishing the roles and identities of ‘coach’ and ‘client’

The first communicative task of the basic activity of ‘Building the Relationship’ involves establishing the different roles and identities⁴⁴ of the participants in and through the coaching interaction with the help of particular discursive procedures. Although the participants’ roles as ‘coach’, ‘client’ or ‘expert’ are pre-established as regards their core dimensions on entering or establishing the coaching realm due to the professional and institutional character of the interaction, their local set-up must be co-actively negotiated and co-constructed in the transpiring interaction: “(c)lienthood is not accepted as given, but as situational and narrative states and interpretations, and being so, they be subject to change. Thus, the client is multiple, not something that can be reduced to a single abstract category” (Juhila et al. 2003: 12). The given opacity and insecurity as regards the general frame of the activity of ‘coaching’ adds a special momentum to this communicative task. In the current data the task evinces the following core components:

6.1.1 Negotiating knowledge and expertise

The first component centers on the concepts of ‘expertise’ and ‘knowledge’ and their discursive construction and distribution, which lead to the locally and discursively emerging roles and identities of ‘professional expert’ and ‘layperson’ but also ‘semi-expert’ (Sarangi and Roberts 1999; Gülich 2003; Brünner 2005). Inextricably linked with issues of knowledge and expertise are the coach’s and client’s responsibility for and participation rights in the structural, thematic and interactive layout of the coaching encounter. The primary focus here is on the distribution of agency or power between the participants as regards the setting of the coaching agenda, the initiation or termination of topics as well as the overall initiation or termination of the coaching encounter (Holmes et al. 1999): “(p)ower is usually defined as implementing one’s agenda” (Ainsworth-Vaughn 2001: 454f). The issue of power and control is of particular interest in the context of executive coaching, to be more precise, in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*: given that responsibilities and participation rights are on the one hand endemically unequally distributed between the participants given the professional setting of coaching, while on the other hand coaching claims to represent a ‘dialogue-at-eye-level’, with the coach being responsible for the process and the client being responsible for the content

44. See Benwell and Stokoe (2006) and De Fina et al. (2006) for the theoretical embedding of identity construction in discourse and see Hall et al. (1999) for the interplay of identities and roles. The focus in the current argumentation is on ‘social / situational identities’ rather than ‘discourse identities’ (see Zimmerman 1998; Greatbach and Dingwall 1998; Georgakopoulou 2002).

(this dilemma is nicely captured in the following quote from CO2 towards the end of his interaction with CL5, after they have been discussing “his” topics: *the way we’re talking now is simply different from before. I’m going to get something from you!* (not in transcript).

As has been repeatedly mentioned so far, coaching is idealized (yet also to a certain extent interactively co-constructed) as a common exploratory journey by coach and client towards the client’s intra-personal experiences or emotions. However, there are many instances in the data where either the client or the coach indexes a markedly different understanding or expectation as regards their roles, responsibilities and participation rights.

Excerpt25_CO1CL3_1

In the following excerpt, the male client turns to the female coach for input as regards appropriate managerial behavior.

```

001      (1.7)
002 CL3  do you actually have to be
003      (0.5)
004 CL3  well informed about as much as possible
005      (4.1)
006 CO1  well i
007      (0.5)
008 CL3  over and above the your normal work
009      (0.25)
010 CL3  job
011 CL3  i mean
012      (0.5)
013 CL3  what
014      (5.4)
015 CO1  you’re thinking about the jour fixe now right
016 CO1  and how you [thro]w yourself into it and also how you prepare
        for it
017 CL3  [yes]
018      (1.3)
019 CO1  erm
020      (1.0)
021 CO1  that’s an issue where i am maybe not in a position
022      (0.75)
023 CO1  to be able to say so much abou[t it]
024 CL3  [hm]hm
025 CO1  right you remember that on
026 CO1  the phone i said when you’ve got really classical
027      (0.5)
028 CO1  management
029 CO1  issues right [then it]
030 CL3  [hmhm]
031 CO1  may be that i cannot answer the one or the [other] question
032 CL3  [hmhm]
033 CO1  so precisely and so well
034      (0.75)

```


035 CO1 erm
036 (1.0)
037 CO1 i think
038 (1.0)
039 CO1 that
040 CO1 you yourself know what you have to know
041 (0.25)
042 CO1 in order to [do your] job properly
043 CL3 [hmhm]
044 CO1 and to organize this jour fixe as it really needs to be done
so that it is efficient
045 CL3 hmhm
046 CO1 don_t you
047 CL3 okay
048 CO1 what i can do however is to help you
049 CO1 when you_re not yet sure about it then i can help you
050 CO1 to find it out
051 (0.5)
052 CL3 hmhm

The client asks the coach about the necessary amount of information and thereby projects himself as the layperson in need of certain information. Concurrently, he projects the reciprocal identity of ‘expert’ on the coach. In the current excerpt, CO1 after a marked pause and a clarification question (line 015: *You’re thinking about the jour fixe now?*) explicitly rejects this projected identity as expert *that is an issue where I am maybe not in a position to be able to say so much about it* (lines 021ff). This represents a challenging moment in the context of professional encounters, where professionals are paid for being the expert and for helping the clients with their professional knowledge (cf. Graf and Spranz-Fogasy 2018a). Thus, the coach accounts for her rejection via re-topicalizing their prior-to-coaching telephone conversation and her then-passed-on information *when you’ve got really classical management issues, then it may be that I cannot answer the one or the other question so precisely and so well* (lines 026ff). Another strategy to account for her dis-aligning behavior is to attribute the role of expert to the client, via an ascription (lines 039f: *that you yourself know what you have to know*) that is met by the client’s agreement and by explicitly claiming her expertise in another area (line 048: *what I can do, however, is*) in supporting the client on the intra-personal level (lines 049f: *then I can help you to find it out*).

As some clients have participated in the *Emotional Intelligence* training prior to their coaching, they are semi-experts as regards the method and procedure and have gained first insights into their personality according to the underlying IFS model. This semi-expertise on the part of the clients can cause challenging moments for the coaches in their own roles as experts. These challenging moments are tackled differently discursively as illustrated in the following two excerpts.

Excerpt26_CO1CL1_1

Prior to the following excerpt, the female client CL1 has reported about her experiences and insights from *Emotional Intelligence* training. In particular she informs the coach that – although she continues to practice mindfulness (on the ladies' toilet in her company!) – it is not showing the desired result: *well, I do sense myself. But that doesn't help me when I definitely know that I'm getting red patches somewhere on my neck* (not in transcript). Yet, mindfulness shows prominently on the coach's professional agenda.

```

001 CO1  yes
002      (6.0)
003 CO1  so we_ll
004 CO1  also work
005      (0.25)
006 CO1  with mindfulness here o[kay] if you can imagine well i will
007      (0.25)
008 CO1  support you
009 CL1  [hm]
010 CO1  and well
011      (0.25)
012 CO1  so that you_re more [in c]ontact with it
013 CL1  [hm]
014      (0.5)
015 CO1  with the things which
016      (0.25)
017 CO1  dominate
018 CO1  inside with the knowledge that
019      (0.5)
020 CO1  naturally the answers are
021      (0.25)
022 CO1  in your inner world
023 CO1  for these questions emotionally so close well
024      (0.75)
025 CO1  erm
026      (1.0)
027 CO1  i can help you so to speak
028 CO1  to make your way there and also with the help of the
           questions erm well to discover
029 CO1  a bit more and to sense a bit more as we[ll i]n my experience
           the answer is is it is
030 CL1  [hm]
031 CO1  in ther[e right]
032 CL1  [where el]se should it be
033 CO1  [yes yes yes]
034 CL1  [where else ((laughs))]
035      (0.5)
036 CO1  well naturally i know
037 CO1  a few principles right i er or it_s also er er
038      (4.5)
039 CO1  a_i_ll also make them transparent
040 CO1  for you [okay]
041 CL1  [hm]
042 CO1  and i_ll help you to slow down a bit now in this approach

```

043 (0.25)
044 CO1 to perceive things more precisely and to ask the questions
which mh
045 (0.5)
046 CO1 well
047 CO1 could be [expe]dient
048 CL1 [hm]
049 (0.75)
050 CO1 hm
051 CL1 ((laughs))
052 (1.5)
053 CL1 i know this approach in that it is
054 (0.5)
055 CO1 [((laughs briefly))]
056 CL1 [similar to someth]ing that i always do as well just in a
completely different field ((laughs))
057 CO1 [yes]
058 CL1 [the] answers are well [of course]
059 CO1 [precisely]
060 CL1 they_re in here but
061 (0.25)
062 CL1 there are certainly some mechanisms
063 CL1 which
064 (0.25)
065 CL1 [you know] and which
066 CO1 [precisely]
067 CL1 [i do]n_t [know certain] types of behavior which you have
068 CO1 [yes that_s right]
069 CL1 already seen q[uite] often and know where
070 CO1 [yes]
071 CL1 they [come] from which will then (certainly)
072 CO1 [yes]
073 CL1 help me to und[erstand ((blows nose))]
074 CO1 [yes precisely]
075 CL1 and then to cope w[ith them]
076 CO1 hm hm
077 (2.0)
078 CL1 i do something
079 CL1 similar every day [((laughs))] at work
080 CO1 [yes]

As the ambitious and high-performing executive client was not successful in practicing mindfulness, the coach's methodological pre-announcement *so we'll also work with mindfulness here* (lines 003ff) creates a challenging moment in two respects: the coach needs to prove that the method is worthwhile (despite the fact that it has had no positive effects in the client so far) and must accomplish a delicate balance between honoring the client's ambition and competency and presenting herself as the true expert with whom the client can successfully practice mindfulness. To this end the coach honors her client's attempts by defining her own work as support (lines 006ff: *I will support you*) or help (line 027: *I can help you*) to achieve better results as the client herself has already achieved in or when practicing mindfulness:

so that you're more in contact with it (line 012) or with the help of the questions to discover a bit more (lines 028f). Concurrently, she stresses the importance of the method and claims her own expertise as regards this knowledge (lines 018ff: *with the knowledge that naturally the answers are in your inner world for these questions* and lines 029ff: *In my experience the answer is in there*) and as regards this method (lines 036f: *I naturally know a few principles*). She also verbalizes her procedure of *making principles transparent* (line 039) and *slowing them down* (line 042) by repeating, reformulating and detailing the single steps of practicing mindfulness. Before the ambitious client can accept the coach's expertise (lines 062ff: *certainly some mechanisms which you know and which I don't, certain types of behavior which you have already seen quite often and know where they come from*), she presents herself as an expert, too, by explicitly stating her own professional knowledge as regards the method *I know this approach in that it is similar to something that I always do as well, just in a completely different field* (lines 053ff). Once the coach has honored the client's expertise in her own professional realm (lines 057ff: *yes, precisely*), the client can accept the coach's expertise and allow her to help her learn and understand more about the method.

The following excerpt illustrates another strategy to handle the client's semi-expertise as regards his/her knowledge of IFS and *Emotional Intelligence*.

Excerpt27_CO2CL7_1

```

001 CO2 °h do you have
002 (0.25)
003 CO2 any idea what would do you good or which direction
004 CL7 °h
005 CO2 °h our work could go in
006 CL7 well i_ve got the feeling that
007 CL7 erm
008 (1.2)
009 CL7 mh how should i put it °h well that it has a lot very much
010 CL7 to do with me personally and
011 (0.25)
012 CL7 with my inner balance and
013 CL7 [with] my inner family
014 CL2 [yes]
015 CL2 hmhm
016 CL7 so s
017 (0.75)
018 CL7 think it has
019 (0.5)
020 CL7 mh (.)

```

The coach invites the client's presentation of her concern via an open-elicitation strategy, where he explicitly addresses her epistemic knowledge *do you have any idea* and positively and prospectively frames her needs as *what would do you good?* (lines 001ff) He then reformulates his open topic or concern elicitation into *which*

direction our work could go in (lines 003ff), i.e. framing coaching as a mutual endeavor by the two of them (first personal plural *our*). Given her knowledge as semi-expert, the client in her reply – instead of engaging in describing ‘symptoms’ or reasons in a subjective, life-world mode as expected from laypersons – engages in diagnostic categorization acts herself *that it has very much to do with me personally and with my inner balance and my inner family* (lines 009ff). Yet, she meta-pragmatically frames her diagnosis as experientially, not epistemically based knowledge by framing it as a feeling, not a fact (line 006: *I’ve got the feeling*). The client thereby applies both the underlying professional theory of EI (and its idea that ‘problems’ on the outside result from intra-personal conflicts) and its professional terminology *my inner family*.

After the client has elaborated some more on her concern or her (professional) situation (via semi-professionally contrasting her outer and inner world, by e.g. referring to personality parts *these dominant or these doer and organizer guys have just taken the reins* and by addressing inner states *I lose myself*) and the coach has prompted the client to refocus on the inter-personal level by questions such as *on a totally objective level, what’s the timing like?* (not in transcript), the coach finally turns down the client’s categorization in the following negative gist:

Excerpt27/2_CO2CL7_1

001 CO2 °h no really
 002 (0.25)
 003 CO2 well
 004 (0.25)
 005 CO2 (we) er i think that the
 006 CO2 situation is simply quite complex [really]
 007 CL7 [hmhm]
 008 (0.25)
 009 CL7 hmhm
 010 CO2 and that it_s not good
 011 CO2 to
 012 (0.5)
 013 CO2 follow a trail t[oo qu]ickly but rather °h first to take a
 014 CL7 [yes]
 015 CO2 look at [what_s up]
 016 CL7 [hmhm]
 017 CO2 °h and something that_s still missing for me is
 018 (2.1)
 019 CO2 erm
 020 (3.3)
 021 CO2 how you really want to make use of it for yourself
 022 (0.5)
 023 CO2 so both the situation
 024 CO2 you_re in like the coaching session now [or in gene]ral °h
 025 CL7 [hmhm]
 026 (1.7)
 027 CO2 er

Pre-announced via the summarizing *no, really* (line 001), the coach turns down the client's assessment of her situation (i.e. her semi-professional assessment of her concern): he first accounts for rejecting the client's assessment by countering with his professional assessment of the client's situation (lines 005f: *that the situation is simply quite complex*), initiated by the ego-referential epistemic marker *I think* (line 005), which is followed by a negative qualification (line 010: *that it's not good*) of the procedure that is implied by the client's concern definition (lines 011ff: *to follow a trail too quickly*). He then offers an alternative, goal-free procedure to first regard the whole situation, contrasted and initiated by *but*, i.e. *first to take a look at what's up* (lines 013ff). The coach not only turns down the client's assessment of her concern, but also professionally categorizes her concern presentation as deficient or incomplete: *something that's still missing for me is how you really want to make use of it for yourself* (lines 017ff). In doing so, the coach both re-claims his diagnosing authority, and presents himself as a responsible professional who uses his professional expertise and experience in the client's best interests.

6.1.2 Clients' self-presentation

Another relevant aspect in tackling the communicative task 'Establishing the Roles and Identities of 'Coach' and 'Client' is the question as to how much and what kind of (personal) information the participants pass on during the interaction as regards their personality, their background, etc.. In and through their self-presentation the participants thereby construct a particular image of the self:

Telling a story provides a self-portrait: a linguistic lens through which to discover people's own [...] view of themselves as situated in a social structure. The verbalization and textual structure of a story [...] combines with its content, and with its local and global contexts of production, to provide a view of self that can be either challenged or validated by an audience. (Schiffrin 1996: 199).

One aspect of the asymmetrical character of coaching interactions (and of any other type of professional interaction, cf. Graf and Spranz-Fogasy 2018a) is that while the client's personal information represents relevant coaching material and is of utmost importance for the ensuing coaching work, its discursive representation is (usually) not countered by personal information from the coach, i.e. there is no mirroring (Coates 1996). Of great (analytic) interest in this context is how clients discursively introduce and establish their identities (e.g. via stating their feelings and beliefs or via reporting of actions, etc.) and what type of identity (e.g. a more epistemic or a more agentic self) they thereby project and index (cf. Schiffrin 1996: 194).

In the following excerpts, different ‘types of clients’ emerge from the data. Of particular interest in the current data is whether the executive clients, on embarking with their self-presentation, choose to stage their professional or their personal self. Such discursively indexed images of self are interactionally relevant for the ensuing relational work in the context of the basic activity ‘Building the Relationship’.

Excerpt28_CO1CL3_1

During the onset of their first coaching session, CL3, a very performance- and success-oriented client, embarks on the following self-presentation:

```
001 CL3 well
002 CO1 yes yes
003 CL3 i am i certainly [didn_t] take on
004 CO1 [yes]
005 CL3 [the job in order] to
006 CO1 [yes yes]
007 CL3 say yes good that_s the next step a[nd]
008 CO1 [ye]s
009 CL3 it_s working now and it_s
010 CL3 fine [right] well i place a
011 CO1 [hm]
012 (1.4)
013 CL3 er relatively high demands
014 (0.5)
015 CL3 er on myself
016 CO1 hmhm
017 CL3 in terms of how i do my job
018 CO1 hm [hm]
019 CL3 [and] then above all
020 CL3 also what the result is, what comes out in the [end]
021 CO1 [hm] hm
022 CL3 and in the
023 CL3 period since [i er actually]
024 CO1 [i_m just writi]ng some things do[wn]
025 CL3 [ye]s yes of course er started
026 CL3 the job
027 (0.5)
028 CL3 er i have
029 (0.5)
030 CL3 always actually managed to
031 CO1 hmhm
032 CL3 success
033 CL3 be successful over the year
034 (0.25)
035 CL3 yes regardless in which capacity that was
```

The client CL3 – who is receiving coaching as part of an incentive or accompanying measure on taking on a next higher position in the banking business – opts in his self-presentation for his ‘business self’, which he presents in two steps: in his ensuing self-presentation, the client first thematically focuses on his new job and

his expectations. In doing so, he stylistically uses the language of success and performance (via his choice of vocabulary *high demands* (line 013), *result* (line 020), *I have always actually managed* (lines 028ff), *successful* (line 033) and his use of Anglicisms such as *the next step* (line 007).

Excerpt28/2_CO1CL3_1

In his facts-orientated self-presentation, the client next moves on to presenting himself as a person, pre-announced via: *perhaps a few things about myself* (lines 002ff):

```

001 CO1  hmhm
002 CL3  er whereby i_d like to add perhaps
003      (0.5)
004 CL3  a few things about myself
005 CL3  so i_m forty six years old
006 CO1  hmhm
007      (0.5)
008 CL3  erm
009      (0.5)
010 CL3  and i don_t come from
011 CL3  bavaria
012      (0.25)
013 CL3  you [can gene]rally hear that
014 CO1  [hmhm]
015 CL3  so i
016      (0.25)
017 CL3  actually come from the
018 CL3  far north i grew up in i was born in in [NAME OF PLACE]
019      (0.25)
020 CO1  hm[hm]
021 CL3  [er] went
022 CL3  to school and did my military service there and did an
        apprenticeship in a bank and
023 CL3  then i studied
024      (0.25)
025 CL3  business administration in [NAME OF PLACE] and then i
026      (0.5)
027 CL3  as er
028 CL3  a result then you_re a bit more flexible and (staid) when you
        then
029 CL3  [finish yo]ur
030 CO1  [hmhm]
031 CL3  studies in [just fou]r and a half years
032 CO1  [hmhm]
033      (0.5)
034 CL3  and then [NAME OF COMPANY]
035 CL3  as it was called at the time was quite simply the best
        empl[oyer] for me
036 CO1  [yes]
037      (0.25)
038 CL3  and then i started working for the [bank]
039 CO1  [hmh]m

```


040 CL3 and have actually been since i
 041 (0.75)
 042 CL3 well
 043 (0.25)
 044 CL3 finished the trainee program or ever since transferring er
 into into
 045 CL3 er a normal professional [life]
 046 CO1 [hnh]m
 047 CL3 i've always been a manager
 048 CO1 hmhm hmhm
 049 CL3 it got going the new bundesländer a small branch
 050 CL3 and it continued to develop [and]
 051 CO1 [yes]
 052 CL3 actually i was
 053 (0.25)
 054 CL3 always [successful]
 055 CO1 [always ye]s
 056 CL3 in my functions
 057 (0.5)
 058 CO1 yes
 059 CL3 in any case [or even very succ]essful
 060 CO1 [hmhm hmhm]

Although pre-announced as information on his person, the client apart from giving his age (line 005: *so I'm forty-six years old*) and origin (lines 010ff: *I don't come from Bavaria ... come from the far north, I grew up in (NAME OF PLACE)*) focuses exclusively on his educational background and professional development and career, which he presents by listing the individual stages (lines 022ff: *school, military service, apprenticeship in a bank, studied business administration, trainee program, manager*) in a very matter-of-fact style. He finishes off this self-presentation sequence by thematically coming back to his primary focus of success and high performance in his job(s), which he rounds off via an extreme-case formulation: *and actually I was always successful in my functions in any case or even very successful* (lines 050ff).

Excerpt29_CO1CL4_1

A completely different image of the self is presented by the male client CL4 in the following sequence, taken from the first session in the context of diagnosing. The coach invites the client to recount an incident where he struggles with his (inappropriate) emotionality:

001 CL4 yes
 002 (0.25)
 003 CL4 erm so when
 004 (1.0)
 005 CL4 my family situation so i
 006 (0.25)
 007 CL4 a[m]
 008 CO1 [hm]hm
 009 CL4 married and have two
 010 (1.0)

011 **CL4** my wife has two children well they_re not step children
 because their biological father is still [alive]
 012 **CO1** [hmh]m
 013 **CL4** °h er two girls
 014 (0.5)
 015 **CL4** they
 016 **CL4** are now °h twenty and twenty two years old
 017 **CO1** hmhm
 018 **CL4** °h

CL4 chooses an incident from his family situation instead of his professional life as manager: he describes the relationship with his step-daughter by recounting distressing episodes from the past that made him ill (via extreme case formulations, dialect features, direct speech, interjections, etc.):

Excerpt29/2_CO1CL4_1

001 **CL4** yes
 002 (1.5)
 003 **CL4** and such situations we have them
 004 (0.5)
 005 **CL4** we
 006 **CL4** have them qui[te often]
 007 **CO1** [hmhm]
 008 **CL4** yes
 009 (2.0)
 010 **CL4** with a difficult past
 011 **CO1** [((laughs)) ((unintelligible))]
 012 **CL4** because
 013 **CL4** puberty was hard
 014 **CO1** ye[s yes]
 015 **CL4** [well th]e younger daughter she sometimes ran away
 016 **CL4** from home
 017 (0.75)
 018 **CL4** um we had to pick her up again from places from
 019 **CL4** the police and so
 020 (0.5)
 021 **CL4** so at
 022 **CO1** hm
 023 **CL4** fourteen
 024 (0.25)
 025 **CL4** that was the peak
 026 **CO1** yes
 027 (0.25)
 028 **CL4** um she
 029 **CL4** was then for some time then too (.) moved in with her father
 because i said erm
 030 **CL4** i can_t take it any more and i wa[s also]
 031 **CO1** [hm]
 032 (0.5)
 033 **CL4** erm physically ill well i have (.)
 034 **CL4** °h er whether i really have crohn_s disease or not is
 difficult to say

035 CO1 hmhm
036 CL4 it was diagnosed i then went away for a course of [treatment]
037 CO1 [hmhm]
038 CL4 and this was
039 CL4 then also the moment for me with psychological support to
just set
040 (1.5)
041 CL4 clear
042 CL4 limits for myself and to say listen guys
043 (0.25)
044 CL4 that_s not how it works
045 CO1 clear
046 CO1 [hm]
047 CL4 [°h] and i_m not playing along anymore
048 CO1 hmhm

The client presents himself as a highly sensitive and emotional person with delicate health who is sometimes rendered powerless or helpless by the behavior of others, not as a success- and career-oriented manager. CL4 corroborates this self-portrayal both thematically (e.g. his repeated and lengthy detailing of his instable health or listing the various sources of support he has sought such as homeopathy or autogenic training), linguistically (e.g. his reconstruction practices of using strong dialect features, emotional exclamations or other stylistic features of high involvement, accompanying laughter, etc.) and interactively (e.g. his considerate behavior as regards the coach and her pursuing her agenda is explicitly addressed by the coach) across the whole coaching processes.

While the male client in CO1CL4 – at least throughout most parts of the first two meetings – constructs himself as an over-emotional, extremely sensitive and fragile personality, the male client in CO1CL3 (Excerpt (28) and (28/2)) presents himself as ambitious, goal and performance oriented, successful and tough: “(i)t is a well-established principle in social psychology that, in presenting a description of some state of affairs, a person is simultaneously engaged in a presentation of self” (Heritage and Robinson 2006: 48).

6.1.3 Coaches’ self-disclosure and personal topics

Besides clients’ explicitly (or implicitly) passing on personal information as part of ‘acting as a coaching client’, we also find instances in the data where coaches talk about themselves outside the social or a-topical small talk as boundary actions (cf. Holmes 2000: 37), i.e. instances where coaches pass on private or personal information. Contrary to the unmarked status, interactional expectedness and relevance of clients’ verbalizations as regards personal information about their private lives, etc., those instances where coaches pass on personal information are (more or

less) marked cases and always create a particular effect on the relationship. Yet, as Pawelczyk (2011) and others argue, self-disclosure of therapists and other helping professionals, i.e. “the process of making the self known to other persons” (Jourard and Lasakow 1958: 91) nevertheless serves the following main reasons across professional helping formats: strengthening the therapeutic alliance, normalizing the patient’s experience, offering alternative ways of thinking and encouraging clients’ or patients’ own disclosures (cf. Farber 2006: 139).

In what follows, instances of the coaches’ self-disclosure and the introduction of personal topics from the data are discussed as regards their various functions and marked status:

Excerpt30_CO1CL4_1

Towards the end of their diagnosing actions during the first session, the coach offers the following self-disclosure, which is initiated by a pre-announcement *I’d like to get one other thought of off my chest, I noticed, in relation to your step-daughters* (lines 002ff) and counters the client’s personal experiences as a step-father with her own first-hand experience as a step-daughter.

```

001      (2.0)
002 CO1  °h i_d just like to get one other thought of off my chest i
         noticed
003 CO1  °h in relation to your step daughters right
004 CL4  hmhm
005 CO1  °h (because) i thought
006 CO1  i can firstly understand
007      (0.25)
008 CO1  your situation so well
009      (0.5)
010 CO1  because i can
011 CO1  understand that really well er
012      (0.5)
013 CO1  this taking things for grant[ed]
014 CL4  [hm]hm
015 CO1  aha so with
016 CO1  the (that_s the way it is) her realm °h and
017      (0.25)
018 CO1  if i identify with the with
019      (0.25)
020 CO1  the
021 CO1  daughter it_s because i also had a step father
022 CL4  hmhm
023 CO1  yes °h erm
024      (2.0)
025 CO1  then as a daughter it really is her own home of course and
026 CO1  he_s not got that much say
027 CL4  yes
028 CO1  °h and that can be a really thorny issue
029 CL4  precisely

```

030 (2.0)
031 CO1 because quite simply it_s also her home isn_t it and that is
really
032 CO1 [a]
033 CL4 [h]mhm
034 CO1 conflict
035 CL4 ye[s]
036 CO1 [th]at is really a conflict [so i]
037 CL4 [yes]
038 CO1 simply want to get it off my chest
039 CO1 again
040 (0.25)
041 CO1 at this point (so to speak) to simply express my
understanding
042 CO1 [that th]at_s
043 CL4 [hmhm]
044 CO1 also a true dilemma
045 (0.5)
046 CL4 yes
047 (1.0)
048 CL4 yes i fear it is as well
049 (1.0)

She becomes visible as the person behind the professional coach as she opens up the additional interaction field ‘coach – coach’s personal relations – client’. Yet, the coach’s self-disclosure is explicitly tied in with and results from the client’s concern or topic, namely ‘difficult relationship with his step-daughter’. The coach thereby not only explicitly expresses her understanding of the client’s difficult situation as a step-father, i.e. validates his feelings (lines 006ff: *I can firstly understand your situation so well*), but also offers a step-daughter’s perspective in the form of a ‘second story’ (line 021: *I also had a step-father*). She thus enhances the client’s understanding of the dilemma and conflict-ridden situation for both parties and concurrently affiliates with the client’s emotions via what Wynn and Wynn (2006) term ‘sharing empathy’. This sharing or display of empathy through the use of a second story (Ruusuvuori 2005) in her response to her client’s troubles telling accomplishes relevant relational work:

To promote client insight into their feelings and to make it easier to talk about them, [professional agents] may share personal information about experiences similar to those of clients. Such disclosure always needs to have the clients’ best interest in mind.
(Nelson-Jones 2005: 131)

Yet, the following excerpt illustrates a case in the data where the coach introduces a personal topic that has not developed out of the client’s own topics or concerns.

Excerpt31_CO2CL5_8

In the extract from the eighth and last session of CO2CL5, the coach talks about his business, i.e. his and his wife's coaching and training company, as regards their expansion plans. This acting represents a marked deviation from the coaching agenda, where the client is responsible for topics and the coach for the process and the method(s) to work on the client's topics. Introduced as "risks and side effects", Künzli (2013: 53) argues as follows in the context of a coach's self-disclosure: "If the coach tells you his life story, it may well be interesting and authentic, but this self-disclosure is unlikely to contribute much to the success of the process" (translated by author).

```

001 CO2   that_s actually important for our own deliberations also in
          relation to
002 CL5   hm
003 CO2   advertising strategie[s or] business strategies
004 CL5   [hm]
005 CL5   hm
006 CO2   and we_re not yet
007 CO2   that big so
008 CL5   hm
009       (0.5)
010 CL5   you_re talking about your
011       (0.25)
012 CL5   comp
013       (0.25)
014 CL5   [any] now
015 CO2   [yes]
016 CO2   precisely
017 CL5   er and what type of company is it if i
018       (0.25)
019 CL5   may ask

```

The coach discloses personal information as regards his own business. As he is referring to his business vaguely as *we*, the client first poses a clarification question as regards the reference of the *we* and next inquires into the line of business. By adding *if I may ask* (lines 017ff) to his question, he indexes their role distribution and interactive behavior as marked.

Unlike the coach's self-disclosure in Excerpt (30) that has thematically developed out of the client's concern and fulfills coaching-relevant functions in the context of feelings-talk, the topic of 'legal advice as regards coach's own business' originates on the interaction field 'coach – client – coach's professional or personal relations' and is thus not a second story or follow-up narrative. However, such mixing of roles, without a clear (e.g. meta-pragmatic) framing and/or relevant coaching function for the locally emerging coach-client interaction, may cause relational misunderstandings or raise false expectations as regards the (continuation of) the relationship.

Résumé – Communicative task ‘Establishing the Roles and Identities of ‘Coach’ and ‘Client’

The analysis has evinced ‘Negotiating Knowledge and Expertise’, ‘Clients’ Self-Presentation’ and ‘Coaches’ Self-Disclosure and Personal Topics’ as part of the communicative task ‘Establishing the Roles and Identities of ‘Coach’ and ‘Client’

Table 8. Communicative task ‘Establishing the Roles and Identities of ‘Coach’ and ‘Client’ – Core components

Communicative task	Core components
Establishing the Roles and Identities of ‘Coach’ and ‘Client’	Negotiating Knowledge and Expertise
	Client’s Self-Presentation
	Coach’s Self-Disclosure and Personal Topics

6.2 Negotiating hierarchy in an asymmetrical relationship

The next communicative task that coach and client engage in as part of the basic activity of ‘Building the Relationship’ is ‘Negotiating Hierarchy in an Asymmetrical Relationship’. Encounters between professionals and clients are inherently asymmetrical due to the particular distribution of knowledge, power and expertise (cf. Lalouschek 2008: 8), an endemic feature that also holds true for person-centered approaches to counseling or coaching: “it would be naïve to assume that such ‘client-centered’ counseling, while less obviously authoritarian than the more medically oriented models, is necessary free from the effects of power” (Silverman 1997: 9; see also Fairclough’s (1989) differentiation between ‘coercive’ and ‘consent’ power and Holmes et al. (1999) on oppressive vs. repressive discourse). However, according to the current findings, the inherently asymmetrical relationship between coach and client can be discursively co-constructed concurrently as a hierarchical one or as a non-hierarchical one, as the second interactive realization of the communicative task ‘Negotiating Hierarchy in an Asymmetrical Relationship’.

The first core component of this communicative task is the default case in professional and institutional interaction, i.e. the participants discursively establish an asymmetrical-hierarchical relationship.

6.2.1 Establishing an asymmetrical-hierarchical relationship

Excerpt32_CO2CL6_1

While in all other coach-client dyads across the corpus the participants decided to work together, i.e. enter the coaching engagement during their prior-to-coaching telephone conversation, CO2 and CL6 agreed on deciding that during their first face-to-face coaching encounter. The pending question, namely whether or not they 'do' coaching together, is on the coach's agenda and is introduced by him via the closed question *do we want to embark on this project together or maybe not?* (lines 001ff).

```

001 CO2  do we want to embark on this project tog[ether]
002 CL6  [hmh]m
003 CO2  °h or maybe not
004 CL6  hmhm
005 CO2  and erm
006      (0.75)
007 CO2  my impression (.) well just to put the cards
008 CO2  on the table i_d like to embark on it with you
009 CL6  hmhm
010 CO2  i think we
011 CO2  can work together well °h it_s important for me though that you
012      (1.9)
013 CO2  also
014      (0.25)
015 CO2  hear about the risks [before]
016 CL6  [hmhm]
017      (0.5)
018 CL6  yes
019      (0.5)
020 CL6  i
021 CL6  think
022      (0.75)
023 CO2  °h well to also put it
024      (0.25)
025 CO2  er very bl
026      (0.5)
027 CO2  let_s say bluntly
028 CO2  °h but for that purpose i haven_t yet provided
029 CL5  h[mhm]
030 CO2  [enough] of a
031      (0.25)
032 CO2  diagno[sis]
033 CL6  [hm]hm
034      (0.25)
035 CO2  erm
036      (0.5)
037 CO2  when you go to your
038      (0.25)
039 CO2  general practitioner
040      (0.25)
041 CO2  then he doesn't always necessarily know
042      (0.25)

```


043 CO2 what the causes could be
 044 CO2 that lie behind it °h that_s why he sends you to a specialist
 045 CO2 that_s not something i would do right now [((unintelligible,
 1.7s))]
 046 CL6 [precisely i_d say stick to (.) let_s]
 047 CL6 precisely that_s the two of us for now and yes [prec]isely
 048 CO2 [yes]

Although the coach verbally invites the client's opinion on whether or not they want to start the 'project together', i.e. do coaching together, in the form of a polar question, he does not interactionally offer the client 'client time' to reflect on the question or come up with an answer. Neither does the coach invite the client's personal assessment of the situation via, for example 'how do you see the situation?'. Instead, he states his personalized opinion *and my impression ... I'd like to embark on it with you* (lines 005ff) and adds his professional assessment *I think we can work together well* (lines 010f). Concurrently, by offering his opinion or answer as regards the 'yes' or 'no' of working together first, it is interactionally harder for the client to turn the invitation down as this would represent a marked and dis-preferred answer (Schegloff 2007: 60). Next, the coach refers back to his information-delivery sequence as regards the 'risks and side-effects' of coaching and re-topicalizes the issue of therapy *it's important for me, though, that you also hear about the risks before* (lines 011ff). In this context of a possible therapy if the client turned out to be less stable than assumed, the coach stages himself in the hierarchical role 'one up' by borrowing from the medical discourse: he implies the hierarchical model of the almighty physician who diagnoses patients in a top-down manner (lines 028ff: *but for that purpose I haven't yet provided enough of a diagnosis*) and sends them on to other specialists (lines 037ff: *when you go to your general practitioner then he doesn't always necessarily know what the causes could be that lie behind it. That's why he sends you to a specialist*). The coach finalizes his excursion to medical discourse by assuring the client that *that's not something I would do right now* (line 045) and thus comes back to his initial statement *I'd like to embark on it with you* (see above). For the first time during this sequence, apart from minimal response tokens along the coach's verbalizations, the client explicitly agrees with the coach (lines 046f: *precisely*) and elaborates his uptake via confirming *that's the two of us for now* (line 047). An answer to the coach's question posed at the beginning, namely whether or not they want to start the project together, is not offered by the client as throughout this sequence, in which coach and client should ideally decide as equal standing partners whether they want to work with each other, we witness a coach who not only sets the agenda (as a responsible professional who keeps track of topics that must be tackled during the first encounter) in an asymmetrical way, which is to be expected in professional interaction, but also establishes a hierarchical one-up relationship by 'talking down on the client'.

In the next excerpt, taken from another process between the same coach and another male client, the coach explicitly refers to his hierarchically higher role in his interaction with the client:

Excerpt33_CO2CL5_8

The coach has introduced personal topics as regards his coaching and training business and the client – a professional lawyer – has given him advice on some legal issues during large parts of their eighth and final session. The coach also introduces another personal topic, i.e. he has the idea of using the video recordings of their coaching interaction for a coaching conference where he will give a talk on their method (mindfulness in coaching) and would like to use the client as a positive example of how fast and dramatically people can change their problematic emotionality when working with EI. He introduces and discusses this idea with the client and frames his thematic excursion by referring to their relationship as coach and client:

```

001      (7.0)
002 CO2  °h yes °h er
003 CO2  another bit of feedback ((laughs)) er th[at is] er
004 CL4   [hm]
005 CO2  really only a
006 CO2  thought which
007 CL4   [((unintelligible))]
008 CO2  [occurred] to me and which i don_t really think can be
         realized
009 CO2  °h but on the level on which we_re speaking to each other
010 CL5   yes
011 CO2  now i just want to put it plainly
012      (0.75)
013 CO2  because i also think you are
014      (0.75)
015 CO2  yes
016 CO2  and that is actually really also an expression of the fact °h
         that i am °h
017 CO2  deliberately abandoning what is the h
018      (0.25)
019 CL5   hm[hm]
020 CO2  [th]e higher position in the hierarchy here
021 CL5   hmhm
022      (0.5)
023 CO2  as your coach [and] erm
024 CL5   [yes]
025      (0.25)
026 CO2  we say good bye to each other on a level
027 CO2  where this equ °h ality and equal status
028 CO2  is simply documented again °h and you_ll al[so s]ee it on the
029 CL5   [hm]
030 CO2  recording how strongly that is [doc]umented
031 CL5   [yes]
032 CO2  that you
033 CL5   yes

```

034 CO2 help me that i can speak about myself personally that
 [(really) we] are sitting
 035 CL5 [hnhmhm]
 036 CO2 face to face as individuals
 037 CL5 hnhm
 038 CO2 although [we_re]
 039 CL5 [hnhm]
 040 CO2 in a business
 041 CO2 context
 042 CL5 hm
 043 CO2 °h
 044 (0.5)

The coach pre-emptively hedges, mitigates and downgrades the idea (a highly problematic idea, given the client's organizational background and the topicalization of organization internal information, etc.) he is about to present to the client (lines 005f: *really only a thought*; line 008: *which I don't really think can be realized*). He accounts for introducing the idea at all by referring to their particular interaction in the here-and-now of their coaching encounter: *but on the level on which we're speaking to each other* (line 009). The coach further elaborates his account by explicitly opposing their (usual) hierarchical relationship as coach and client (lines 016ff: *that I am deliberately abandoning what is the higher position in the hierarchy here, as your coach*) with facing each other as equals (lines 026f: *on a level ... where ... equality and equal status*). On this level of equality, the client helps the coach to talk about himself and his personal topics despite their business context (lines 038ff: *although we're in a business context*).

Although the coach here explicitly topicalizes the de-hierarchization of his relationship with the client, in so doing he implicitly re-establishes it as an asymmetrical-hierarchical relationship by 'talking down' on the client. What is more, by introducing his own topics or concerns (both the expansion plans as regards his business and 'using' the client's documented change for proving the success of their coaching method), he takes up the client's space.

After instances of 'Establishing an Asymmetrical-Hierarchical Relationship' between coach and client have been illuminated with the help of examples from the corpus, next, instances of 'Establishing an Asymmetrical-Non-Hierarchical Relationship' are discussed.

6.2.2 Establishing an asymmetrical-non-hierarchical relationship

De-hierarchizing the coaching relationship refers to acts such as addressing each other by first names or addressing feelings of closeness beyond professional empathy, although the inherent asymmetry between coach and client in their respective roles as professional expert and layperson (in the coaching context) is upheld.

Excerpt34_CO2CL7_1

Coach and client know each other from the *Emotional Intelligence* training; they call each other by their first names and discuss personal topics at the boundaries of their professional encounter (such as exchanging greetings from people they both know). The client reports how her line manager had suggested coaching due to her feelings of exhaustion, etc. and how she happily accepted the offer:

```

001 CL7  °h because it_s actually precisely the thing erm
002      (0.25)
003 CL7  where i think that i_ll help me
004 CL7  get on now
005      (1.5)
006 CO2  °h yes good well i was
007      (0.5)
008 CO2  so let_s
009 CO2  say °h it_s always two different things if you know somebody
        and they
010      (0.25)
011 CO2  [get in touch]
012 CL7  [((laughs))]
013 CO2  °h then i_m happy about their trust in me and
014 CO2  on the other hand i find it a pity of course that somebody is
        suffering or that
015 CO2  they_re [not doing too] well
016 CL7  [((laughs briefly))]
017 CO2  °h because usually
018      (0.5)
019 CO2  people get in touch
020 CO2  when they_re not doing so well [((laughs))]
021 CL7  [hm]
022 CO2  yes
023      (0.5)
024 CO2  ((smacking lips))

```

The coach positively receives the client's assessment that coaching (i.e. the HR measure she was offered by her line manager) is exactly what she needs in her situation *yes, good* (line 006) and then moves on to topicalizing his ambivalent feelings (line 009: *it's always two different things*) towards the client (again) seeking coaching with him: he accounts for his ambivalent feelings with the fact that he knows the client (line 009: *if you know somebody*), which causes both the feeling of gratefulness that she trusts him as a coach (line 013: *then I'm happy about their trust in me*) and feeling sorry for her that she is suffering or not feeling well (lines 014f: *on the other hand I find it a pity, of course, that somebody is suffering or that they're not doing too well*). In explicating his feelings for the client, yet not as an *in situ* empathic practice part of doing feelings-talk in the context of co-constructing the client's change, but as a more general stance towards somebody he knows and thus feels sorry for, the coach de-hierarchizes their asymmetrical relationship.

Excerpt35_CO1CL2_1

The following excerpt illustrates how a non-hierarchical relationship is initiated in the context of discussing terms of address (towards the end of coach and client's first coaching encounter):

```

001      (0.4)
002 CO1  what about the form of address actually for you
003 CO1  is it okay to use sie
004      (0.75)
005 CL1  well i_d prefer du
006 CL1  if it (.)
007 CO1  then let_s use du next time [(okay)]
008 CL1  [yes] if that_s alright
009      (0.75)
010 CL1  because it does somehow go into quite some depth really a[nd
      th]at doesn_t
011 CO1  [yes]
012 CL1  really go together i find
013      (2.0)
014 CO1  i_ve just noticed it
015 CO1  myself i er
016      (0.25)
017 CO1  didn_t really notice it at all in the process
018 CO1  because i also felt very
019      (0.5)
020 CO1  er close to you
021 CL1  yes
022 CO1  but er i
023      [omission]
024 CO1  [then i_m [FIRST NAME]]
025 CL1  [(unintelligible)]
026 CL1  yes
027 CO1  and you_re [FIRST NAME]
028 CL1  exactly [FIRST NAME]

```

The de-hierarchization in this inherently asymmetrical context is initiated by the coach in her professional role: she initiates the topic of address terms by inviting the client's opinion via an open question: *what about the form of address actually for you?* (line 002). The client, in an immediate reply, communicates her preference for *well, I'd prefer "Du"* (line 005). The coach, in another latched reply, concludes this short negotiation sequence via *then let's use "Du" next time* (line 007). After coach and client have thus agreed on their new way of addressing each other, first the client and the coach account for their wish to use the proximity markers: while the client refers to the depth of the process as the reason for this more intimate framing of their relationship (lines 010ff: *because it does somehow go into quite some depth really and that doesn't really go together*), the coach refers to her in situ feeling towards the client (lines 018ff: *because I also felt very close to you*). The mutual agreement on switching from formal *Sie* to informal *Du* is finalized by a self-presentation of the

coach *then I'm (FIRST NAME)* (line 024) and her other-presentation of the client *and you're (FIRST NAME)* (line 027) and an uptake by the client *yes* and elaboration and confirmation via *exactly (FIRST NAME)* (lines 026ff).

By switching from *Sie* to *Du* as markers of distance and proximity (and calling each other by their first names), the female coach and her female client redefine their relationship as one more of 'friendship' than of business partners (Tracy 2002: 51).

Résumé – Communicative task 'Negotiating Hierarchy in an Asymmetrical Relationship'

To sum up, the communicative task of 'Negotiating Hierarchy in an Asymmetrical Relationship' entails two core components in the coaching data under scrutiny here: coach and client can either establish an asymmetrical-hierarchical relationship or can discursively frame their relationship as non-hierarchical although its asymmetrical character is not negotiable at any point due the professional framing of their encounter.

Table 9. Communicative task 'Negotiating Hierarchy in an Asymmetrical Relationship' – Core components

Communicative task	Core components
Negotiating Hierarchy in an Asymmetrical Relationship	Establishing an Asymmetrical-Hierarchical Relationship
	Establishing an Asymmetrical-Non-Hierarchical Relationship

6.3 Topicalizing the coach–client dyad within the triadic coach–client–organization relationship

The remaining communicative task of the basic activity 'Building the Relationship' that participants need to tackle is 'Topicalizing the Coach–Client Dyad within the Triadic Coach – Client – Organization Relationship'. This communicative task evinces two core components in the data: 'Addressing Trust and Performativity' and 'Addressing Financial, Organizational and (Pre-)Diagnostic Aspects'. The first component entails topicalizing problematic issues such as functionalizing coach–client intimacy for the larger organizational purposes, a possible conflict of interests on the part of the coach (cf. Habscheid 2003: 133) and the issue of give and take. The second component refers to discussing the embedding of the coach–client dyad in the triad 'coach – client – organization' more on the administrative level as regards, for example, seeking the HR manager's consent for additional coaching sessions.

The business focus (indirectly) addresses the triangular relationship coach – client – client’s organization and stresses the role of the coach as a paid service provider, contracted to work on the client’s concern, and the client’s role as the receiver of such a service in his/her own interests and in particular in the interests of the organization.

6.3.1 Addressing trust and performativity

One component of the communicative task ‘Topicalizing the Coach-Client Dyad within the Triadic Coach – Client – Organization Relationship’ that has emerged from the data analysis is the issue of performativity and give and take.

Excerpt36_CO1CL2_1

In the following excerpt, the female client – very much towards the beginning of the first session – verbalizes her feeling of resistance as regards accepting the coaching, which had been offered and/or paid for by her company:

```
001 CL2  °h simply the fact that i_m here now and that i_m letting
002 CL2  [NAME OF COMPANY] pay for me it_s really difficult for me i_m
           only doing it
003 CL2  because your husband recommended it to me because he said
004       (0.25)
005 CL2  erm
```

The client frames accepting coaching as very difficult (via the extreme case formulation *really difficult*, line 002) and attributes her presence to the coach’s husband, i.e. her trainer during the *Emotional Intelligence* seminar, who convinced her to accept coaching from the company. The client then continues to elaborate on her difficulty to accept coaching and frames her decision as a rational one, against her inner feeling of resistance (*And now I do it in my head, but I do feel a certain inner resistance to that*, not in transcript).

Excerpt36/2_CO1CL2_1

The client further elaborates.

```
001 CO1  [hmh]m
002 CL2  [well]
003 CL2  it_s simply having the well the feeling that this may have
           been
004 CL2  given to me as a present but actually again there_s a return
           service
005 CO1  [yes]
006 CL2  [that i] have to provide that_s the real problem i think and
           not
007 CO1  yes
```

She accounts for her inner resistance with her fear that receiving something (i.e. coaching) as a present from the company is nevertheless tied to offering something in return on her part in the sense of *quid pro quo*.

Excerpt36/3_CO1CL2_1

After actively listening to the client's apprehensions, the coach next sets out to validate the client's inner resistance and fear:

```
001 CO1  but that is naturally important now right at at at the
        beginning isn't it i
002 CO1  can also relate to that very well that it feels like doesn't
003 CO1  feel like i'm simply getting something here no strings
        attached right
004 CL2  yes
005      (0.25)
006 CO1  instead your inner self associates it with something then
        maybe something is
007 CO1  expected then I have to function even better and
008 CL2  yes precisely
009 CO1  [hm hm]
010 CL2  [°h yes]
011 CL2  then maybe in the end i'll have to er give up my value
012 CL2  judgments and [and then become er jus]t as
013 CO1  [(laughs quietly)) that]
014 CL2  streamlined as all the others er and simply
015      (0.25)
016 CO1  yes
017 CL2  do everything
018 CL2  for money
019 CO1  yes
020 CL2  and that is that is
021      (0.25)
022 CL2  well
023      (0.25)
024 CL2  that is really bad
```

First, the coach marks the client's verbalizing her apprehension and fear as relevant for their interaction or beginning to work together (line 001: *but that is naturally important now right at the beginning*). She next validates the client's emotions via expressing her understanding for the client and her feeling that receiving coaching is pinned to expectations of functioning or performing better. In doing so, the coach reformulates the client's words according to her professional terminology and uses direct speech via speaking for the client *your inner self associates it with ... then maybe something is expected, then I have to function even better* (lines 006f). The client agrees with the coach's reformulation *yes, precisely* (line 008) and further elaborates or reformulates the coach's *I have to function even better* into *maybe in the end I'll have to give up my value judgments ... become just as streamlined as all the others and simply do everything for money* (lines 011ff). The client finalizes her

elaboration of the negative implications which she fears that accepting coaching can have for her via the extreme case formulation *that is really bad* (line 024), i.e. offers a final assessment.

Excerpt36/4_CO1CL2_1

In what follows, the coach addresses the client's apprehension via explicating and detailing her understanding of her role as coach as regards her professional responsibility for her client and for the client's company, who is paying for her services:

```
001 CO1  erm and as for myself i can say well simply
002 CO1  erm
003      (0.25)
004 CO1  i_ve got no agenda there right
005 CL2  hmhm
006 CO1  neither am i er obliged to
007 CO1  someone ((unintelligible)) from [NAME OF COMPANY] to
        manipulate you
008 CO1  in such a way well so that you operate better there right
009 CO1  but that but
010 CL2  so that i give up my conscience somewhere
```

By speaking from her perspective (line 001: *and as for myself I can say*) and thus presenting herself as independent from the company, the coach addresses first a negative and then a positive image of her role as coach: she negates having an agenda (implying an agenda of turning the client into a 'better' manager for the company) and also negates needing to fulfill an obligation for the company (lines 006f: *neither am I obliged to someone from (NAME OF COMPANY)*) to mold the client into functioning better (lines 007f: *to manipulate you in such a way that you operate better there*). She then sets to elaborate on her (positive) understanding of coaching, briefly interrupted by the client's uptake of her negative assessment and collaborative completion *so that I give up my conscience somewhere* (line 010).

Excerpt36/5_CO1CL2_1

The coach next offers her personal definition of coaching:

```
001 CL2  [((laughing))]
002 CO1  [(then] let_s just say) i see coaching as being w well (there
        and)
003 CO1  something where you simply enhance your poten[tial dev]elop
        and with those
004 CL2  [hmhm]
005 CO1  things where you yourself notice that
006      (0.5)
007 CO1  it_s an effort for you that
008 CO1  er
009      (0.25)
010 CO1  something is not quite right for you e[rm]
011 CL2  [hm]hm
```

```

012      (0.5)
013 CO1  where life is
014      (0.25)
015 CO1  exhausting
016 CO1  for you right and to help you with that so that it_s
017 CO1  somehow less hassle for you right
018 CL2  hmhm less hassle would be really good
019 CO1  yes
020 CO1  and then i think that is first and foremost something that
      you can
021 CO1  profit from
022      (0.25)
023 CL2  hmhm
024 CO1  right hopefully
025 CL2  hm[hm]
026 CO1  [we]ll that_s what it_s about at any rate

```

After listening to the client's apprehensions as regards accepting the coaching and validating her apprehensions, the coach next offers her personal definition of coaching (line 002: *I see coaching as being*): she frames coaching as a service and help, first and foremost for the client to develop her potential (line 003) and to support her in alleviating the feeling of effort and strain in her life (lines 007ff). The client agrees with the coach's definition of the purpose of coaching via the uptake *hmhm, less hassle would be really good* (line 018). After the coach has detailed her understanding of coaching and the goals of coaching, she rounds off her trust-building sequence by addressing the beneficiaries of coaching: *that is first and foremost something that you can profit from* (lines 020f).

Excerpt36/6_CO1CL2_1

In her trust-building sequence, the coach also addresses possible consequences in the client's professional surroundings:

```

001 CO1  °h and that will naturally have an effect
002      (0.25)
003 CO1  but
004 CL2  hmhm
005 CO1  how that can be (.)
006 CO1  we_ll have to see how so that can have a very [positive]
007 CL2  [hmhm]
008 CO1  effect also on [the com]pany
009 CL2  [hmhm]
010      (0.25)
011 CO1  it really can right wherever you are
012 CO1  it will (.) it can have a positive effect but it can also be
013 CO1  the case i mean it can never be completely ruled out that it
      also has
014 CO1  other consequences
015 CL2  hmhm
016 CO1  but that_s also okay

```

In addressing the possible consequences of the client's coaching benefit, i.e. *exploiting one's potential even more* (not in transcript), she lists both the option of positive consequences for the company (*so it can have very positive effects, also for the company*, lines 006ff) and possible negative consequences, which she frames vaguely as *but it can also be the case, I believe, it can never be ruled out, that it also has other consequences* (lines 012ff). As a final act of her unburdening and assuring the client of her loyalty, the coach frames this other possibility, i.e. possible negative consequences for the client's company as acceptable, too (*but that's also OK*, line 016).

6.3.2 Addressing financial, organizational and (pre-)diagnostic aspects

The second form of introducing the client's organization into the coaching discourse between coach and client is by topicalizing financial, organizational and (pre-)diagnostic aspects.

Excerpt37_CO1CL3_1

After the coach has introduced her method and procedure, she offers the male client the discursive space to clarify open questions as regards her background, etc. (cf. "Offering the possibility to ask questions", Nowak 2010).

```

001 CO1   okay
002       (1.0)
003 CO1   and erm
004       (2.1)
005 CO1   well naturally
006 CO1   whatever you would also like to know about me or about
007       (0.5)
008 CO1   my background or my procedure
009       (1.1)
010 CO1   you are
011 CO1   (naturally) also
012       (0.25)
013 CO1   more than welcome [to find] out a bit more
014 CL3   [hmmh]
015       (0.25)
016 CL3   okay good
017       (0.5)
018 CL3   yes
019       (0.5)
020 CL3   erm good i_ve just had another look at erm your cee vee again
021 CL3   er [as it was]
022 CO1   [hmmh]
023 CL3   in with the [document]tation
024 CO1   [hmmh]
025       (0.5)
026 CL3   erm
027       (1.1)

```

028 CL3 yes well
 029 CL3 there will almost certainly be questions at some point
 depending on the
 030 CL3 situation well it it [it_s not so]
 031 CO1 [hmhm]
 032 CL3 important for me now to know everything that
 033 CL3 you've done [ever]ybody
 034 CO1 [yes]
 035 CL3 you've er er helped
 036 (0.5)
 037 CL3 erm i_m also
 038 CL3 assuming now that the bank decided to choose you and your
 pool of consultants
 039 CL3 with good reason [i will cer]tainly
 040 CO1 [hmhm]
 041 CL3 not do the
 042 CO1 yes yes
 043 CL3 validity check once again [whetherer]
 044 CO1 [(laughs))]
 045 CL3 it_s also okay for [yes] well i
 046 CO1 [yes]
 047 CL3 assume that to be the case
 048 CO1 hm[hm]
 049 CL3 [er] er proceeding or as as clarified for me
 050 CL3 well (.) yes i_m pretty
 051 (0.5)
 052 CL3 precise about that or i_ve had
 053 (0.25)
 054 CL3 some

Via an open elicitation strategy (line 006: *whatever you would also like to know*), and an explicit invitation (lines 010ff: *you are naturally also more than welcome*), the coach invites the client to ask her about anything that is of interest to him, as regards her person, her background or her method. Although the client first accepts the coach's offer via *okay* and *good* (line 016) and informs her about having read her CV in the information offered by the bank (lines 020ff: *I've just had another look at your CV, as it was in with the documentation*), he implicitly orients to the triadic relationship 'coach – client – client's organization' and disclaims any personal interest in what the coach has done or with whom she has worked; instead he places all responsibility for the quality of the coaching, etc. on his company (lines 037ff: *I'm also assuming now that the bank decided to choose you and your pool of consultants with good reason*, presents himself as true to the company's line and explicitly frames their decision for the coach as good, trustworthy and reliable (lines 045ff: *I assume that to be the case*).

As regards the organizational and diagnostic aspects, coaches need to report back to the clients' HR department once the process has been finalized. Given the clients' verbalizations of rather private topics or the disclosure of less-dominant discourses in the safe space with their coach, the coaches' professional obligation to

report back to the clients' company is potentially threatening and must be tackled with some delicacy.

Excerpt38_CO1CL4

001 (0.25)
 002 CO1 erm
 003 (0.25)
 004 CO1 in any case i would
 005 (0.25)
 006 CO1 erm
 007 (0.25)
 008 CO1 um write
 009 (0.5)
 010 CO1 two three lines
 011 CO1 about the conclusion now [firstly]
 012 CL4 [yeah]
 013 CO1 of the coaching [um that is]
 014 CL4 [hmm]
 015 CO1 um
 016 (0.25)
 017 CO1 something that
 018 CO1 i
 019 (0.25)
 020 CO1 will then send to mister [NAME]
 021 CL4 hmm
 022 CO1 but i would send it to you
 023 CO1 first so that you can look at it and say [it_s]
 024 CL4 [yes]
 025 CO1 okay right [then]
 026 CL4 [sure]
 027 CO1 you [can change]
 028 CL4 [hmm]
 029 CO1 something or
 030 (0.25)
 031 CO1 add [some]thing
 032 CL4 [yes]
 033 CL1 or remove it well
 034 (0.25)
 035 CO1 so that [you] know
 036 CL4 [yes]

As part of the coach's business relation with the client's company and as part of the finalizing activities, she is expected to report back to the paying organization as regards CL4's coaching progress. The coach not only topicalizes their coach-client dyad within the triadic coach – client – client's organization relationship and thus evokes the larger organizational context of their interaction, but also raises a potentially challenging issue given that the results of the client's opening up in the safety and seclusion of their coaching encounter are passed on to a third party. The coach orients to this challenge by explicating her procedure to the client of putting together a few lines (lines 004ff: *In any case I would write two, three lines*),

yet passing them on to him (lines 022f: *but I would send it to you first*) to allow for changes, etc., before she passes the written document onto the company's HR department. She further mitigates her doing by using the conditional form or using direct speech in speaking for the client for her detailed description.

As coaching is at times suggested by a client's HR department or their HR manager, some pre-coaching diagnosing has taken place, which often leads to suggesting a particular coach to the client. In the following extract, the client addresses this issue, thereby explicitly topicalizing the triadic coach – client – client's organization. To put it differently, in the next extract we witness how the interaction field 'coach – client – client's organization' is discursively opened up by the client.

Excerpt39_CO1CL2_1

```

001 CL2 i've erm brought something with me namely two things the one is
002 CL2 erm I have to see what i've done with the other one that_s in
      there
003 CL2 anyway
004 CO1 yes
005 CL2 the first one is what i discussed with mister [NAME1]
006      (0.25)
007 CL2 once
008 CL2 [and]
009 CO1 [yes]
010 CL2 wro[te down an]d
011 CO1 [that_s good]
012 CO1 hmhm
013 CL2 then the other one
014 CL2 is what mister [NAME2] wrote down for me
015 CO1 aha what he
016 CO1 wro what he thi[nks or ((laughs out loud)) yes okay good yes
      yes good yes yes yes]
017 CL2 [yes preisely that_s what [NAME2] said that that he should do
      that s]o
018 CL2 he did that of his own accord but
019      (0.5)
020 CO1 yes
021 CL2 erm
022      (0.25)
023 CL2 as far as the objective is concerned [i sh]ould have brought
      that along with me
024 CO1 [yes]
025 CO1 good o[kay]
026 CL2 [shoul]d i give it to you then or read it out or
027 CO1 erm
028      (0.25)
029 CO1 let_s see
030      (0.25)
031 CO1 i (.) so how shall we proceed ((unintelligible)) [yes it_s]
032 CL2 [let_s start with] [NAME1]
033 CO1 good okay
034 CL2 what the boss has to say

```

In an interactionally marked instance in the data, the female client, right at the onset of her first encounter with the coach (after engaging in some preliminary small talk as regards alternative medicine), initiates ‘presenting the concern’ without prior invitation by the coach: she pre-announces her action both verbally *I’ve brought something with me* (line 001) and non-verbally by taking out an envelope that contains two documents. She describes what she has brought along as *namely two things* (line 001), which she further defines as *the first one is what I discussed with Mr. (NAME1) once and wrote down* (lines 005ff) and *then the other one is what Mr. (NAME2) wrote down for me* (lines 013f). The client thus introduces the voice of others (in this case the voice of her line manager and of her boss) into the coaching, i.e. she brings the company into the coach-client dyad, instead of presenting her own concern or goal for coaching. The coach non-verbally (via her loud and laughing voice) and verbally (via the exclamation *Aha!* and by repeating *what he wro/ what he thinks* (lines 015f)) marks the client’s boss’s pre-diagnostic acts as deviating from the coaching norm. Yet the client – at this stage – continues with her agenda of presenting the others’ voices, elaborates the coach’s ironic comment *what he wro/ what he thinks* after an agreement (line 017: *yes, precisely*) into *that’s what (NAME2) said, that he should do that ... as far as the objective is concerned*, (lines 017ff). The client closes the sequence ‘concern presentation through the voice of others’ via a closing statement *I should have brought that along with me* (line 023). After the client turns to her with the question *should I give it to you then or read it out?* (line 026), the coach hesitates and then formulates an open agenda offer *how shall we proceed* (line 031), referring to their general procedure or start. Yet, the client misinterprets the coach’s agenda question and offers *let’s start with (NAME1): what the boss has to say* (lines 032ff). The coach gives up on her agenda, leans back in her chair and listens to the client reading out what her boss considers to be her concern in coaching.

Résumé – Communicative task ‘Topicalizing the Coach-Client Dyad within the Triadic Coach – Client – Organization Relationship’

The third communicative task of the basic activity of ‘Building the Relationship’ addresses the organizational context of the professional format of ‘executive coaching’: whatever coach and client do in their local dyadic interaction is embedded in and thus influenced by the larger context, i.e. the clients’ company. This organizational context is introduced into the in situ coaching work in the form of addressing trust and performativity and addressing financial, organizational and (pre-)diagnostic aspects, respectively.

Table 10. Communicative task ‘Topicalizing the Coach-Client Dyad within the Triadic Coach – Client – Organization Relationship’ – Core components

Communicative task	Core components
Topicalizing the Coach-Client Dyad within the Triadic Coach – Client – Organization Relationship	Addressing Trust and Performativity Addressing Financial, Organizational and (Pre-)Diagnostic Aspects

6.4 Summary – ‘Building the relationship’

To sum up, the basic activity of ‘Building the Relationship’ contains three major communicative tasks, ‘Establishing the Roles and Identities of ‘Coach’ and ‘Client’, ‘Negotiating Hierarchy in an Asymmetrical Relationship’ and ‘Topicalizing the Coach-Client Dyad in the Triadic Coach – Client – Organization Relationship’. These are acted out in recurring structures and principles of interaction via various core components. Table 11 summarizes the communicative tasks and their core components that have emerged from the data analysis as endemic for building the relationship between coach and client in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*.

Table 11. Basic activity ‘Building the Relationship’ – Communicative tasks and core components

Communicative tasks	Core components
Establishing the Roles and Identities of ‘Coach’ and ‘Client’	Negotiating Knowledge and Expertise Client’s Self-Presentation Coach’s Self-Disclosure and Personal Topics
Negotiating Hierarchy in an Asymmetrical Relationship	Establishing an Asymmetrical-Hierarchical Relationship Establishing an Asymmetrical-Non-Hierarchical Relationship
Topicalizing the Coach-Client Dyad within the Triadic Coach – Client – Organization Relationship	Addressing Trust and Performativity Addressing Financial, Organizational and (Pre-) Diagnostic Aspects

As regards the structural, thematic and interactive layout of these communicative tasks and core components, the following recurring structures and principles of interaction have emerged as strategies of coach and client to communicatively establish and maintain their overall relationship.

While the importance of ‘Building the Relationship’ is stressed across the practice literature on coaching (witness, for example, the frequently used term of

‘coaching alliance’ in analogy with ‘therapeutic alliance’ across the coaching practice literature (see Chapter 2)), its *in situ* discursive realization has so far not been analyzed and discussed. In analogy with Spranz-Fogasy’s (1992) concept of a ‘permanent task’, it is claimed here that ‘Building the Relationship’ represents a permanent activity. Unlike the other basic activities, the participants constantly engage in relational work in and while doing coaching. What is more, relationships are at the center of executive coaching as expounded by Palmer and McDowall (2010: 4): “(n)ot only is the content of coaching sessions frequently in some way concerned with relationships, the process itself is always based on relationships. These necessarily involve the coach, the coachee, but often also a client (commissioning organisation)”. Despite such an omnipresence and significance for the overall interaction type or professional format of ‘executive coaching’, ‘Building the Relationship’ is most of the time acted out implicitly rather than explicitly. That is, the coach-client relationship unfolds in the participants’ co-construction of coaching with every communicate act coach and client engage in. In addition to such constant implicit relational work, the participants also explicitly build their relationship by establishing their roles and identities, negotiating hierarchy within an inherently asymmetrical relationship and topicalizing their coach-client dyad within the larger organization context of the client’s company. The activity ‘Building the Relationship’ thereby defies any structural preference along the coaching process.

The participating coach and client co-construct their relationship along various dimensions, which are in accordance with the overall morphology of the coaching process: coach and client focus (more) on the professional dimension of their relationship when they, for example, negotiate knowledge and expertise; they focus (more) on the personal dimension of their relationship when they de-hierarchize their asymmetrical relationship in the context of switching to first names, for example, and they focus (more) on the business dimension of their relationship when they arrange dates for next meetings, etc.. All of these dimensions, however, usually merge into one another and result in a complex relational set-up between the professional coaches and their executive clients.

Executive coaching represents a type of professional discourse acted out by a professional expert and a layperson that have different interactional responsibilities and participation rights. The basic activity of ‘Building the Relationship’, or, to be more precise, its participation framework, adheres to this overall structuring principle: although the data evince a range of quasi-conversational sequences acted out by more or less equal-status partners, the underlying asymmetry between a professional and a layperson remains unaltered. Even in cases of de-hierarchization, the professional coach always acts as its initiator. This attests to the underlying and unchangeable professional and institutional interaction framework of coaching as one of ‘expert-layperson’.

Co-constructing change

The relevance of the basic activity of ‘Co-Constructing Change’ is captured succinctly in the quote by Whitworth et al. (1998: xix) stating that “(p)eople come to coaching for lots of different reasons, but the bottom line is change”. Clients’ change and how this comes about represents the main focus of the coaching practice literature, coach training manuals and coaching outcome research. The current linguistic analysis is on its discursive in-situ co-construction by the participants (see Graf under review; Graf and Jautz under review; Pawelczyk and Graf under review). In order to discursively co-construct change for or in the client, coach and client must ‘do’ the following: firstly, the client’s concern⁴⁵ must be explicated and a goal must be defined and communicatively tackled according to the underlying coaching agenda; to this end, the ‘coaching object’ must be clarified and further processed via diagnostic and intervening acts based on the professional theory of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*; in addition, client’ insights and new ways of experiencing or behaving must be transferred from the inside-the-coaching realm to the outside via acts of transferring. Especially this aspect attests to the business and output orientation of executive coaching, as communicatively co-constructed coaching results need to undergo and pass a reality check in the clients’ business world.

As Schulz and Steyaert (2014: 187) expound, coaching conversations, like other forms of counseling such as psychotherapy, medical counseling or business counseling, represent professionalized problem talk between a coach as expert facilitator and a manager as layperson. According to Muntigl et al. (2014), “(o)ne common thread that runs across the different helping professions is the general scenario in which clients seek out professionals for assistance and, in doing so, offer a ‘report of a problematic experience’. The told trouble usually consists of a (negative) assessment of a specific event that directly involves the teller, i.e. the client (cf. Muntigl

45. Primary concerns are the very reasons why clients enter professional formats such as health care, consulting, counseling, psychotherapy or coaching in the first place (Pick 2017; Graf and Spranz-Fogasy 2018a). ‘Concern’ in the current discussion is understood as both ‘problem’ or ‘issue’ and in particular as ‘goal’, i.e. the reason(s) why people come or are sent to coaching can either have a deficit or an optimizing orientation. Prototypical reasons or concerns of executive clients pertain to broad categories such as leadership skills, managerial effectiveness, peak performance and, in particular, personal development as regards emotion regulation or appropriate emotionality.

et al. 2014: 38; see also Miller and Silvermann 1995: 725). These tellings of troubled experiences are both invited by the coaches in the current data and create empathic opportunities for them to further pursue the intended emotion- and experientially based agenda of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* (see also Vehviläinen 1999: 128). To be empathic, it is important that recipients of troubles telling ratify or confirm that the trouble expressed by the teller is indeed relevant or important and, furthermore, that recipients affiliate with the teller's trouble (Muntigl et al. 2014: 40). To put it differently, coaches' affiliation with clients' emotional distress is not only affiliation as such but serves the aspired professional problem solving: affiliation has an intrinsic coaching purpose as empathy represents an essential part of successful coaching. As such, affiliative and empathetic practices lay the ground for coaches' further actions. Following Pain's (2009: 38) argument for psychotherapy, unlike troubles-tellers in ordinary conversations, who expect emotional reciprocity and sympathetic responses, clients in coaching interactions expect to receive help and/or advice to solve their problems and thus achieve change.

In executive coaching (like in psychotherapy but unlike, for example, medical interaction), the actions taken to diagnose clients' concerns as well as to work towards possible solutions for clients' concerns, i.e. to intervene, once these have become interactively co-constructed, are exclusively based on talk activities. They include very few 'real' actions such as physical examinations. (In the current context 'practicing mindfulness' (see below) is the only non-verbal, yet verbally embedded, intervening action, besides sporadic note taking or jotting down something on index cards by the coaches.) Talk is both the essential medium and the essential diagnostic and interventive tool in coaching. Coaching concerns must be tackled communicatively in a particular type of dialogue as the necessary information resides in the clients themselves, i.e. the clients' accounts and narratives must be given the status of evidence (cf. Sarangi 2001: 6). Yet, clients' subjective versions are only the 'raw material' out of which coaching-relevant information is teased out by the coaches (cf. Pain 2009), given that the coach as the professional expert holds the interpretative dominance (Schulz 2013). Just like in other types of professional interaction, there is a clash between the clients' subjective, life-world perspective on their issues and the coaches' professional categorization of primary concerns according to the underlying coaching theory (Brünner 2005; Pick 2017). In the current case of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* the agenda is to (re-)focus clients' attention towards their underlying emotions and automatic reactions as regards their (professional) concerns. Due to the underlying interactional asymmetry of professional formats, it is not the clients' version of the concern that is interactively explored. Instead, the clients' concern – both in its definition and further processing – is transformed according to the underlying coaching theory and agenda, i.e. the individual subjective, experience of the client is fitted into the institution's

categories, structures and terminologies (e.g. via the process of ‘fragmentation’, where the clients’ narrative and explanation are split and selected according to coaching relevant meaning (Lalouschek 2008). Coaches orient to and mark as relevant those aspects of clients’ versions which are considered ‘coaching-relevant matters’. In analogy with Hutchby’s (2007: 59) tenet in child counseling that “the practice depends for its success on the collaborative production of talk about ‘therapeutic objects’”, the success of a coaching process then depends on collaboratively turning clients’ verbalizations into ‘coaching objects’.

Besides these (interactive) characteristics that ‘Co-Constructing Change’ in executive coaching shares with other professional helping formats, its particular socio-cultural and organizational context adds the following features to the discursive morphology of this basic activity in the context of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*:

- Coach and client have a telephone conversation prior to their first face-to-face coaching encounter. During this conversation, the client’s reason(s) for coaching are topicalized and are classified and sanctioned as coachable. Unlike in other professional encounters, coaching clients thus do not have to engage in accounting practices for entering coaching during the first meeting, i.e. they do not need to legitimize their visit: “the problem presentation phase is the first, and perhaps the most crucial, phase of the encounter for the credibility and legitimacy of patient concerns” (Heritage and Robinson 2006: 85).
- Given the organizational embedding of executive coaching, prior to the coaching encounter, clients’ issues are topicalized with their line or HR managers, who thus engage in pre-diagnostic activities before the proper diagnostic and interventive procedures during the coaching interaction itself. These acts of pre-diagnosis are often responsible for HR managers suggesting a particular coach to the client and thus pre-empt a certain thematic and interactive framing of the later ‘Co-Constructing Change’.
- In addition to more or less concrete or tangible issues or concerns that either motivate the client himself/herself to seek coaching or their line managers to suggest coaching, a second source of concerns are those that materialized during the *Emotional Intelligence* training, also offered by the coaches. Finally, in those cases where coaching is part of an incentive for high potentials when taking on a new job or position, the diagnostic process first of all serves as a survey of demand as regards possible concerns or goals of the coaching, before these are then – as in the other cases – further processed according to the underlying coaching theory and thus co-constructed as topics.
- The discursive actions that underlie co-constructing clients’ change need to solve the following two paradoxes: firstly, while diagnosing and intervening are largely acted out in re-focusing clients on their emotional experiencing via

therapeutic interventions, coaching is theoretically and institutionally set apart from therapy, and any false impression in that direction must be avoided at all costs in the local interaction between coach and client. Secondly, coaching is idealized as dialogue-at-eye-level, yet the coach in his/her professional responsibility and role sets and maintains the overall agenda. Concurrently, at times clients call for a ‘classic’ asymmetrical-hierarchical role distribution between the coach as expert, who offers help and advice, and the client as layperson, who seeks help and advice.

Coach and client tackle three main communicative tasks when they engage in the basic activity of ‘Co-Constructing Change’: they need to engage in (acts of) ‘Diagnosing’, (acts of) ‘Intervening’ and (acts of) ‘Securing Transfer’ (see Table 12). Especially the latter attests to the overall business orientation of executive coaching where the client’s (personal) insights and change are functionalized for organizational purposes. Whereas the first communicative task of diagnosing centers on discursively establishing the coaching object via retrospective actions, the second communicative task of intervening centers on prospectively working on the previously established coaching object according to the professional agenda of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*. Yet, the underlying goal-and-solution orientation of executive coaching has it that the diagnostic activities are also prospective in nature as diagnosing predominantly refers to exploring and defining the goal (which lies in the future and is positively framed) and not the problem or concern (which lies in the present or even in the past). Finally, the communicative task of securing transfer aims to relocate clients’ in-situ insights and learning from the here-and-now of the coaching interaction into client’s professional (or private) outside-the-coaching context, while at the same time guaranteeing the integration of clients’ insights and learning from their between-coaching experiences into the ongoing coaching process.

Table 12. Basic activity ‘Co-Constructing Change’ – Communicative tasks

Diagnosing
Intervening
Securing transfer

Despite its theoretical prominence as attested to in the coaching practice literature and existing outcome research and despite its undisputable quantitative prominence in the current data, it is claimed here that ‘Co-Constructing Change’ with its communicative tasks of ‘Diagnosing’, ‘Intervening’ and ‘Securing Transfer’ in its coaching-specific interactional morphology and trajectory depends on and results from the particular interplay of all four basic activities. It is thus not given any extra status as regards its interactional relevance for coaching purposes.

Due to the vast amount of data and the complexity of the material in the context of the basic activity ‘Co-Constructing Change’, more *ex ante* categorization of the data (than for the other three basic activities of ‘Defining the Situation’, ‘Building the Relationship’ and ‘Evaluating the Coaching’) is indispensable in the following presentation and discussion of the communicative tasks ‘Diagnosing’, ‘Intervening’ and ‘Securing Transfer’ and their respective core components.

7.1 Diagnosing⁴⁶

7.1.1 Eliciting and presenting the concern

As holds true for doctor-patient interaction and other helping interactions, coaches use particular question formats to solicit particular types of presenting concerns (cf. Robinson 2006: 41; Deplazes 2016; Graf and Spranz-Fogasy 2018b): while open questions, especially initial open questions, mark the onset of a sequence with the client as the primary speaker and the coach as listener that ends when clients finalize their presentation, closed questions initiate a different interaction trajectory of question-answer, with the coach as primary speaker in the questioning position and client in the answering position (cf. Lalouschek 2005b: 68). What is more, open-topic elicitations do not overtly specify the thematic scope or subject, but “create a space for the clients to name ‘discussable’ issues” (Peräkylä 1995: 249). In presenting the concern / goal by verbalizing incidents from their professional (or private surroundings), clients present their subjective, life-world version of what brought them to coaching in the first place. Structurally, ‘Eliciting and Presenting the Concern’ (together with clients’ verbalizations) usually occupy the first thematic slot of the proper coaching activity after the introductory orientation phase, i.e. the pre-coaching activities. According to Heritage and Robinson (2006: 49), “the problem presentation phase is one of the only (and often *the* only) structurally provided-for locations where patients are licensed to present their concern in their own way and in accordance with their own agendas”, i.e. they thus have choices concerning both the content and the form of presenting the concern. The same holds true for coaching. The thematic orientation of clients’ named issues thereby hints at or implicitly attests to their underlying expectations as regards their interaction with the coach and their individual definition of coaching: e.g. by responding with a problem-oriented topic naming, they display their orientation to the institutional context of coaching as problem talk (cf. Peräkylä 1995: 250) while by responding

46. This communicative task is often termed ‘situational analysis’ in the coaching literature due to the unwanted therapeutic or medical implications of the label ‘diagnosis’ (cf. Peltier 2010: xxxvii, but see also Schreyögg 2003 or Müller 2006 and their use of the term ‘diagnosis’).

with managerial or performance-oriented topic namings, they index their expectation of coaching as a ‘make-me-fit-for-the-job’ instrument. What is more, the coach and client’s prior-to-coaching telephone conversation and the way the concern was introduced and pre-diagnosed there also make different interactional trajectories or diagnostic procedures relevant. To conclude with Peräkylä (1995: 251), “(e)liciting primary ‘concern’ seems to attend to the sensitiveness of the counseling encounter in a very subtle way”. In what follows, various examples from the corpus illustrate this sensitiveness.

A crucial difference as regards the interactive trajectory of the core component of ‘Eliciting and Presenting the Concern’ lies in clients’ goal orientation, i.e. their decidedness as regards their goal in coaching. While in the first example below the client enters coaching without a clear idea of what he expects from coaching (see Excerpt40_CO2CL61), in the second example (see Excerpt41_CO1CL3_1) the client comes with a very precise idea of where and how coaching should support him in his role as executive.

Excerpt40_CO2CL61

The coach – as part of his overall initial framing and orientation practices at the onset of their first encounter – also initiates the first diagnostic acts:

```

001 CO2 °h
002      (0.75)
003 CO2 yes
004 CO2 and now let_s [see]
005 CL6 [((laughs))]
006 CO2 ((laughs)) °h what would be good
007 CO2 for you
008      (0.75)
009 CO2 to start off with
010      (0.9)
011 CO2 so either hearing a little bit more from me
012 CO2 about how we could work together °h
013      (0.5)
014 CO2 or you
015 CO2 just say
016      (0.5)
017 CO2 well relating to
018      (0.25)
019 CO2 the topics you told me about
020 CO2 on the phone what you_ve brought with you today and where
021      (0.5)
022 CO2 °h
023 CO2 [we wou]ld
024 CL6 [hmhm]
025 CO2 what direction we should take to explore together
026 CL6 hmhm
027 CO2 together

```

028 (1.0)
 029 CO2 °h
 030 (1.0)
 031 CL6 ((clicks tongue)) ((sighs)) you see
 032 CL6 i am (.) i_m just letting myself in for this
 033 (0.25)
 034 CL6 business here er
 035 CO2 hmhm
 036 CL6 whatever you think is more expedient i
 037 (0.25)
 038 CL6 i i don_t mind i am
 039 CL6 indifferent i can tell you something about myself you can
 tell me again
 040 (0.5)
 041 CL6 what you_re going to (.)

The coach initiates and meta-pragmatically introduces their moving onto the next agenda point (after their preliminary talk about the research project): *yes, and now let's see what would be good for you to start off with* (lines 004ff): He offers the client two agenda and activity options: either *hearing a little bit more from me about how we could work together* (lines 011f), which would imply a further engagement in the basic activity of 'Defining the Situation' in the context of the methodological and procedural framing of coaching, or *you just say, well, relating to the topics you told me about on the phone, what you've brought with you today and ... what direction we should take to explore together* (lines 014ff). The latter implies moving onto core coaching work, i.e. presenting (and processing) the concern or reason for coaching (the coach thereby differentiating between the topics discussed during their prior-to-coaching conversation and possibly more current and pressing issues that bother the client at the moment). In offering this second option, the coach engages in 'Eliciting the Concern'. The client – after pauses, non-verbal hesitation markers, a false start and a self-initiated repair (all attesting to his unwillingness to take on the active part) – turns the coach's agenda offer down and returns the responsibility as regards deciding on the next agenda point to the coach and his expertise *whatever you think is more expedient* (line 036). His passive, indifferent, wait-and-see attitude also shows in his reference to their coaching interaction as *I'm just letting myself in for this business here* (lines 032ff) or his explicit reference to his indifferent state of mind *I don't mind, I am indifferent* (lines 038f).

Excerpt41_CO1CL3_1

A completely different picture emerges in the following excerpt where the male client self-initiates the presentation of his concern without prior invitation from the coach, meta-pragmatically pre-announcing it as *so maybe the reason why I'm here* (line 003). (Prior to the excerpt the coach has detailed her method and procedure and has engaged in other framing and orientation acts as regards their coaching interaction.)

001 CL3 yes
 002 (0.5)
 003 CL3 good so maybe the reason why i_m here
 004 CL3 i_d say it is naturally [very th]e timing is very very
 005 CO1 [hmhm]
 006 (0.25)
 007 CL3 good for me
 008 (0.25)
 009 CL3 for coaching
 010 CO1 hm hmhm
 011 CL3 erm the coaching sessions which were
 012 CL3 given to me but that was well also on er the agenda which was
 013 CL3 sent to th you
 014 (0.5)
 015 CL3 er that it_s actually support for
 016 CL3 my first steps as branch manager with a view to
 017 CL3 further promotion yes well in a bigger branch
 018 CO1 hmhm

Throughout the process, client CL3 presents himself as very output, performance and success-oriented. At the onset of the excerpt, the client, after pre-announcing his goal presentation, first positively assesses the fact of receiving coaching at the present moment (lines 004ff: *it is naturally very, the timing is very, very good for me for coaching*). He thereby both demonstrates and implies his compliance with coaching as such and his will to use it in the best possible way for him. Next, he describes and repeats the purpose or goal of the coaching as envisioned by his company (lines 012f: *that was well also on the agenda which was sent to you*), namely as a general incentive for executives who take on a next higher position and as a preparation for the following career move (lines 015ff: *support for my first steps as branch manager ... with a view to further promotion, yes, well, in a bigger branch*). Yet, via (partly) relativizing this 'official' purpose via *actually* (line 015), he already hints at another, more personal concern or goal for coaching, which he is about to present to the coach: in hard times for the banking business it is more and more challenging to be both successful as regards facts and figures and to be an understanding and supportive boss for his staff (in the lines following the excerpt).

Another relevant aspect in the context of 'Eliciting and Presenting the Concern' (as well as later on in 'Exploring the Concern and Defining the Goal') is obviously the type of concern, i.e. the question whether the coaching object has an external, factual or an internal, emotional referent. While there are (parts of) processes where coach and client tackle factual, external themes (see Excerpt 42), the principal focus in the current data of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is on whether or not the client's (problematic) emotionality is introduced as a primary concern by the client (see Excerpt 43), and if not, how the coach, in exploring the concern and defining the goal, refocuses the client on his/her emotionality. This thematic dimension is of interactional relevance for the ensuing processing and intervening acts to follow as the coaches either respond to feelings-talk or initiate feelings-talk in the client.

Excerpt42_CO2CL5_2

The client, who is new in his current executive position and has just reported on recent developments with his colleagues and opponents in the company, presents the following concern as an answer to the coach's elicitation of a topic at the onset of their second meeting:

```
001 CO2  right that_s clear
002      (1.7)
003 CO2  erm
004      (2.0)
005 CO2  what would your goal be for our clarification
006 CO2  of that
007      (0.25)
008 CO2  here today so where you like to get [to]
009 CL5  [so] i i would like to
010      (1.5)
011 CL5  er
012 CL5  to
013      (0.25)
014 CL5  have well a kind of
015      (0.25)
016 CL5  well guideline for me how i can navigate through
017 CL5  the the through these conflicts
```

Prior to the excerpt, at the beginning of the session, the client reported on the latest developments in his new department and in particular about upcoming conflicts with colleagues in China. Answering the coach's open, yet thematically focused topic-elicitation strategy (line 006: *of that*) as regards the client's goal for their second session (lines 005ff: *what would your goal be for our clarification of that here today*) and his reformulation (line 008: *so where would you like to get to?*), the client phrases his aim for the current meeting in an aligning manner, also framing his answer in the conditional form used by the coach: *so I would like to have a kind of guideline for me how I can navigate through these conflicts* (lines 009ff).

While the above excerpt presents a factual concern located on the external, inter-personal interaction field of the client's professional realm, the following excerpt illustrates the presentation of a concern in the context of 'problematic emotionality', i.e. a concern located on the client's intra-personal interaction field.

Excerpt43_CO1CL1_1

The female client – after narrating a dramatic incident at the airport where she suffered a nervous breakdown before boarding a plane – presents her uncontrollable emotions as her concern:

```
001 CO1  [yes]
002 CL1  [and] there are two two things which are important for me now the
003 CL1  first one
004      (0.75)
005 CL1  is to get a somewhat thicker skin or to develop so something
        some kind of
```

006 CL1 mechanism [so th]at i
007 CO1 [hm]
008 (0.75)
009 CL1 so that i don_t let things get so close to me
010 CL1 especially things which go [wron]g or i don_t know i also
don_t know i haven_t yet
011 CO1 [hm]
012 CL1 found out what i[t is whether it_]s fear of being defeated or
that this
013 CO1 [yes yes yes]
014 CL1 perfectionism
015 CO1 hm
016 CL1 the other thing is to develop a mechanism so that not every
time
017 CL1 somebody °h
018 (0.75)
019 CO1 h[m]
020 CL1 [ask]s me about that sympathetically i
021 (0.5)
022 CL1 don_t i notice that i
023 CL1 [start] crying
024 CO1 [hm] when somebody asks you ((unintelligible)) about
025 (0.5)
026 CL1 n[ow i]
027 CO1 [what]

Introduced by a meta-pragmatic relevance framing (line 002: *two things which are important for me now*), the client presents her overall concern, namely ‘needing coping strategies or mechanisms to avoid being over-emotional in public’: via a two-part list she first presents *the first one is to get a somewhat thicker skin or to develop some kind of mechanism so that I don’t let things get so close to me* (lines 002ff), met by the coach’s agreement and understanding *yes, yes, yes* (line 013). As the second aspect of her concern, the client next lists *the other thing is to develop a mechanism so that not every time somebody asks me about that sympathetically, I don’t, I notice that I could start crying* (lines 016ff). In her uptake of the client’s concern, the coach reformulates the second part *when somebody asks you about ...* (line 024).

While both clients present their need for strategies or mechanisms to cope with challenging situations as their concern, in the first case the strategies refer to strategies in the client’s interaction with external referents, i.e. with his business partners; in the latter case, the strategies refer to referents within the client herself, i.e. her uncontrollable emotionality. Due to the internal action logic of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, the intervening practices to follow as part of the coach and client’s next communicative task in the context of ‘Co-Constructing Change’ are therefore located on the inter-personal interaction field and the intra-personal interaction field respectively.

As regards the coaches' eliciting strategies, the current data evinces the following practices: besides open-topic elicitation strategies in the form of open questions or declarative questions such as *now to you and to what brings you here* (not in transcript) or *have you got any idea what would be good for you?* (not in transcript), another frequent concern elicitation strategy in the material is inviting the client to create a hypothetical world as regards their goals in coaching.

Excerpt44_CO1CL4_1

```

001 CO1  so let_s assume
002      (3.0)
003 CO1  erm
004      (1.0)
005 CO1  we
006      (0.25)
007 CO1  are a few months down the road
008 CO1  so it is maybe the end of
009 CL4  hmhm
010 CO1  the year or the beginning of next year °h and
011      (1.0)
012 CO1  we_ve just had the last session
013 CL4  hm[hm]
014 CO1  [you] would have come here for the last
015 CO1  time °h and you say something has now
016      (0.25)
017 CO1  something
018 CO1  has evolved °h i_ve made some progress here the time spent
      here was
019 CO1  worthwhile
020 CL4  hmhm
021 CO1  °h
022      (0.5)
023 CO1  um at this point in time what would be
024 CO1  a a
025      (0.25)
026 CO1  well so a really satisfying a good result for you where you
027 CO1  would say that was really worthwhile i_ve made some progress
      here
028      (1.0)
029 CO1  °h
030      (0.5)
031 CO1  and feel free to give yourself time to answer the question
032      (2.5)
033 CL4  if i
034 CL4  reacted
035      (0.25)
036 CL4  in a more relaxed way in certain situations
037 CO1  hmhm
038 CL4  and
039      (0.5)
040 CL4  precisely

```

The coach in this excerpt elicits the client's goal for coaching by creating a hypothetical world (Gaik 1992; Peräkylä 1995; Sarangi 2010) or a hypothetical change scenario: she formulates a hypothesis using the conditional form as an invitation to speculate about a future moment in time and about the client's possible positive future evaluation as regards their coaching work, which she presents in the form of a three-part list *something has evolved, I've made some progress here, the time spent here was worthwhile* (lines 017ff). The second part of the hypothetical world or change scenario is an open hypothetical question, again in the conditional form, which addresses the coaching goal the client will have reached at the invited future moment in time. This goal-oriented topic elicitation strategy already directs the client's verbalizations to the purposefulness and helpfulness of executive coaching by inviting the formulation of a positive result (Grant 2006: 156). The coach rounds off this hypothetical change scenario by prompting the client to take his time in reflecting on the question; this discursive device both opens up the client's reflection space, thus securing the production of relevant material for diagnosing, and serves a coaching-didactic function as it introduces the client to the particular 'discourse and language of coaching'. After a 2.5 second pause – the client's reflection time – CL4 presents a first version of his goal in a manner that syntactically aligns with the coach's open question and that states a changed, i.e. more relaxed, emotional behavior in certain situations: *if I reacted in a more relaxed way in certain situations* (lines 033ff).

The discursive strategy of 'creating a hypothetical world' is a transient phenomenon between 'Eliciting and Presenting the Concern' and 'Exploring the Concern and Defining the Goal' and can thus accomplish different actions: by building a possible world and an alternative reality by linguistic means (Peräkylä 1995), the participants discursively develop a hypothetical change scenario which ties in the client's goal(s) in coaching, i.e. one possible communicative result of the acts of diagnosing, with a successful coaching process, i.e. the aspired and anticipated (communicative) result. Together with its future orientation, the positive and sometimes even playful and creative footing of such a hypothetical world opens up the horizon of the coaching discourse and aims to re-direct the overall orientation of the interaction from a deficit orientation to a solution orientation.

While the excerpts so far presented illustrate 'Eliciting and Presenting the Concern' during the onset of first sessions, diagnosing acts to elicit and present the concern are also structurally positioned during later phases of the first session or during follow-up sessions as clients at times introduce various coaching objects they want to work on. As one interactional consequence, these second or additional concerns are tackled in communicative loops: after the first diagnostic and intervening acts which address the concern first listed or introduced by the client, coach and client may re-engage in eliciting and presenting the second or additional concern or goal further along the session or the process.

Excerpt45_CO2CL5_5

The coach – at the onset of the fifth session and just prior to the excerpt – elicits the client's current concern via *naturally I'm curious about what you've brought along, what's important for you today* (not in transcript).

001 CL5 so
 002 (0.5)
 003 CL5 looking back on it
 004 (0.5)
 005 CL5 when i now think about it again
 006 (1.0)
 007 CL5 the
 008 CL5 starting point was rather the formal
 009 (0.25)
 010 CL5 er strategic one (.) i_m in a new position
 011 CL5 have [to find a] new
 012 CO2 [hmhm]
 013 CL5 [position i have to]
 014 CO2 [hmhm hmhm hm]hm
 015 CL5 find my bearings in a [er]
 016 CO2 [ye]s
 017 (1.0)
 018 CL5 er in a group of
 019 (0.75)
 020 CL5 managers
 021 CO2 hmhm
 022 CL5 er how can i go about that
 023 CL5 how [can i]
 024 CO2 [hmh]m
 025 (0.25)
 026 CL5 maintain my own
 027 (0.5)
 028 CL5 position [what]
 029 CO2 [hmh]m
 030 CL5 how how do i deal with
 031 CL5 °h people who attack my po[sition °h]
 032 CO2 [hmhm hmh]m
 033 (0.5)
 034 CL5 er and er from this
 035 [omission]
 036 CL5 consciously
 037 CO2 hmhm hmh[m]
 038 CL5 [y]es what
 039 (1.5)
 040 CL5 i thought about °h at the beginning
 041 (0.5)
 042 CL5 of course was that you could maybe also give me some tips °h
 how i can
 043 CL5 how i can
 044 CO2 how you can crack the[m ((laughs))]
 045 CL5 [((laughs briefly))] how i can beat the boys
 046 CL5 a bit and °h improve my own position but [°h]
 047 CO2 [hm]

048 CL5 it doesn't help
 049 (1.5)
 050 CL5 er to believe that there would be er hard and fast rules
 051 CL5 for every situation which well work at the touch of a [button]
 n but 'h i
 052 CO2 [yes]
 053 (0.75)
 054 CL5 think that the key to that lies in the individual of course
 055 CO2 yes
 056 CL5 somewhere

The thematically open-elicitation strategy by the coach inspires the client to retrospectively reflect on his primary motivation to seek coaching: *so looking back on it, when I now think about it again* (lines 001ff). He first categorizes this original coaching goal as *strategic* and *formal* (lines 008 and 010), explains it via external facts as regards his new post as executive (lines 011ff: *have to find a new position, I have to find my bearings in a group of managers*), lists the resulting questions (for coaching) such as *how can I maintain my own position, how do I deal with people who attack my position* (lines 023ff) and offers his original expectations as regards his interaction with the coach: *what I thought about at the beginning, of course, was that you could maybe also give me some tips how I can ...* (lines 038ff). He then opposes his original understanding of handling such challenging situations with the coach's help (lines 050f: *that there would be hard and fast rules for every situation which work at the touch of a button*) with his new understanding of solving these situations, i.e. via a re-focusing on his intra-personal level, succinctly expressed in his gist summary *but I think that the key to that lies in the individual, of course. Somewhere.* (lines 051ff).

The client (and the coach) have so far pursued or worked on a factual concern as regards successful positioning strategies for the client as an executive manager in a new position; from now on – and introduced by the client's *the key to that lies in the individual, of course* – they will pursue and work on the client's intra-personal experiences and emotions in order to strengthen his impact and persuasive power on the outside, i.e. in his professional interaction with colleagues.

7.1.2 Exploring the concern and defining the goal

A next important act in diagnosing the client's coaching concern is for coach and client to (further) explore the elicited and/or presented concern and to mutually define *the* concern or *the* goal for their coaching interaction. Given the prospective, solution-oriented focus of executive coaching, the diagnostic activities on the whole center less on questions like '*what is the problem*' (i.e. the concern) and more on '*what are possible solutions*' (i.e. the goal) as part of the underlying goal orientation of coaching:

Alongside exploration of the contents of the concern and identification of the “problem” or the constellation of the problem, it is also a question of clarifying the desired solution, as concerns are usually divided into two parts, namely the problem or its symptoms, and also the desire for a solution. Clarification of the concern is completed by formulating a joint definition of a goal for the counseling or coaching. (Lalouschek 2013: 413; translated HH)

The core component of ‘Exploring the Concern and Defining the Goal’ entails that part of the communicative task of ‘Diagnosing’ where coach and client further process and (pre-)agree on the object of coaching by explicating the thematic scope of the concern/goal of coaching (cf. Nothdurft 1984: 66; Lalouschek 2013). A relevant aspect of exploring the concern and defining the goal is to transform them according to the underlying agenda of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*; i.e. these practices that (begin to) translate the clients’ subjective, life-world perspective on their concerns into the coaches’ professional categorization, i.e. a (re-)focusing of the clients’ perception of their concern from an external and inter-personal perspective to an internal or intra-personal perspective. Diverging relevancies between the coach, as representative of a particular profession, and the client make an (interactive) transformation process necessary (Cicourel 1992; Lalouschek 2005a; Sator 2011). Clients’ subjective experience is thereby fitted into coaching relevant categories, structure and terminologies via e.g. fragmentation (Lalouschek 2005a). Strategies to explore and define the concern in the current coaching approach are often linked to initiating a re-focusing of the client and his/her concern from the inter-personal level to the intra-personal level, i.e. to the discursive co-construction of emotions. Frequently found empathic practices such as active listening, validation, reformulations and re-interpretations (i.e. similar strategies as those applied during the proper intervening) prepare the ground for the ensuing feelings-talk during the intervening practices.

Excerpt46_CO1_CL3_1

In the following excerpt, CL3 talks about his difficult situation as a banking executive in times of the financial crisis: he wants to be a good and understanding boss for his staff but needs results, a dilemma which causes a lot of pressure:

```
001 CL3  strongly [in focus]
002 CO1  [yes yes] hm yes
003      (0.5)
004 CL3  there_s an additional challenge to that now
005 CL3  of course particularly in this difficult situation
006      (0.5)
007 CL3  erm
008      (0.25)
009 CL3  this
010      (0.5)
```


011 CL3 on the one hand
 012 (0.5)
 013 CO1 hmhm
 014 CL3 this personal side to management on the other
 015 CL3 hand the pressure from the figures [right]
 016 CO1 [i get it] i get it completely
 017 CL3 and
 018 CL3 and that is definitely
 019 CO1 a b[alancing act]
 020 CL3 [at the momen]t a balancing [act]
 021 CO1 [yes]
 022 CL3 to get it
 023 CO1 could you
 024 CL3 [right]
 025 CO1 [say p]articularly when you say that you_re very
 026 (0.25)
 027 CO1 oriented towards your staff and you
 028 CO1 pay special attention to people as individuals and you invest
 a lot of time in that too
 029 (1.1)
 030 CO1 is that something which well which simply takes up a lot if
 your time right
 031 CO1 on the one hand
 032 (0.25)
 033 CO1 more discussions even more discussion even more well
 034 CO1 care [for your] staff than usual on the other hand the
 pressure which is
 035 CL3 [hmhm]
 036 CO1 increasing the press[ure to perf]orm
 037 CL3 [((clears throat))]
 038 CO1 which is incre[asing]
 039 CL3 [this is] that_s one
 040 CL3 [thing]
 041 CO1 [that_s] the one thing [hmhm]
 042 CL3 [er altho]ugh with these things
 043 (0.25)
 044 CL3 well i think i haven_t yet
 045 CL3 found the the silver bullet in conversations ´ with your staff
 046 (0.5)

The client – in presenting his concern – details the challenging situation of leading his staff in a personal, individual and supportive manner (line 014: *this personal side to management*) and being pressured by the numbers or results he has to deliver (line 015: *the pressure from the figures*). Via acts of active listening the coach further processes or explores the client's concern: She first expresses her understanding and validates the client's challenge in *I get it, I get it completely* (line 016); she also collaboratively completes the client's assessment *and that is definitely a* (lines 018f) via *balancing act*, (line 019), another discursive practice to communicate empathy and affiliation. The coach, in her next step to further explore and define the client's concern according to the underlying professional theory of

Emotionally Intelligent Coaching, reformulates and re-interprets the client's report. Meta-pragmatically framed as a question *could you say* (lines 023ff), the coach first details and personalizes the client's *personal side to management* (line 014) in a three-part list *you're very oriented towards your staff and you pay special attention to people as individuals and you invest a lot of time in that too* (lines 025ff) and then reinterprets and further elaborates the client's dedication in the form of a question that invites the client's answer: *is that something which, well, simply takes up a lot of your time, right? On the one hand more discussions, even more discussions, even more, well, care for your staff than usual. On the other hand the pressure which is increasing, the pressure to perform which is increasing?* (lines 034ff). In his uptake the client partially agrees with the coach's re-interpretation *that's one thing* (lines 039f) and then continues to elaborate his concern *well I think, I haven't yet found the silver bullet* (lines 044f).

According to Lalouschek (2013), an essential component of 'Exploring the Concern and Defining the Goal' is clarifying its desired solution. In the following excerpt – a continuation of Excerpt 46 above – coach and client embark on such a clarification, i.e. of the silver bullet.

Excerpt46/2_CO1CL3_1

```

001      (0.75)
002 CO1  well let_s assume you could
003 CO1  say [let_s assume
004 CL3   [hmhm]
005 CO1  that you_d found this silver bullet
006 CL3   hmhm
007      (0.5)
008 CO1  well that would
009      (0.25)
010 CO1  you would be more successful at
011      (1.3)
012 CO1  achieving
013 CO1  a balance for things which are not working so well at the moment
014 CO1  so
015      (0.25)
016 CO1  what would be
017      (0.25)
018 CO1  what would be different in such a
019      (0.5)
020 CO1  conversation you have
021 [omission]
022 CL3   well what
023      (1.3)
024 CL3   so i think that i_d have
025      (0.25)
026 CL3   found the silver bullet
027 CL3   when f f when after these conversations

```

028 (0.75)
029 CL3 the
030 (0.75)
031 CL3 things we agreed on
032 (3.0)
033 CL3 would lead to success

In a next step to further explore and define the client's concern, the coach creates a hypothetical world and invites the client, with the help of the irrealis, to speculate on his silver bullet, i.e. his desired solution: *well, let's assume, you could say, let's assume that you'd found this silver bullet* (lines 002ff). She further elaborates on *silver bullet* and reformulates it to *well, you would be more successful at achieving a balance for things* (lines 008ff). Next, she prompts the client to reflect on the differences in these talks once he has achieved his silver bullet: *so what would be different in such a talk?* (followed by further elaborations on these conversations, not in transcript). The client, in an aligning manner, comes up with the following answer, also using the irrealis: *So I think that I'd have found the silver bullet when, after these conversations, the things we agreed on would lead to success* (lines 024ff).

While in the above excerpts we witness a step-by-step (more-or-less) co-exploration and co-definition of the client's concerns, the following excerpt evinces an asymmetrical top-down definition by the coach:

Excerpt47_CO2CL6_1

001 CO2 no no no but what is clear is that there is
002 CO2 so to speak
003 (0.75)
004 CO2 hm that_s maybe part a
005 (0.25)
006 CO2 major part of your
007 (0.25)
008 CO2 conflict
009 (0.5)
010 CO2 there is the person [NAME OF CLIENT] and there is the function
011 CL6 yes
012 CO2 [NAME OF CL[IENT]]
013 CL6 [yes y]es
014 (0.75)
015 CO2 sometimes they are exactly the same
016 CL6 hmhm
017 CO2 and
018 CO2 sometimes [not]
019 CL6 [hmh]m
020 (0.75)
021 CL6 yes
022 (0.75)
023 CO2 and the causes are very different

The coach, in a straight-forward and unmitigated manner, following the client's verbalizations as regards his (very vague) reasons for coaching, comes up with a professional categorization and assessment of the client's concern, pre-announced via *but what is clear is* (line 001), namely *there is the person (NAME OF CLIENT) and there is the function (NAME OF CLIENT)* (lines 010ff) and *that's maybe part, a major part of your conflict* (lines 004ff). The coach continues (not in transcript) to elaborate on these reasons and finishes off his professional assessment by formulating the question or concern *and how do you manage something like that successfully without becoming an optimized zombie?*, an assessment met by the client's uptake and agreement.

Another ingredient of co-constructing the client's concern is an explicit mutual definition of the client's goal in coaching: "(c)larification of the concern is completed by formulating a joint definition of a goal for the counseling or coaching" (Lalouschek 2013: 424). This mutual defining of the goal in coaching is illustrated in the following excerpt:

Excerpt48_CO2CL5_2

```

001      (1.5)
002 CO2  erm
003      (1.5)
004 CO2  well for you it would be a good result today
005 CO2  to have implemented let_s say a kind of plan of action or a
        strategy
006 CL5  yes i
007 CL5  in the end i also need a a strategy so that i can also deal
        with this uncertain er
008 CL5  situation

```

The client's straight-forward and facts-oriented content and presentation of his concern as *so I would like to have a kind of guideline for me how I can navigate through these conflicts* (see lines 009ff in Excerpt 42) does not lead to extended negotiation and processing sequences between the participants; instead, the coach, shortly after the client has presented his concern, reformulates *a kind of guideline* as *plan of action* and *strategy* (both line 005). The client, in a latched answer, agrees with the coach's reformulation *yes* (line 006) and in turn offers his own reformulation, in alignment with the coach's words: *in the end I also need a strategy so that I can also deal with this uncertain situation* (lines 007f).

7.1.3 Mapping the current state

As coaching transpires across a number of sessions and thus represents a ‘conversation-in-a-series’ in Button’s (1991) sense, a core component of coach and client’s discursive acts of diagnosing during follow-up sessions is ‘Mapping the Current State’: the initial thematic orientation of the coaching interaction may have changed either within the original concern or new or follow-up concerns (Robinson 2006) may have become thematically (and thus interactively) relevant. Thus the current state as regards the thematic scope and developmental state of the relevant concern(s) needs to be assessed in communicative loops in order to guarantee the extended connectedness of the encounters (cf. Peräkylä et al. 2008: 15) and as necessary preparation for the interventive acts to follow (Vehviläinen 1999; Maier-Gutheil 2009). Coach and client thereby discursively orient to the difference between the ‘new concern’ and ‘follow-up concern’, i.e. concerns which were raised and worked on during a previous session and which are now being followed up on in terms of e.g. the client’s insights or observations (cf. Robinson 2006: 23). Given the particular context of the current executive coaching approach with its strong focus on clients’ emotionality and personality, the thematic orientation of clients’ concern sometimes develops from an inter-personal perspective to an intra-personal perspective. Such a change in thematic focus concurrently entails a change in interventive practices.

‘Mapping the Current State’ not only entails integrating insights and new experiences, etc. from (between) the various sessions or the integration of a changed thematic orientation and thus a possible change on the interactive level as regards the necessary interventive acts. Mapping the current state also aims to integrate possible insights that clients have gained while working on their issues during the *Emotional Intelligence* training.

Excerpt49_CO1CL2_2

Just prior to the transcript, coach and client – as part of their pre-coaching small talk – have talked about how long it takes the client to get from her home to the coach’s premises.

```
001 CO1  yes ha then on this trip half way round the world
002 CO1  you've probably had a bit time to tune into today
003 CL2  yes
004 CO1  right
005 CL2  that's true that is the
006      (0.75)
007 CL2  the advantage when you i have
```

The coach indirectly invites the client to map her current state by offering the following assumption: *then on this trip half way round the world you've probably had a bit of time to tune into today* (lines 001f). The client agrees via *yes, that's true* (lines

003ff) and elaborates on the advantages of not carrying something to read on the subway as this gives her the time to think and reflect, not in transcript).

Excerpt49/2_CO1CL2_2

Following the client's elaborations, the coach further pursues her agenda point of 'Mapping the Current State':

001 CO1 and
 002 (0.25)
 003 CO1 er when you sense how you feel today
 004 CO1 to be here now also after the seminar and we can simply
 005 CO1 take the time well °h to sense your feelings what your
 006 CO1 mood is like your condition
 007 (0.5)
 008 CL2 °h actually pretty good
 009 CL2 i_d say all in all so the seminar
 010 (0.25)
 011 CL2 °h was very intensive
 012 CL2 once again but was well er f i just found it
 ((unintelligible)) very
 013 CL2 good for me °h and it also cleared up some questions from
 last time
 014 CL2 astonishingly enough
 015 CO1 hmhm
 016 (0.25)

The coach invites the client to focus on her current emotional state via the action invitation *when you sense* (line 003) and an open topic elicitation (line 003: *how you feel today*), yet thematically focused on the client's well-being or emotional state after having participated in the *Emotional Intelligence* training between their coaching sessions. The client, in an aligning manner, first offers a relatively positive general assessment as regards her current state: *actually, pretty good, I'd say. All in all* (lines 008f). Immediately afterwards, and thereby aligning with the coach's thematic orientation as regards her experience with the training, she embarks on reporting about her insights from the training as regards her personality parts, new insights, which will be integrated and worked on by coach and client in their ensuing coaching work.

Résumé – Communicative task 'Diagnosing'

The communicative task of 'Diagnosing' evinces the following core components in the data: the clients' concern or their goal for coaching is elicited or invited by the professional coach as a first step to get the process of diagnosis going and clients, in turn, present their concern or goal via narrative or descriptive reconstruction practices. The clients' recounting acts offer the material that is transformed by the coaches according to their professional agenda and that is further explored and finally and ideally re-constructed and defined as a 'coaching object' as the result

of the coach and client’s interactional achievement of their (collaborative) acts of diagnosing. Given the character of coaching as a ‘conversation-in-a-series’, the status of the coaching objects, once established, needs to be assessed during each meeting anew, i.e. coach and client also engage in actions to map the current state of the client’s concern.

Table 13. Communicative task ‘Diagnosing’ – Core components

Communicative task	Core components
Diagnosing	Eliciting and Presenting the Concern
	Exploring the Concern and Defining the Goal
	Mapping the Current State

As regards the structural positioning of the communicative task of ‘Diagnosing’, we observe a prominence of diagnostic practices during (the initial part of) a first coaching session (Müller 2006; Schreyögg 2012). This holds equally true for other professional formats such as therapy or doctor-patient interaction as the diagnostic results lay the groundwork for the upcoming interventions on the part of the professional. Yet, we witness a gradual transition from acts of ‘Diagnosing’ to acts of ‘Intervening’ as these core communicative tasks of the basic activity of ‘Co-Constructing Change’ often go hand in hand and merge into one another in interactive and communicative loops: “due to the change process of presentation and reaction by the coach, the concern gains form and shape with its explicit and implicit expectations” (Müller 2006: 34; translated HH).

7.2 Intervening

‘Intervening’, generally defined as any interference in the affairs of others, is understood here more specifically as any communicative action – initiated by the coach and further worked on by coach and client in their particular interaction – that further processes the client’s concern(s) and/or goal(s) (cf. Becker-Mrotzek and Brünner 2007; Lalouschek 2013; Deplazes 2016). These have been previously co-constructed by coach and client in and through their diagnostic activities; the type and interactive realization of the interventions thereby depend on the prior identification and classification of particular coaching objects to which particular interventions can act as a response (cf. Hutchby 2007: 59). A particular case in point here is the question as to whether the coaching objects are located on the client’s inter-personal interaction field or his/her intra-personal interaction field, i.e. whether or not clients have presented their emotionality as their coaching object

during the diagnosing acts. Furthermore, the intervening practices should also ‘fit’ the agreed-on individual definition of coaching by coach and client during the basic activity of ‘Defining the Situation’.

7.2.1 Practicing mindfulness

The work of the coaches in the corpus is characterized by a very strong focus on verbal interaction with their clients. The only recurring non-verbal intervening action is ‘Practicing Mindfulness’, which represents a core concept of their professional theory of *Emotional Intelligence* and the IFS model. This form of self-awareness is both the aspired state of mind in clients, when they are working on the clients’ concern on their intra-personal level (see below), and a concrete exercise to be learned and practiced in the face-to-face interaction between coach and client (and transferred to the outside-the-coaching realm). The exercise is verbally framed and – depending on the client’s experience – either practiced as some kind of focusing or preparatory work for ensuing feelings-talk or ‘taught’ to a learning client in the form of a practical exercise.

In the following excerpt, mindfulness is ‘taught’ to a client as a means to be more in contact with himself and his feelings.

Excerpt50_CO1CL3_2

The coach – time and again – has mentioned mindfulness as a desirable state for CL3 to be in better contact with his feelings and thus to develop a better feeling for other people (= his staff), too. In this context she has concretely suggested that the client, on arriving at his workplace, for example, and before getting out of his car and entering the office, should take some time to focus on his inner state. Just prior to the excerpt, the client has inquired about how to do that, i.e. how to focus on his emotional experiences:

```
001      (0.5)
002 CO1  well
003      (1.6)
004 CO1  i can certainly do it w accompany your briefly
005 CL3  hmhm
006 CO1  so that you simply [for a while]
007 CL3  [yes that is]
008 CO1  right
009 CL3  i_d say [the th]is
010 CO1  [yes]
011      (0.25)
012 CL3  the starting point in order to be able to
013 CO1  precisely
014 CL3  practice it as well [that wo]uld be
015 CO1  [yes]
016 CL3  that would be [reall]y good
017 CO1  [yes]
```


018 CL3 [of course] yes
019 CO1 [precisely]
020 (0.5)
021 CO1 well the first step is the same as
022 CO1 now in that you find a comfy position to be in that can
include you saying
023 CO1 yes like this but it can also be the case that you_d
024 (0.25)
025 CO1 rather put your legs
026 CO1 together [upright]
027 CL3 [hmhm] hmhm
028 (1.4)
029 CO1 and and then that
030 CO1 we can simply do that now that that you_d better close
031 CO1 your eyes
032 CL3 hmhm
033 CO1 or look at the floor so that you
034 (0.25)
035 CO1 don_t pick up on so
036 CO1 many signals [from th]e
037 CL3 [hmhm]
038 CO1 outer world
039 CL3 hmhm
040 (0.5)
041 CO1 hm precisely
042 (2.5)
043 CO1 precisely
044 (0.5)
045 CO1 and
046 (1.3)
047 CO1 when you
048 (0.25)
049 CO1 then say to yourself inwardly i_ll
050 CO1 switch off now
051 (0.75)
052 CO1 leave the outer world behind
053 (2.4)
054 CO1 and i_ll just take
055 CO1 a bit of time to
056 (0.25)
057 CO1 go inside myself and to
058 (1.7)
059 CO1 take note of myself
060 (1.5)
061 CO1 take note of your body how you are sitting here on the
062 (1.0)
063 CO1 cushion
064 (10.4)
065 CO1 and it can also be the case that you when you
066 (0.5)
067 CO1 focus on your inner self you_ll naturally also notice that
there are noises
068 (0.25)

069 CO1 out there
 070 (3.9)
 071 CO1 but that you allow yourself to take more
 072 (2.2)
 073 CO1 notice of what
 074 CO1 thoughts are in there for example
 075 (9.4)
 076 CO1 or another useful thing to take note of is
 077 CO1 always bodily perceptions basically where there_s
 078 (1.9)
 079 CO1 tension or
 080 CO1 which parts of your body are relaxed
 081 (22.8)
 082 CO1 and there_s no need to change anything
 083 CO1 in the perception of what it is either it_s more a case
 084 (0.5)
 085 CO1 of being curious
 086 CO1 and open towards what can i pick up
 087 (0.75)
 088 CO1 of what_s going on inside me
 089 (6.5)
 090 CO1 how do i feel right now in my body
 091 (10.5)
 092 CO1 what can i pick up on
 093 (1.0)
 094 CO1 of
 095 CO1 what_s concerning me
 096 (19.3)
 097 CL3 hm
 098 (2.2)
 099 CL3 that_s rather
 0100 (3.5)
 0101 CL3 i
 0102 CL3 have just tried not to [think of] of anything in particular
 but
 0103 CO1 [hmmh]
 0104 CL3 to really
 0105 (0.5)
 0106 CL3 listen into the my body [and]
 0107 CO1 [hm]hm
 0108 (2.2)
 0109 CL3 well
 0110 CL3 what i surely now don_t know w whether that was five minutes i
 0111 CL3 don_t know but
 0112 (0.5)
 0113 CL3 there was a (.)
 0114 CO1 two three three minutes maybe three
 0115 CO1 [minutes] hmmh
 0116 CL3 [really]
 0117 (0.5)
 0118 CL3 there was somehow such a such a feeling of being relax[ed]
 0119 CO1 [h]mhm

Inspired by the client's question as to how mindfulness works, the coach gives the client a guided practicing of mindfulness in the here-and-now of their coaching interaction (line 004: *I can certainly accompany you briefly*), an offer which the client explicitly accepts as *in order to be able to practice it as well, that would be really good, of course* (lines 012ff). In the following training sequence, the coach takes the client step by step through 'practicing mindfulness', i.e. she instructs him how to 'be mindful'. The coach first instructs him to find a comfortable seating position and to close his eyes or look downwards, accounting for her instructions via *so that you don't pick up on so many signals from the outer world* (lines 033ff) and inviting the client to really practice that with her *we can simply do that now* (line 030). She then takes the client in a step-by-step manner from the 'outside' to the 'inside' in slow motion via inserting many and long pauses: she guides the client through an inner monologue with himself, by speaking for the client as in *I'll switch off now, leave the outer world behind (2.4s) and I'll just take a bit of time to go inside myself and to (1.7s) take note of myself ...* (lines 049ff) and details and granulates his possible bodily and sensational experiences (e.g. lines 079f: *tension or which parts of your body are relaxed*). In addition, she also unburdens the client in a situation that is (extremely) unfamiliar to him by telling him how to deal with his possible sensations or experiences *there's no need to change anything in the perception ... it's more a case of being curious and open towards: "What can I pick up on of what's going on inside me? How do I feel right now in my body? What can I pick up on of what's concerning me?"* (lines 082ff). The client – after a marked pause of nearly 20 seconds – reports about his experience with the practice: he has tried to think about nothing and to just listen to his body and *there was somehow such a feeling of being relaxed* (line 0118). In its vagueness the client's answer attests to his unfamiliarity with that kind of 'tool' or practice.

7.2.2 Processing the concern on the intra-personal level

According to the underlying professional theory of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, clients' change depends on (re-)focusing or reframing (Watzlawick et al. 1974) them from the external, factual level to the internal, emotional level, which allows them to better understand their inner self (and their emotions, which are here re-interpreted as personality parts) and thus to act better or more successfully (i.e. emotionally more appropriately) on the outside in their professional realm as executives. This also entails, in the first step, a focus on oneself, succinctly explained by the female coach to her male client in the context of 'Exploring the Concern and Defining the Goal': *now in coaching we can only work on topics which you are really in a position to influence* (not in transcript).

In certain cases, however, no re-focusing is required, given that the clients themselves are focusing on the intra-personal level as regards their concern due to their experience from the *Emotional Intelligence* training (e.g. the female client CL7 offers the following when invited by the coach to present her concern during their first session: *it has very much to do with me personally and with my inner balance and my inner family* (lines 009ff in Excerpt 27 in Chapter 6). In these cases, the depth of the process to co-construct change is deeper, i.e. the interaction-field ‘coach – client – client’s personality parts’ is acted out via e.g. the coach guiding the client through a dialogue with his/her personality parts.

The various intervening strategies or discursive practices in the context of processing the concern on the intra-personal level that feature prominently in the current data can be subsumed under ‘feelings-talk’. Feelings-talk is defined as “various aspects of eliciting, refocusing and evoking emotions in the client. Clients’ emotions and emotionality are thereby first brought into the open, i.e. turned into the primary conversational topic, and then processed along the ensuing interaction” (Fiehler 2005) to allow for a reinterpretation and reorganization that enhances the clients’ quality of life (Graf and Pawelczyk 2014: 66f).

One discursive practice to bring the clients’ emotions into the open, i.e. to turn them into the primary topic of their in-situ interaction with the coach and thus to initiate feelings-talk, is to name or topicalize the client’s feelings. Such empathic behavior or ‘noticing’ (cf. Schegloff 2007: 219) signals the coach’s emotional presence to the client and (can) thus function as a relevant gate-opener for intervening acts on the intra-personal level.

Excerpt51_CO1CL2_1

As part of the presentation of her concern, the female client is reading out and commenting on what her line manager wrote down as regards her coaching goals or her concern for coaching. She meta-pragmatically summarizes its thematic content as *so, well, that was on the topic of dealing with emotions* (lines 003f) and positively assesses it as *well, it fits in, just like he describes it* (lines 004f).

```
001 CL2   good
002       (0.25)
003 CL2   so well that was
004 CL2   on the topic of dealing with emotions well it fits in just like
005 CL2   he er like he describes it
006 CO1   before you er read out what [FIRST NAME SURNAME]
007 CO1   wrote i_d really like to just well
008       (0.25)
009 CL2   ye[s]
010 CO1   [e]r
011 CO1   ask you well because i have the feeling even as you talk
012 CO1   about it now right it_s
013       (0.25)
```

014 CO1 already tangible here and the
015 CL2 yes
016 CO1 emotions are probably also there now aren_t they yes yes
017 CL2 yes yes
018 CO1 °h and are you experiencing it as pleasant now the emotions or
019 CO1 also the commitment you_re talking about them with and
020 (0.25)
021 CO1 or is it
022 CO1 also a bit stressful
023 (0.5)
024 CL2 rather
025 CL2 stressful [as well]
026 CO1 [stressful]
027 (0.25)
028 CL2 so not pleasant
029 CO1 it_s not pleasant
030 CL2 no
031 CO1 hmhm
032 (0.5)
033 CL2 hmhm
034 CO1 °h and when you sense the feeling the
035 CO1 unpleasantness is that the palaver er
036 (0.25)
037 CO1 or when we
038 CO1 sense the feelings what what is a stressful question when you
039 CO1 talk about it
040 CL2 ((breathes in loudly through her nose))
041 (8.0)
042 CL2 °h i can_t say
043 CL2 so precisely what[_s so stressful ab]out it either it_s
simply stressful
044 CO1 [hmhm hmhm]
045 CO1 yes
046 (0.5)
047 CO1 so it uses up ((unintelligible)) it uses up energy [hmhm]
048 CL2 [hmhm]

In the current excerpt, we witness how the female client, although talking about her emotions and agreeing with her boss's assessment as regards her emotionality, is distanced and detached from her own emotionality at the beginning of their coaching encounter. In order to help the client access her emotionality, the coach intervenes via first pre-announcing her action *before you read out what (NAME) wrote, I'd really like to just ask you* (lines 006ff) and then address the client's in-situ emotionality *it's already tangible there and the emotions are probably also there now?* (lines 012ff). She frames her statement in a tentative manner, by offering her state of emotions and using the ego-referential epistemic expression *because I have the feeling* (line 011). After the client agrees with the coach's assessment as regards the presence of her feelings, the coach inquires further into the nature of these feelings by re-focusing the client on the quality of her feelings with the help of a closed

question: *are you experiencing it as pleasant now, the emotions ... or is it also a bit stressful?* (lines 018ff). The client – in an aligning manner – responds by repeating the coach's words and opting for the negative quality *rather stressful as well, so not pleasant* (lines 024ff), which in turn is repeated and ratified by the coach. After coach and client mutually agree on the quality of the client's in-situ feelings, the coach proceeds to further inquire into the quality of this unpleasant feeling: she invites the client to sense her inner state or feeling (line 034: *and when you sense the feeling*) and further explores these feelings by detailing them *the unpleasantness. Is that the palaver?* (lines 034f) or *what is stressful when you talk about it?* (lines 038f) in question form in order to enhance the client's self-reflection. The client – after a marked pause of 8 seconds ('client's time') – responds to the coach's question and they continue their explorative and self-reflexive feelings-talk, i.e. to process the client's concern on the intra-personal interaction field.

In those cases where the client's feelings, or (inappropriate) emotionality, are (pre-)established as the primary topic or concern, the interactional resources of coaching-specific feelings-talk as discursive practices to process this primary topic or concern are

- talking about the client's emotions and/or personality parts (see Excerpt 52) and
- experiencing one's emotions and/or personality parts (see Excerpts 53 and 54).

'Talking about the client's feelings and/or personality parts' thereby often functions as preparation for 'experiencing one's emotions and/or personality parts'.

Excerpt52_CO1CL2_2

Between her first and her second coaching session, the client has participated in the second part of the *Emotional Intelligence* training where they also worked with her personality parts as representatives of her contradicting emotions. These contradicting emotions cause her to experience life (both in the professional and private realm) as extremely exhausting and unpleasant; working on these emotions, i.e. changing her emotional experiencing, is the client's primary concern in coaching.

```

001 CO1   hm
002 CL2   and er
003       (0.5)
004 CL2   and again that was a really interesting experience for me
005 CL2   because one part it_s like this i called one part the mother
         lion
006 CL2   that one_s a really strong protective very energetic
007 CL2   part °h
008 CO1   hm hm [hm]
009 CL2   [it] was very angry very ve[ry angry °h]
010 CO1   [hm hm]
```

011 (0.25)
012 CL2 and
013 CO1 hm
014 CL2 then it occurred to me that between the last seminar and this
one
015 CL2 there were four or five scenes where i also became extremely
016 CL2 angry at work so where i could simply
017 CO1 yes
018 CL2 not control my feelings any more at all

In reporting on the seminar, the client classifies her experience there as very interesting and focuses in particular on her experience with a personality part which she calls the *mother lion*, one which she describes as *that one's a really strong, protective, very energetic part* (lines 006f) and which was extremely angry during this seminar (line 009: *it was very angry. Very, very angry*).

Excerpt52/2_CO1CL2_2

She next relates her experience of being so angry during the seminar with feeling angry on many occasions outside, in real life, and embarks on recounting one of these occasions: after an open-air theater event one night she was cycling home with her husband and fell behind because he was cycling faster and other people got in her way. As she does not see well in the dark, the whole situation was very unpleasant for her (lines 001f: *so it was a really unpleasant situation for me*).

001 CL2 skidded °h and then i (.) so it was a really
002 CL2 unpleasant situation for me there in the dark and erm
003 (0.5)
004 CO1 yes
005 CL2 and i can_t se[e anything] at all and so dreadful °h and
006 CO1 [yes yes]
007 (3.5)
008 CL2 and
009 CL2 so there was this frightened little girl and then the mother
lion arrived
010 (0.25)
011 CL2 then he er stopped for once and then i was so fed up with him
012 CL2 that i slapped him in the face which was ((laughing a bit))
013 CL2 which was really not the right thing to do and no[t]
014 CO1 [ye]s
015 CL2 something [that i norm]ally
016 CO1 [yes yes]
017 CL2 do
018 CO1 but something snapped there didn_t it
019 CL2 and a[nd that th]at was
020 CO1 [yes yes]
021 CL2 precisely the mother lion again namely beca[use she said how can]
022 CO1 [yes yes yes yes] yes
023 CL2 this nasty man [erm not prote]ct
024 CO1 [yes yes yes]
025 CO2 the little [girl]
026 CO1 [hm] hm hm hm

After framing the whole situation as very unpleasant and spooky for her, the client next switches to explaining her experience and her emotional reactions with the help of her personality parts: *and so there was this frightened little girl and then the mother lion arrived* (line 009). The client continues to describe the situation, i.e. after some time her husband stopped and waited for her and she, in all her anger, slapped him in the face. The coach, following the client's argument on the intra-personal level of her personality parts, re-interprets the client's reaction as *something snapped there, didn't it?* (line 018). This reinterpretation, in turn, is further specified and elaborated by the client in an aligning manner in *and that was precisely the mother lion again, namely, because she said, how can this nasty man not protect the little girl* (lines 019ff).

In order to process the client's concern (i.e. to change her (negative) emotional attitude towards her life, both in the professional and private realm as something extremely exhausting and unpleasant), the participants talk about the client's personality parts as representatives of her emotions and their – i.e. the parts' – reactions as well as the reasons for these reactions; the overall interventive goal here is to better understand these emotions, to accept them and thereby change their negative dimension.

While Excerpt 52 illustrates an instance where the participants talk about the client's emotions in the context of her experience with her personality parts as a discursive strategy to process the concern on the intra-personal level, the following excerpts illustrate cases where the clients (re-)experience their emotions instead of talking about their emotions. This represents another widely practiced discursive practice to process the clients' concern on the intra-personal level in the context of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*.

Such an experiential approach to the clients' emotions or (challenging) emotional experiences as their primary concern works via

- re-enacting concrete situations from the client's past that were emotionally challenging (see Excerpt 53) or
- further exploring the clients' personality parts (in those cases where the clients have participated in *Emotional Intelligence* training) (see Excerpt 54).

7.2.3 Re-enacting concrete situations

A frequently found interactional resource to foster feelings-talk in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is to re-enact an incident, whereby coach and client, in processing the latter's concern, thematically return to one of those episodes from the client's professional and/or private realm they have previously (i.e. during their diagnosing sequences) verbalized as significant, problematic or challenging etc..

These episodes or incidents are staged and re-enacted in situ in a phantasmatic transposition in Bühler's (1934) sense as coaches reorient the clients from an external perspective on their inter-personal relations with colleagues, members of staff or their boss etc. towards an internal perspective as regards their emotional experiences and inner states in the context of these inter-personal encounters in order to help them access, accept and change the involved feelings or emotions (i.e. in order to process their concerns 'problematic emotionality'). In particular the latter aspect of changing one's emotions is achieved via trying out alternative reactions in the local interaction with the coach.

Excerpt53_CO1CL4_1

In the following excerpt, the coach and client pick the incident 'telephone conversation with the client's step-daughter' as a concrete example to work on the client's emotionality (he usually overreacts, behaving in a brusque and disapproving manner which he later regrets). The coach first invites the client to describe how such a telephone conversation normally transpires:

```
001          (0.75)
002 CO1    good °h let_s take another look
003 CO1    first of all at how things normally proceed
004          (0.75)
005 CO1    okay
006          (0.5)
007 CO1    good
008 CL4    hmhm
009 CO1    °h
010          (0.5)
011 CO1    well then slow motion means um also that i ask you to simply
012 CO1    dw also dwell on part of it so to speak like
013 CO1    stopping it the movie i mean
014 CL4    hmhm
015 CO1    okay
016          (4.0)
017 CO1    so just
018 CO1    conjure up the
019          (0.25)
020 CO1    room where the telephone is and it rings
021 CL4    hmhm
022 CO1    and then you
023          (0.25)
024 CO1    sit down and pick up the receiver
025          (3.0)
026 CO1    sort of preparing yourself
027 CO1    mentally for the
028          (3.0)
029 CO1    familiar con[versation]
030 CL4    [hmhm]
031          (2.0)
032 CO1    and then let
033 CO1    yourself
```

034 (0.5)
 035 CO1 take it in as well in
 036 (2.0)
 037 CO1 these first few
 038 (0.25)
 039 CO1 moments
 040 (2.0)
 041 CO1 when such a demand comes
 042 (2.0)
 043 CO1 or such a sentence
 044 (3.0)
 045 CO1 how you register for the very first time that something is
 reacting inwardly
 046 (6.0)
 047 CO1 how do you pick up on your first inner reaction this
 048 CO1 taking everything for granted
 049 (12.0)
 050 CO1 does something happen in your body or is it
 051 CO1 a thought
 052 (0.5)
 053 CO1 feeling

After *good* (line 002) as a structuring device that marks the transition to the proper ‘processing work’, the coach begins, after yet another short information-delivery sequence to explain *slow motion* like in a movie (lines 011ff), to navigate the client through his re-enacting the telephone call with his step-daughter as it transpires in the moment (line 003: *how things normally proceed*). She thereby gives both stage instructions on how to mentally re-construct the imaginary scenario and lists possible options to guide his self-exploration as regards possible internal, bodily or emotional, reactions (line 045: *something is reacting inwardly*, or lines 050ff: *does something happen in your body or is it a thought, a feeling*). Interactively, she verbalizes the method of ‘slow motion’ by speaking in short sentences or half-sentences, by inserting long pauses and detailing strategies that aim to break up the re-enacted incidents, the verbalized emotional experiences or bodily impressions into smaller and smaller units.

Excerpt53/2_CO1CL4_1

After a long pause of 12 seconds, the client embarks on a scenic description where he replicates parts of the imaginary telephone conversation and inserts parts of his inner monologue.

001 (12.0)
 002 CL4 well basic (.) well
 003 CL4 basically it_s like this erm when i got to the phone ((laughs))
 004 CL4 and i see the number on the display
 005 CO1 hmhm hm[hm]
 006 CL4 [th]en i already think to myself oh
 007 CL4 [((laughs))]
 008 CO1 [hmhm ye]s here we go again

009 CO1 [oh ((laughs))]
010 CL4 [precisely] cautious
011 CO1 ca[u yes]
012 CL4 [let_s say]
013 CL4 a bit on the alert
014 CO1 a bit alarmed
015 CL4 hmhm th[e yellow li]ght
016 CO1 [yes yes]
017 (0.25)
018 CL4 is on
019 CL4 ((laughs)) [ah] what_s the matter now
020 CO1 [yes]
021 CO1 hmhm
022 CL4 ((laughs))
023 CO1 so s something inside
024 CO1 does assume that something will (.) something is about to
happ[en]
025 CL4 [ye]s preci[sely]
026 CO1 [hm]hm
027 (0.25)

The client initiates and pre-announces the scenic description of his emotional experiences prior to picking up the phone via *well basically, it's like this* (lines 002f) and then describes step-by-step in the present tense and in an emotionally agitated manner (the client laughs, uses emotion exclamations such as *oh!*, or quotes his thoughts in direct speech as in *Ah! What's the matter now?* (line 019)). The coach both elaborates the client's exclamations as in *Here we go again* (line 008) and re-formulates his words as in *a bit alarmed* (line 014) to both signal to the client that she is hearing what he says, but also as a possible request to warrant and further detail what he says. She also re-interprets the client's inner monologue into *so something inside does assume that something will ... something is about to happen* (lines 023f); the coach thereby introduces the intra-personal level and re-orientes the focus of the client's verbalization according to the underlying coaching agenda to his personality parts, a refocusing met by the client's agreement and uptake: *yes, precisely* (line 025).

In what follows (not in transcript), coach and client further detail and granulate the client's inner and outer reactions to his step-daughter's call up until the client – in his re-enacting the telephone call – repeats his answer *no* to his step-daughter's expressed wish to celebrate her birthday at their place.

Excerpt53/3_CO1CL4_1

The coach continues to inquire into the client's feelings on turning down the step-daughter's wish:

001 CO1 °h and what_s it like the fact
002 CO1 that you start off by saying no what what are your own
fe[elin]gs
003 CL4 [ah]

004 CO1 abo[ut that]
 005 CL4 [often i] regret
 006 CL4 it afterwards
 007 CO1 hmhm
 008 (0.5)
 009 CL4 yes
 010 (0.5)
 011 CL4 it is a purely protective [mechanis]m
 012 CO1 [yes yes]
 013 CL4 yes
 014 (0.75)
 015 CL4 erm
 016 (2.0)
 017 CO1 hmhm
 018 (0.75)
 019 CO1 hmhm
 020 (2.0)
 021 CL4 so it_s possible that one i don_t
 022 CL4 only feel good about it
 023 CO1 °h yes
 024 (0.5)
 025 CO1 yes yes hmhm °h so there is something
 026 CO1 ambivalent about it for that reason it_s
 027 (0.25)
 028 CO1 good to notice that that
 029 (1.0)
 030 CO1 sometimes more sometimes less when you see the number that
 something
 031 CO1 starts up inside which also wants to protect you
 032 (0.5)
 033 CO1 such a
 034 CL4 yes
 035 CO1 protective mechanism starts up
 036 CL4 hmhm
 037 CO1 something like °h ah (let)
 038 CO1 something that
 039 (0.5)
 040 CO1 already sets itself to no
 041 CL4 precisely

She thereby addresses the client's feelings with his own reactions via an open question that aims to enhance his self-reflection: the client offers a negative assessment of his own behavior, which in turn serves as the basis for the coach's re-interpretation in *so there is something ambivalent about it* (lines 025f) and professional assessment: *for that reason it's good to notice that, sometimes more, sometimes less, that [something] starts up inside which also wants to protect you. Such a protective mechanism starts up ... something that already sets itself to "no"* (lines 026ff). The coach continues to re-shape the client's assessment of his own behavior according to the underlying model of personality parts (lines 030f: *something ... which also wants to protect you*) with its focus on the intra-personal level. She thus advances her

professional agenda to re-orient the client's perspective from the 'outside' to the 'inside' and from 'unconsciously reacting in an inadequate emotional manner' to 'understanding one's emotions and thus dealing with them adequately'.

Excerpt53/4_CO1CL4_1

Given that the overall purpose of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is not only to understand and accept, but also to change one's (problematic) emotionality, the coach next embarks on developing alternatives for and with the client:

```
001      (3.0)
002 CO1  °h so here there could be
003 CO1  if we
004      (0.25)
005 CO1  stop here for a while before we continue here there could be
006 CO1  a question mark um could i pick up the phone with a different
007      (0.5)
008 CO1  attitude
009      (1.0)
010 CL4  yes
011 CO1  so not in the sen[se]
012 CL4  [i co]uld be pleased
013 CL4  for a change
014      (1.0)
015 CO1  yes but it has to be realistic now maybe you don_t
016 CO1  [feel distur]bed just yet but
017 CL4  [((laughs))]
018      (0.25)
019 CO1  will do so soon (.) ((laughs)) so
020      (0.25)
021 CO1  let_s say
022 CO1  so
023 CL4  yes
024 CO1  what would be there what would be
025      (0.5)
026 CO1  so really realistically what would be
027      (0.5)
028 CO1  a change there or
029      (0.25)
030 CO1  a more positive
031      (0.5)
032 CO1  state of affairs when you like now
033 CO1  get to the phone
034      (0.25)
035 CO1  so when you would pick up the the receiver
036      (3.0)
037 CL4  °h
038      (8.0)
039 CL4  °h like with the others neutrality
040 CO1  more neutral
041      (0.5)
042 CL4  yes
043      (3.0)
```

044 CO1 hmhm
 045 CL4 well when my parents call or my sister
 046 CL4 sister curious
 047 CO1 curious curious

The coach frames her next procedural step in a question *so here there could be ... a question mark* (lines 005f) and via speaking for him (lines 006ff: *could I pick up the phone with a different attitude?*) prods the client to think of alternative reactions to seeing his daughter's number on the display (as opposed to lines 002f at the beginning of Excerpt 53: *let's take another look at how things normally proceed*). After he first offers *I could be pleased for a change* (lines 012f), which is professionally sanctioned by the coach as unrealistic (mitigated by laughter), the client aligns and – after a marked pause – offers *more neutral* (line 040) as an alternative behavior or reaction. By repeating the client's words, the coach signals both 'I hear you' and invites further elaboration, which is immediately offered by the client in line 046: *curious*. The sequence of 'searching for an alternative attitude' is finalized by further elaborating on the client's offered alternative *curious* and by mutually agreeing on a neutral and curious attitude as acceptable emotional reactions to his step-daughter's wish.

In order to process the client's concern (his inappropriate emotionality in situations where he does not feel respected and valued), the participants, in a step-by-step manner, re-enact a concrete situation with his step-daughter, where his inappropriate emotionality usually shows, and in doing so 'develop' alternative, more appropriate ways of showing his emotions in his interaction with his step-daughter.

Exploring further into the clients' personality parts

Given that some clients are more in contact and more immersed with their emotionality or their personality parts, the experiential processing of the clients' concern can set in and transpire on a deeper level: the data evinces instances where the coach navigates the client in the latter's own interaction with his/her personality parts, i.e. in the client's own dialogue with his/her personality, as in the following excerpt.

Excerpt54_CO1CL2_2

During her *Emotional Intelligence* training, the client has 'met' and defined various personality parts of hers, among them the 'mother lion' and the 'little girl' (as part of her overall concern, both in coaching and the training context) to work on her emotionally experiencing her life as exhausting and unpleasant). While in Excerpt 54, she reported about them in the context of 'talking about one's emotions / personality parts', the coach is now navigating the client on the intra-personal level through her interaction with her

personality parts ‘mother lion’ and ‘little girl’, i.e. there is a sort of staged or imaginary triadic interaction between coach – client – client’s personality parts.

The idea of the following emotion work (i.e. processing the client’s concern on the intra-personal, emotional level) is to allow the client’s weak and sensitive side, termed her ‘little girl’, to show more of itself and to reconcile the client with this part that has been neglected and little valued so far in the client’s success- and performance-oriented life.

As a first step, the coach invites the client, who is in good emotional contact with this personality part, i.e. her feeling weak and sensitive, to translocate this feeling to the outside of herself and to position it somewhere in the room:

```
001 CO1 good yes
002 (0.5)
003 CO1 good well then
004 CO1 now we can take a look at whether she can still find a good
005 (0.25)
006 CO1 place
007 (0.5)
008 CO1 so that she can keep her distance
009 (0.5)
010 CL2 so in the best case a bit to
011 CL2 the side but with the little girl in full view
012 CO1 hm[hm hmhm]
013 CL2 [and you to]o
014 CL2 so here
015 CO1 hmhm hmhm yes well °h hopefully ((unintelligible))
```

The coach initiates this imaginary interaction between the client and her personality part(s) by inviting the client to find a good place for the part: *well then, now we can take a look at whether she can still find a good place so that she can keep her distance* (lines 003ff). By using the first person *we*, she signals to the client that she is on the client’s side and that this exploration work is their mutual project. The client ‘locates’ the mother lion mentally in the room and comments her imaginary action via *in the best case a bit to the side, but with the little girl in full view. And you too, so here* (lines 010ff); the (deictic) place adverbials *to the side* and *here* thereby function to link her imaginary transposition to the here-and-now of her interaction with the coach.

Excerpt54/2_CO1CL2_2

Next, the coach invites the client to get into contact with the little girl:

```
001 CO1 okay hm ((laughing))
002 (4.0)
003 CO1 good then just give yourself
004 CO1 the time [NAME] to get into contact with the little girl so
005 (0.25)
006 CO1 really slowly like
007 (3.0)
008 CO1 you begin to become aware
```

009 (18.0)
 010 CL2 yes it_s there once again °h really
 011 CL2 strong this
 012 (2.0)
 013 CL2 grief but it_s also much more than grief
 014 CL2 it is also like a injuries
 015 (0.25)
 016 CL2 not only vulnerability but
 017 CL2 also being hurt as well
 018 CO1 hmhm
 019 (4.0)
 020 CL2 this i_m not allowed to be
 021 CL2 somehow then i also think of my parents
 022 (2.0)
 023 CL2 who also found it hard
 024 CL2 to cope with the with the little girl
 025 CO1 good

Via the action invitation *just give yourself the time, (NAME) to get into contact with the little girl so really slowly* (lines 003ff) in ‘slow motion’ (both verbally via *just give yourself the time* or *really slowly* and interactively by inserting many pauses), the coach orients the client emotionally towards her personality part, i.e. the little girl. After a long pause of 18 seconds, the client offers the feelings *really strong, this grief* (lines 010ff), *also like injuries* (line 014) and *not only vulnerability but also being hurt as well* (lines 016f) as a result of her coming into contact with the little girl. She next reformulates these feelings into *this I’m not allowed to be somehow* (lines 020f), speaking from the little girl’s perspective. Yet, immediately afterwards, she speaks again more from her own perspective as a client (i.e. dissociates from the intra-personal focus on the little girl) and relates the feeling with her parents: *then I also think of my parents, who also found it hard to cope with the little girl* (lines 021ff).

Excerpt54/3_CO1CL2_2

Yet the coach re-oriens the client back from the external perspective of her parents to the little girl and the latter’s feelings:

001 (0.75)
 002 CO1 (but) the little girl had the feeling i_m not allowed to be
 like that
 003 CO1 like i
 004 CL2 yes
 005 CO1 like i am
 006 (3.5)
 007 CL2 yes
 008 (0.75)
 009 CL2 well i i can feel it really clearly
 010 CL2 now strongly these
 011 (0.5)
 012 CL2 this feeling both as sadness and
 013 CL2 vulnerability

014 (4.0)
015 CL2 i_m deliberately allowing it to happen now
016 (0.25)
017 CL2 but the
018 CL2 little girl is not used to that
019 (0.25)
020 CL2 that she allows that it is allowed to
021 CL2 happen because (.)
022 CO1 hmhm
023 (6.0)
024 CO1 just show her that that you now
025 CO1 let it happen and that you
026 (2.0)
027 CO1 really have time
028 (0.5)
029 CO1 and space
030 (0.5)
031 CO1 for
032 (0.25)
033 CO1 the empathy
034 (20.0)
035 CO1 and you can take note
036 CO1 [FIRST NAME] of how she
037 (0.25)
038 CO1 reacts to it that you are there that
039 CO1 you are listening to her that you
040 (0.5)
041 CO1 are paying attention to her (like) like
042 CO1 she is experiencing it right now
043 CL2 ((clearing throat)) °h yes as i said she_s not
044 CL2 used to that and is somehow a little bit surprised but
045 CL2 also er feels that
046 (0.25)
047 CL2 it feels
048 (0.25)
049 CL2 good
050 (2.5)
051 CL2 it feels
052 CL2 good it_s what (.) °h particularly because this feeling of
sadness has
053 CL2 been totally reduced
054 (4.0)
055 CL2 let_s see whether that_s just a
056 CL2 wave
057 CO1 hm yes keep going
058 (9.0)
059 CL2 °h she_s now imagining

This re-orientation by the coach happens by repeating and reformulating the client's words into *but the little girl had the feeling, I'm not allowed to be like that, like I am* (lines 002ff). By speaking for the little girl, the coach also creates a greater emotional immediacy. As a consequence, the client now speaks about her feeling

(lines 009ff: *well, I can feel it really clearly now ... this feeling, both as sadness and vulnerability*), comments on her inner experience with this feeling (line 015: *I'm deliberately allowing it to happen now*) and also speaks from the perspective of the little girl (lines 017ff: *but the little girl is not used to that ... that it is allowed to happen*). The coach acknowledges the client's reporting of her inner experiences with the little girl and, after another long pause, engages in further action suggestions as regards the client's interaction with the little girl: *just show her that you now let it happen and that you really have time and space for the empathy* (lines 024ff). She also invites the client to observe and sense how the little girl reacts to this (lines 035ff: *and you can take note, (FIRST NAME), of how she reacts to it, that you are there*). These action suggestions and invitations as regards the client's contact with the little girl, i.e. with her sensitive and vulnerable side, are further detailed and granulated by the coach (e.g. *that you are listening to her* (lines 038f), *that you are paying attention to her* (lines 039ff)). In speaking for the little girl and for her feelings, the client first repeats the unfamiliarity of the situation (lines 043f: *she's not used to that and is somehow a little bit surprised*) and then positively qualifies the current feeling (due to validating the little girl and paying attention to her) *it feels good* (lines 051f), further accounting for the positive feeling via *particularly because this feeling of sadness has been totally reduced* (lines 052f). The coach invites the client to stay with the feeling and coach and client further explore the client's little girl (not in transcript).

CL2's primary concern, i.e. her negative emotions as regards her experiencing her (professional and personal) life as draining and joyless, is here further processed via the following intervening practices on the intra-personal level: we witness an imaginary triadic interaction or communication between the coach, who functions as a facilitator for the client in her interaction with her personality parts; while the coach addresses the client with her action suggestions etc., the client realizes those in her contact with her personality parts and thereby often functions as an interpreter between the coach and her personality part, by speaking both for herself and for her feeling or personality part in her answers or reactions to the coach.

To sum up, the primary discursive practice or intervention in order to have clients re-experience their emotions or personality parts, both in the context of 'Re-Enacting Concrete Situations' (see Excerpt 53) and in the context of 'Exploring the Clients' Personality Parts Further' (see Excerpt 54) as part of the core component 'Professing the Concern on the Intra-Personal Level' is 'Navigating'. Navigating is understood here as verbalizing the method of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, to speak with Peräkylä et al. (2005), as its interactional, professional or treatment theory. Via action suggestions (e.g. *that you sense it .../that you sense your feelings there ..., ask the part what it needs from you*), stage instructions that help a client

to re-enact an incident (e.g. *so just conjure up the room where the telephone is, and it rings ...*), questions that enhance the client's self-reflection and bodily awareness (e.g. *do you also feel that in your stomach?*), professional assessments (e.g. *that is naturally a really important feeling as well*) as well as re-formulations (e.g. *disappointed*) and re-interpretations (e.g. *so disappointed and maybe almost a bit sad about it?*), the coach guides the client's processing of his or her concern on the intra-personal level.

Another important aspect of coaches' 'Navigating' is turning 'Slow Motion' into discursive action by inserting pauses, speaking in short sentences, applying an elliptic style and detailing, granulating and reformulating one's verbalizations. Navigating the client in slow motion through his or her emotional experiences and the related personality parts allows the client to explore, understand, accept and – at times if necessary or wished for – change or better control his or her emotionality, i.e. his/her emotionality parts, as their overall primary concern in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*.

7.2.4 Processing the concern on the inter-personal level

Besides processing the concern on the intra-personal, emotional level, there are also instances in the data where the participants process external concerns on the inter-personal, factual level. External concerns refer to managerial questions such as conflict management, leadership issues or organizational questions; such factual concerns are tackled by clarifying their (outer) circumstances and by providing professional assessments or giving the client concrete advice. Yet, given the coaches' professional orientation and focus on emotional intelligence and mindfulness, little intervening work is found in the corpus in the context of such factual concerns.

Excerpt55_CO2CL5_2

In the following excerpt we witness how coach and client discuss the client's professional situation as a new executive facing problems maintaining his position against long-established counterparts in other countries. In the presentation of his concern (see Excerpt 42) the client formulated the need for a *guideline how I can navigate through these conflicts* (lines 016f). Just prior to the excerpt, he factually detailed these conflicts with his counterparts for the coach.

001 (1.5)
 002 CO2 so what i simply i have to clarify the
 003 CO2 situation again it wasn't so completely clear to me in our
 first session either
 004 (2.3)
 005 CO2 what is the balance of power like so as someone on the
 [sidelines no]w
 006 CL5 [hm hm]

007 (1.5)
 008 CO2 when i so to speak when i hear in [NAME OF COMPANY] there are very
 009 CO2 clear guidelines
 010 CL5 hm
 011 CO2 which cover this separation of powers between er
 012 CO2 underwriting and sales so to s[peak]
 013 CL5 [h]m
 014 CO2 and customer support
 015 CL5 hm
 016 CO2 and
 017 CO2 claim settlements
 018 CL5 hm hm
 019 (0.25)
 020 CO2 when it_s quite clearly [NAME OF COMPANY]_s
 021 CO2 policy even if it will maybe not be put into [effect]
 022 CL5 [hm]
 023 CO2 for two years
 024 CL5 hm

In order to discuss the client's professional situation on the inter-personal level, i.e. to develop such *guidelines* for the client, the coach (and the client) need(s) a clear picture of the situation. In what follows, the coach thus aims to clarify the client's professional circumstances. He pre-announces his need for clarification *I have to clarify the situation again* (lines 002f) and accounts for it via *it wasn't so completely clear to me in our first session either* (line 003), thereby pre-empting his later critique of the client's way of talking as being part of the problem. In order to clarify the circumstances, the coach marks the topic 'distribution of power' as relevant: *what is the balance of power like?* (line 005) and (continues to) challenge(s) the client: meta-pragmatically framing his perspective as that of an outsider *as someone on the sidelines now ... when I hear* (lines 005ff) he repeats and judges the reported power relations by the client: *when it's quite clearly (NAME OF COMPANY)'s policy, even if it will maybe not be put into effect for two years* (lines 20ff), *then I don't understand why it's still an issue!* (not in transcript). The client – after a pause – sets out to justify his assessment of the situation and coach and client continue to discuss the power relations in the client's new team (not in transcript).

Out of this discussion on power relations, the coach – as another of his intervening strategies on the inter-personal level – professionally assesses the client's situation (here as one in need of somebody else's support):

Excerpt56_CO2CL5_2

001 CO2 are you strong enough to fight against them
 002 CL5 hm
 003 CO2 that was the point let_s leave
 004 CO2 it there for a w[hile]
 005 CL5 [yes] y[es]
 006 CO2 [wh]ere i said you need [NAME] as cee ee o at least
 007 CO2 so that he can back you up

008 CL5 hm
009 (1.5)
010 CO2 because otherwise they haven_t really
011 CO2 got a reason to actually respond to you
012 CL5 ye[s]
013 CO2 [u]nless you were in terms of the
014 CO2 process from the way you argue it so skillful that you can
persuade them well that

The coach first asks the client, in a challenging way, whether he is strong enough to fight against the other older and more well-established executives; implying a negative answer to his rhetorical question, the coach repeats his professional assessment of what the client should do to maneuver through these conflicts: *where I said, you need (NAME) as CEO at least, so that he can back you up!* (lines 006f) and accounts for his assessment via another rather challenging assessment *because otherwise they haven't really got a reason to actually respond to you* (lines 010f). He continues his professional assessment of the client's situation via offering a condition, in the conditional form, under which the client's opponents would commit themselves to him: *unless you were, in terms of the process, from the way you argue it, so skillful that you can persuade them* (lines 013f). The coach is thereby preparing a thematic shift in focus from the client's (inter-personal) interaction with his professional partners to the client's (intra-personal) interaction with himself in the local context of their coaching encounter (see excerpt below): by questioning how persuasive the client is in his interaction with his colleagues, the coach prepares the ground for offering his personal assessment of how he personally experiences the client. The client, in turn, throughout this challenging assessment of his situation and capacities by the coach, remains rather passive.

The following excerpt (taken from the same session as Excerpt 56, yet during a later stage), illustrates another discursive strategy to work on the client's inter-personal issues: to mirror the client's inter-personal concern with the client's in-situ behavior with the coach in their local face-to-face interaction.

Excerpt57_CO2CL5_2

The coach orients to possible parallels between the client's communicative behavior in his professional realm (his lack of persuasiveness) and his local communicative behavior in the here-and-now of their coaching interaction. The transference is thereby turned into a focal theme or ethnocategory of the coaching by explicitly topicalizing it; the coach-client relationship is strategically used as a platform to enhance the client's learning and development.

001 CO2 yes yes yes so maybe already a bit of feedback on
002 CL5 hm
003 CO2 how well i can follow you
004 (1.5)
005 CO2 a[nd w]here

006 CL5 [hm]
 007 CO2 i ask myself how well can
 008 CO2 others th[en]
 009 CL5 [hm]
 010 CO2 follow you in such situations
 011 (1.0)
 012 CO2 er
 013 (3.5)
 014 CO2 if
 015 CO2 we_re talking about strategies now
 016 (2.0)
 017 CO2 what you_re saying and also the
 018 CL5 yes
 019 CO2 way in which you_re saying it
 020 CL5 hm
 021 CO2 and in that respect i could really imagine
 022 CO2 that i_ll sen[d yo]u
 023 CL5 [yes]
 024 CO2 the dee vee dee really soo[n and] that you
 025 CL5 [hm] h[m]
 026 CO2 should take another
 027 CO2 look at it
 028 CL5 yes
 029 CO2 to see whether what i_[m telling] you here whether you can
 spot it again
 030 CL5 [yes]
 031 CL5 yes
 032 (0.5)
 033 CO2 erm
 034 (1.7)
 035 CO2 in terms of the volume the intonation and the way in which
 036 CO2 you speak is ever[ythin]g
 037 CL5 [hm]
 038 CO2 the same
 039 CL5 hm
 040 CO2 well everything you say is almost
 041 CO2 the same
 042 CL5 hm
 043 CO2 and then it_s really hard for me as the person speaking to you
 044 CO2 to get an impression of what is fixed what is clear where is
 there [no]
 045 CL5 [hm]
 046 CO2 well i
 047 CO2 just want to make it really [clear del]iberately
 048 CL5 [yes yes]
 049 CO2 where is there no mistake
 050 CL5 hm

CO2 trans-locates the client's (possible) problem of not getting his point across convincingly into the here-and-now of their coaching encounter, thereby speaking from personal experience in his professional assessment: via an agenda move he pre-announces *Yes, yes, yes so maybe already a bit of feedback* (line 001) and gives

personal feedback as regards his local face-to-face interaction with the client and his difficulties in following the client's explanations *how well I can follow you* (line 003). In a syntactically aligned form, he next topicalizes his doubt as to how well other people, i.e. the client's professional colleagues or opponents, can follow him: *and where I ask myself, how well can others then follow you in such situations* (lines 005ff). He links and accounts for his thematic insertion with their overall topic of developing strategies for the client to be more convincing (lines 014f: *if we're talking about strategies now*) and refers to the recording of the session as an additional inter-ventive tool that gives the client the option to judge for himself (lines 021ff: *and in that respect, I could really imagine that I'll send you the DVD really soon and that you should take another look at it to see whether what I'm telling you here, whether you can spot it again*). He next details the client's way of communicating (lines 035f: *volume, intonation and the way in which you speak*), which he critically assesses as *everything the same* (line 036ff) and which he holds responsible for the difficulties a listener has to distinguish between things that are fixed and things that can be negotiated (lines 043f: *and then it's really hard for me as the person speaking to you to get an impression of what is fixed*). Throughout the coach's critical personal feedback, the client offers only minimal acknowledgement tokens.

According to the coach's professional assessment, the client's primary concern (his lack of persuasiveness and assertiveness in his professional context as a new executive) also shows in the latter's local interaction with him; the coach thus has immediate experiential access to and knowledge of this problematic behavior and topicalizes these parallels as an inter-ventive practice to process the client's concern on the inter-personal level.

Another recurring intervening practice on the inter-personal interaction field in the context of processing external, factual concerns is the delivery of professional assessments as regards clients' 'correct' professional behavior. In what follows, we witness how the coach clearly acts as a professional expert and advisor in the context of planning an upcoming meeting of the client with his CEO.

Excerpt58_CO2CL5_2

```
001 CO2  yes w[ell basically i be]lieve
002 CL5   [((unintelligible))]
003 CL5   yes
004 CO2   well my personal opinion
005 CO2   [is]
006 CL5   h[m]
007 CO2   it_s not about that for you
008       (1.2)
009 CO2   er
010       (4.0)
011 CO2   because you can do that anyway
012 CO2   for you i think it_s about
```

013 CL5 hm
 014 CO2 providing an awful lot of details for something
 015 CL5 hm
 016 CO2 and then letting the others decide
 017 CL5 hm
 018 CO2 i believe it_s
 019 CO2 very much about your proving that you have managerial skills
 [and sa]ying
 020 CL5 [hm]
 021 CO2 that_s my point of view those are the reasons fo[r it]
 022 CL5 [hm]
 023 CO2 that_s what i want to stand for
 024 (1.0)
 025 CO2 have i got your support
 026 CL5 hm
 027 (1.5)
 028 CO2 and if you_re not sure about that
 029 CO2 then ask again more precisely
 030 CL5 hm
 031 (1.5)
 032 CO2 let_s assume i have this
 033 CO2 talk and h[e say]s it in exactly the same way as he_s already
 said it to me
 034 CL5 [hm]
 035 CO2 it_s nothing to do with that that hm then i have to say to
 him that_s not my
 036 CO2 personal opinion that_s the opinion of [NAME OF COMPANY]
 backed up by the
 037 CO2 executive commi[ttee au]dits
 038 CL5 [hm]
 039 CO2 and this and that document
 040 CL5 hm
 041 (2.2)
 042 CO2 do you also
 043 CO2 see it like [that]
 044 CL5 [hm]
 045 CO2 so erm basically you have to nail down your boss
 046 CL5 [yes]
 047 CO2 [man]agement management and negotia[tion] style
 048 CL5 [yes]
 049 CL5 yes
 050 (2.0)
 051 CO2 so i suspect that
 052 CO2 after the first talk that_s also what he_s expecting that you
 first show your colors
 053 CO2 before you ask him about his colors
 054 CL5 hm
 055 (1.3)
 056 CL5 so you think better to come with
 057 CL5 documentation maybe that_s also easier for him naturally as
 058 (1.4)
 059 CL5 cee ee o
 060 CL5 then er to say yes i_ll back that up or
 061 CO2 of course defin[itely]

062 CL5 i won_t back that
 063 CL5 up
 064 CO2 that_s what you_re [ther]e for
 065 CL5 [hm]
 066 (1.0)
 067 CO2 that you p[repare] it
 068 CL5 [hm]
 069 (2.0)
 070 CL5 we[l1]
 071 CO2 because
 072 CO2 basically you could also be there as an advisor to the
 cee ee o

In the context of a planned conversation or strategy meeting the client is going to have with his boss (and the procedure for which the client detailed just prior to the excerpt), the coach gives the client his professional assessment, although meta-pragmatically framed as his personal opinion (lines 004f: *well, my personal opinion is*): the coach opposes giving more details and then having the other party decide (as was the client's proposed procedure) with proving leadership qualities, clearly stating his opinion and then prompting his boss's support as the more appropriate procedure: the coach emphasizes and details his suggestion via upgrading the alternative procedure *it's very much about your proving that you have managerial skills* (lines 018f), via speaking for the client during the hypothetical conversation with his boss *that's my point of view! Those are the reasons for it, that's what I want to stand for, have I got your support?* (lines 021ff) and via advising further behavior *and if you're not sure about that then ask again, more precisely* (lines 028f), which he details as regards the possible wording. He finalizes his alternative behavior via the gist formulation *so basically you have to nail down your boss* (line 045), a behavior he classifies as *management and negotiation style* (line 047). Next and framed via the ego-referential epistemic expression *I suspect* (line 051), the coach offers a professional assessment of the client's behavior as expected by his boss: *that you first show your colors before you ask him about his colors* (lines 052f). Here the client – for the first time during this assessment sequence – asks the coach to further explain by reformulating *so you think better to come with documentation, maybe that's also easier for him, as CEO, then to say, yes, I'll back that up or I won't back that up* (lines 056ff). The coach explicitly agrees with the client's elaboration *of course, definitely* (line 061) and in turn elaborates his uptake via *that's what you're there for, that you prepare it* (line 064ff) and finalizes his overall professional assessment of the client's (new) role in his relation with his boss as *advisor to the CEO* (line 072).

The client's factual concern on the inter-personal interaction field, i.e. his unconvincing and weak appearance as an executive, is tackled here via a concrete incident, i.e. an upcoming professional meeting with his CEO. Acting as professional expert and advisor, the coach delivers his professional assessment as regards the

client's planned procedure by turning it down and offering an alternative. In its advice and speaking-from-expertise manner, this form of (coaching) intervening practice clearly links up with management consulting.

7.2.5 Linking the intra-personal and inter-personal level

According to its underlying professional theory the current coaching approach stresses and pursues the intra-personal perspective towards the clients' feelings and inner experiences. Yet, concurrently in its executive orientation, the coaching is first and foremost an organizational intervention, geared towards the clients' learning and development in the context of their professional performance as executives. In order to amalgamate these two (opposing) agendas, we witness the following discursive practices in the data:

- a re-orientation of the clients' focus from the external, inter-personal level to the internal, intra-personal level (see Excerpt 59) and
- linking the clients' insights on the internal, intra-personal level back to the external, inter-personal level, i.e. tying the executive clients' insights and change concerning their emotionality back to the overall goal of executive coaching of working on their managerial and professional performativity (see Excerpt 60).

Excerpt 59_CO1CL3_1

In particular at the onset of the intervening work, the data evinces instances where the coaches, in pursuing their professional agenda, re-orient the clients from their focus on external facts on the inter-personal interaction field to a focus on inner issues on their intra-personal interaction field. In other words, the coaches pursue a re-definition and re-experiencing of the clients' primary concern (in or for coaching) on the emotional, experiential level instead of the factual, external level.

In his success and output orientation and his overall understanding of coaching as an additional source for him to achieve peak performance, the client turns to the coach for advice on how to optimally handle his job as an executive bank manager.

```

001         (1.7)
002 CL3    do you actually have to be
003         (0.5)
004 CL3    well informed as much as possible
005         (4.1)
006 CO1    well i
007         (0.5)
008 CL3    over and above the your normal work
009         (0.25)
010 CL3    job
011 CL3    i mean
012         (0.5)

```

013 CL3 what
014 (5.4)
015 CO1 you_re thinking about the jour fixe now right
016 CO1 and how you [thro]w yourself into it also how you prepare for it
017 CL3 [yes]
018 (1.3)
019 CO1 erm
020 (1.0)
021 CO1 that_s an issue where i am maybe not in a position
022 (0.75)
023 CO1 to be able to say so much about it
024 CL3 hmhm
025 CO1 right you remember that on
026 CO1 the phone i said when you_ve got really classical
027 (0.5)
028 CO1 management
029 CO1 issues right [then it]
030 CL3 [hmhm]
031 CO1 may be that i cannot answer the one or the other [questio]n
032 CL3 [hmhm]
033 CO1 so precisely and so well
034 (0.75)
035 CO1 erm
036 (1.0)
037 CO1 i think
038 (1.0)
039 CO1 that
040 CO1 you yourself know what you have to know
041 (0.25)
042 CO1 in ord[er to]
043 CL3 [hmh]m
044 CO1 do your job properly
045 CO1 and to organize this jour fixe as it really needs to be done
so that it is efficient
046 CL3 hmhm
047 CO1 don_t y[ou]
048 CL3 [ok]ay
049 CO1 what i can do however is to help you
050 CO1 when you_re not yet sure about it then i can help you
051 CO1 to find it out
052 (0.5)
053 CL3 hmhm
054 (0.5)
055 CO1 what i find important for such a jour fixe is yes

In the first part of this excerpt, the client turns to the coach as a possible expert in order to reassure himself as regards the right amount of preparation for particular meetings with his staff. After a marked pause and a clarification question (line 015: *You're thinking about the jour fixe now?*), the coach explicitly rejects this projected identity as an expert *that is an issue where I am maybe not in a position to be able to say so much about it* (lines 021ff.). She accounts for her rejection via re-topicalizing their prior-to-coaching telephone conversation, where she informed the client that

she might not be the right person to discuss classical management issues (lines 026ff: *when you've got really classical management issues, then it may be that I cannot answer the one or the other question so precisely and so well*). She then contrasts her non-expertise in classical managerial questions with her expertise in another area: to support the client on the intra-personal level and to help him find out for himself or know for himself how to do it (lines 049ff: *what I can do, however, is to help you when you're not yet sure about it, then I can help you to find it out*).

Excerpt59/2_CO1CL3_1

In her pursuing the intra-personal perspective for the client as regards his concern, the coach next marks 'emotional preparation' as being personally relevant:

```
001 CO1 to find it out
002 (0.5)
003 CL3 hmhm
004 (0.5)
005 CO1 what i find important for such a jour fixe is yes
006 (1.1)
007 CO1 erm
008 (0.75)
009 CO1 alongside the contents and as you say the
010 CO1 structure as well there_s also the emotional preparation
011 CL3 hmhm
012 (1.3)
013 CO1 and that
014 CO1 is something that you can do on the way there i would think
    about
015 CO1 is there something else when you get into the mood for the
    day (.) or
016 CL3 [hmhm]
017 CO1 [do you] talk to make phone calls
018 (0.25)
019 CO1 when you for example this monday
020 CO1 [then]
021 CL3 [well] erm monday [generally not on mondays well]
022 CO1 drive to [[NAME OF PLACE1]]
023 CL3 erm
024 CO1 to [NAME PLACE2]
025 CO1 yes
026 CL3 no well that [is we]ll
027 CO1 [hm]
028 CL3 i generally listen to the radio of course
029 CL3 somebody might call me but not very ofte[n]
030 CO1 [y]es so what i find very important
031 CO1 on this more emotional level right
032 (0.25)
033 CO1 is when it_s clear what the points are
034 CO1 that you which are going to be discussed
035 (0.5)
036 CO1 that you make
037 CO1 yourself aware of how what the reactions will be that are to [come]
```

038 CL3 [hmh]m
 039 (1.3)
 040 CO1 how will i deal with that emo how how how will I deal with that
 041 CL3 hm
 042 CL3 [hm]
 043 CO1 [wel]l so this emotional preparation what do i want to
 repres[ent]
 044 CL3 [hm]hm
 045 (0.5)
 046 CO1 y[es]
 047 CL3 [hm]hm
 048 (1.1)
 049 CL3 hm [hm]
 050 CO1 [wh]at could the sticking points be
 051 (0.25)
 052 CO1 which will come
 053 CO1 and what impression do i then want to make so i consider this
 emotional
 054 CO1 preparation to be
 055 (0.5)
 056 CO1 just as important as the
 057 (0.5)
 058 CO1 content level
 059 CL2 hmhm
 060 (4.3)
 061 CL3 okay
 062 (0.5)

Marking 'emotional preparation' as personally relevant (line 005: *what I find important for such a jour fixe*) besides issues of content and structural matters (lines 009f: *alongside the contents and, as you say, the structure as well, there's also the emotional preparation*), the coach pursues a shift in focus as regards the client's concern. In order to explicate 'emotional preparation', the coach first inquires into the client's work routine (lines 013ff: *and that is something that you can do on the way there ... or do you make phone calls?*). She then further details the emotional perspective or level in the context of the client's jour fixe (line 031: *on this more emotional level*) by marking it as particularly relevant for the client to envision and emotionally prepare for possible reactions in his staff when discussing certain topics (lines 033ff: *when it's clear what the points are that ... are going to be discussed, that you make yourself aware of what the reactions will be that are to come*). She further emphasizes this issue by speaking for the client in some kind of inner monologue: *how will I deal with that? ... What do I want to represent? ... What could the sticking points be which will come and what impression do I then want to make?* (lines 040ff). In so doing, she both creates an emotional immediacy for the client in the context of factual issues and, concurrently, concretely relates her pursued more emotional access to the client's leadership issues as a manager. The coach rounds off this (initial) intervening sequence of linking the intra-personal and the inter-personal level with a closing and summarizing statement that again stresses the importance

of an emotional perspective, also in the context of leadership issues: *so I consider this emotional preparation to be just as important as the content level* (lines 053ff). The coach's refocusing is met by minimal agreement and, after a marked pause of 4 seconds, by the agreement token *okay* (line 061); yet the client does not further inquire into such an emotional perspective, moving on instead to another question (not in transcript).

In the following extract we witness how, towards the end of a coaching process, a factual, external issue – the client's professional options as regards a new position in the company – is further explored with the help of an intra-personal perspective, i.e. with the help of the client's personality parts.

Excerpt60_CO1CL2_6

Prior to the excerpt, the coach has summarized the client's personality parts relevant for the client's pending decision as regards applying for a particular position in the company.

```

001 CO1  so what must it be like so that you
002      (0.5)
003 CO1  feel at ease
004      (1.3)
005 CO1  don_t have to jump
006 CO1  through hoops
007      (2.7)
008 CL2  yes
009      (0.25)
010 CL2  that_s true
011      (4.2)
012 CO1  but sense it again
013 CO1  so you can conjure up something for yourself again from these
       seven right
014      (0.5)
015 CL2  ((laughs))
016 CO1  ((laughs, 3.6s))
017 CO1  so to speak maybe the
018      (0.25)
019 CO1  un the un one moment the second or
020 CO1  the third
021      (1.7)
022 CO1  that you simply conjure up one of them where you
023      (0.25)
024 CO1  simply go through it once again because essentially it_s
       about the question
025      (2.3)
026 CO1  so it can be that it_s clear this afternoon
027      (0.5)
028 CO1  and if it_s not
029 CO1  the question is once again
030      (0.25)
031 CO1  how do you deal with yes
032      (0.5)
033 CO1  these
034      (0.5)

```

035 CO1 very
036 CO1 different inner
037 (0.5)
038 CO1 parts um and right
039 (1.0)
040 CL2 actually that_s the crux of the matter

As her professional summary was based on her own assessment as a professional expert (*well, they were also from me*, not in transcript), the coach – despite the client’s confirmation and uptake (*no, no, but everything’s really OK ... yes, it’s OK like that*, not in transcript) – invites the client via action invitations (*take another look at yourself; sense it again*) to self-reflect on the conditions she (and her personality parts) need in order to feel comfortable in a new position: *so what must it be like so that you feel at ease? ... Don’t have to jump through hoops?* (lines 001ff). The coach also suggests that the client should enter into emotional contact with one of her seven personality parts *so you can conjure up something for yourself again from these seven, right?* (line 013) and that she should emotionally review the decision process as regards the new position (line 024: *simply to go through it once again*). She accounts for her procedure by meta-pragmatically linking the client’s professional decision (line 026: *so it can be that it’s clear this afternoon*) to the more general and all-encompassing issue of her personality parts, i.e. emotional experiences (lines 024ff: *because essentially it’s about the question ... how do you deal with these very different inner parts*). The client agrees with the coach’s assessment as regards the importance of her personality parts via *actually that’s the crux of the matter* (line 040) and embarks on self-reflecting as regards her involved personality parts in her possible new position (not in transcript).

Résumé – Communicative task ‘Intervening’

In the context of ‘Intervening’ as a communicative task in the basic activity of ‘Co-Constructing Change’, the data analysis has evinced the following core components: coach and client practice mindfulness together during their coaching encounters, the clients’ concern is processed on both the intra-personal and intra-personal level and in processing the concern, the inter-personal and intra-personal levels are linked.

Table 14. Communicative task ‘Intervening’ – Core components

Communicative task	Core components
Intervening	Practicing Mindfulness Processing the Concern on the Intra-Personal Level Processing the Concern on the Inter-Personal Level Linking the Intra-Personal and the Inter-Personal Level

7.3 Securing transfer

The third communicative task that forms an endemic part of the basic activity of ‘Co-Constructing Change’ is ‘Securing Transfer’, i.e. those activities that participants engage in in order to help transfer the clients’ learning and development from the local coaching encounter to the outside-the-coaching realm, that is to the clients’ professional (and private) realm. ‘Securing Transfer’ thereby reflects the two-part character of ‘concern’ (Lalouschek 2013) as discussed in the context of Diagnosing: ‘concern’ entails both the component of ‘problem’ and the component ‘solution for problem’ and ‘goal’. In particular the latter aspect, i.e. its solution dimension, attests to the business character and output orientation of executive coaching, given that the clients’ learning and insights, i.e. change, are initiated and pursued (also) for the sake of the paying organization.

7.3.1 Developing transfer practices

The core component of ‘Developing Transfer Practices’ entails those instances in the data where coach and client develop and agree on concrete plans of action for clients to test or observe his/her learning outside the protected coaching space (e.g. such as a particular way of holding an appraisal interview with a member of staff or other measures such as self-perceiving in critical or challenging situations with their boss).

Excerpt61_CO1CL4_3

Prior to the excerpt, the participants worked on alternative ways for the client to deal with his emotionality in the private context with his step-daughter (and also with his wife).

```

001          (0.5)
002 CO1    okay
003          (0.25)
004 CO1    and when your wife says gosh tell me that earlier
005          (1.5)
006 CO1    now i_ll just
007 CO1    give you a
008          (1.0)
009 CO1    a
010          (0.25)
011 CO1    a piece of advice
012          (0.25)
013 CL4    hm [hm]
014 CO1    [and] see what
015 CO1    kind of response you get to it i could imagine that you
016          (0.5)
017 CO1    could reach
018          (0.5)

```


019 CO1 an
020 CO1 agreement with your wife if you wanted
021 CL4 hmhm
022 CO1 you say okay
023 (1.4)
024 CO1 er
025 (1.6)
026 CO1 my dear wife
027 (1.0)
028 CO1 erm now i_m taking it seriously
029 (0.5)
030 CO1 that you
031 CO1 would like to
032 (0.25)
033 CO1 hear it from me
034 (0.25)
035 CO1 earlier that you
036 (0.25)
037 CO1 would like me to voice
038 CL4 hmhm
039 CO1 my displeasure irritation feelings [earlier]
040 CL4 [hmhm]
041 (0.5)
042 CO1 mind you my worry is that
043 CO1 when i do that that this and that and t_other will happen
044 (0.5)
045 CL4 hmhm
046 (0.5)
047 CO1 that you
048 CO1 talk about it with her beforehand completely independently of
some kind of
049 (0.25)
050 CL4 hmhm
051 (0.75)
052 CO1 yes
053 (0.75)
054 CO1 that you say basically something like we have now
055 CO1 got a i_ve now got a project

As part of her transfer practices, the coach embarks on suggesting some concrete actions for the client. However, as giving advice is not part of the (idealized) coaching methodology, CO1 meta-pragmatically frames her action as marked (using the conditional form, personalizing the option (*I could imagine*, line 015) and topicalizing an insecurity as regards the client's reaction to such a procedure (*and see what kind of response you get to it*, lines 014f)): she recommends the client to come to an agreement with his wife as regards expressing his feelings at an earlier point in time. In these transfer practices, the coach speaks for both the client and his wife and in staging this imaginary dialogue, i.e. in speaking for the client, creates both an emotional immediacy and a playful footing. Throughout this extended advice-giving sequence, the client offers only minimal acknowledgements.

Excerpt61/2_CO1CL4_3

```

001          (2.3)
002 CO1    how about that
003 CL4    hmhm hm
004          (0.5)
005 CL4    good idea
006          (0.5)
007 CO1    yes
008 CL4    yes
009          (1.7)
010 CL4    that_s
011 CL4    definitely worth trying
012 CO1    yes
013 CL4    absolutely
014          (0.25)
015 CL4    pr[ecise]ly
016 CO1    [yes]
017          (2.3)
018 CO1    yes

```

This restrained uptaking behavior on the part of the client results in an explicit invitation for the client to assess the ‘project’ CO1 has discursively developed for him as regards new behavior in his private relations and he positively assesses it as a *good idea* and *worth trying* (lines 005 and 011).

The more goal-oriented and concrete the client’s concern is, the easier and at times more relevant it is to agree on certain tasks or exercises the client has to or wants to do between the coaching sessions. In the following excerpt, we witness how a very performance-oriented client engages in practices to secure the transfer of his learning from the coaching realm to outside-the-coaching realm.

Excerpt62_CO1CL3_1

During their first meeting, the participants discussed, besides other topics, how and where the client could integrate some time and pleasure for himself into his densely filled daily working routine as an executive manager.

```

001 CO1    there really should be
002          (0.25)
003 CO1    [time and s]pace for
004 CL3    [precisely]
005 CO1    you so that y[ou]
006 CL3    [cor]re[ct]
007 CO1    [ca]n enjo[y it]
008 CL3    [prec]isely
009 CO1    yes ^h and this enjoyment and this
010 CO1    time for yourself must make themselves felt in a such a way
           that you can benefit more
011 CO1    from this calmness
012 CL3    hmhm
013 CO1    and do the things that you do
014 CO1    under less pressure

```

015 CL3 hmhm
016 CO1 and for yourself so to speak
017 (0.75)
018 CO1 from a
019 CO1 feeling maybe of being a bit more under control or
020 (0.25)
021 CO1 centered or
022 (0.25)
023 CO1 yes
024 (1.9)
025 CO1 that would be th[e added] value
026 CL3 [hmhm]
027 (2.8)
028 CL3 okay
029 (0.5)
030 CL3 so there
031 CL3 ((clears throat))
032 (0.5)
033 CL3 should i now go into myself again
034 (1.4)
035 CL3 should i
036 CL3 try to reflect once again
037 (1.3)
038 CL3 that_s what you_re practically giving me to take away
039 CL3 with me i should
040 CO1 y[es]
041 CL3 [th]ink about it over the next few weeks
042 (0.25)
043 CO1 hmhm

Towards the end of their first session, the coach summarizes their discussed ideas and conditions under which the client could feel more relaxed and less pressured. To this end, the coach details – in the conditional form that indicates a future possibility – these conditions for the client as more time, space, enjoyment and more calmness and thematically links them into *and this enjoyment and this time for yourself must make themselves felt in such a way that you can benefit from this calmness and do the things that you do under less pressure* (lines 009ff). She finalizes these conditions via a professional assessment *that would be the added value* (line 025). The client, in addition to agreeing to the coach's summary via *correct, precisely* (line 006ff), re-interprets it as an invitation by the coach to reflect (lines 030ff: *so should I now go into myself again, should I try to reflect once again*) and as a (concrete) task for the upcoming weeks: *that's what you're practically giving me to take away with me. I should think about it over the next few weeks* (lines 038ff). While the coach does not explicitly link her summary of the client's desired state to a 'work assignment', the client, showing his eagerness to learn and change in order to better perform on the job, is turning it into a concrete 'to do' for him between sessions.

7.3.2 Corroborating learning and development

The clients' learning and development between sessions as regards their original coaching object is brought into the here-and-now of the coaching encounter only via the clients' reports or narratives. As such, the coaches at times question or corroborate these reported (positive or negative) developments or learning experiences in order to further deepen or guarantee the aspired overall change.

Excerpt63_CO1CL3_5

The client has reported about his gained insight from their previous coaching conversation that in order to secure the commitment of his staff it is important to communicate clearly and be oriented to facts and *this increased questioning of actions by managers* (not in transcript).

```

001 CO1  hm hmhm ((smacks lips))
002      (0.5)
003 CO1  and
004      (0.5)
005 CO1  this
006      (0.5)
007 CO1  chasing things up more
008      (0.5)
009 CO1  this increased questioning this paying more systematic
      attention to that
010      (0.5)
011 CO1  also
012 CO1  on the factual level that
013      (0.75)
014 CO1  how_s that working
015 CL3  hmhm well
016 CO1  in the last few
017 CO1  weeks
018      (0.75)
019 CL3  well good in the last few weeks i_ve had er
020      (0.25)
021 CL3  as good as no er
022 CL3  ah appointments with my staff
023      (0.25)
024 CL3  tha[t that th]at is well
025 CO1  hmhm
026      (0.25)
027 CL3  that is er
028 CL3  er hm
029      (0.25)
030 CL3  yes somehow the problem
031      (0.75)
032 CL3  erm that has now somehow grown
033      (0.25)
034 CL3  hm er in the last few weeks
035      (0.5)
036 CO1  hm[hm]
```

037 CL3 [er]m
 038 (3.0)
 039 CO1 ((smacks lips))
 040 CO1 so the
 041 CO1 insight is still [((unintelligible))]
 042 CL3 [the insight is th]ere so the actually putting it into practice
 043 CL3 is something I haven_t done yet
 044 (0.5)
 045 CO1 yes

The coach reformulates the client's *this increased questioning of actions by managers* (not in transcript) via a three-part-list (lines 005ff: *this chasing things up more, this increased questioning, this paying more systematic attention to that*) and in an open question prompts his answer as regards the success of carrying out this intended behavior: *how's that working? In the last few weeks?* (lines 014ff). The coach's digging deeper as regards his successful carrying out of the intended behavior represents a challenging moment for the high-performing client: while in line 015 he already produces a marked turn-taking signal as a response to the first part of the coach's question, he comes up with a down-toning answer in the form of a dis-preferred second turn (marked by self-initiated repairs, hedges, hesitation makers, accounts etc.): *well, good, in the last few weeks I've had er as good as no er oh appointments with my staff ...* (lines 019ff). The coach, after a 3 second pause, reformulates his negative answer via *so the insight is there* (lines 042), a reformulation which is taken up the client in turn, who finishes off this sequence by opposing the (positive) fact of having gained the insight with the (negative) fact of still lacking the practical realization: *The insight is there! So the actually putting it into practice is something I haven't done yet!* (lines 042f). Instead of, for example, inquiring further into the reasons for such lack of putting it into practice, the coach acknowledges the client's answer and both move on to the next topic (not in transcript).

Excerpt64_CO1CL4_4

In the following excerpt, the client is reporting about positive changes in his behavior – expressing his emotions openly, also with colleagues in the context of business meetings – and the coach invites the client's self-reflection as regards the origin of his being more courageous and open now as opposed to having been more tentative and cautious before (line 006: *I was much more cautious before*).

001 (0.25)
 002 CL4 yes
 003 (0.5)
 004 CL4 yes
 005 (0.75)
 006 CL4 i was much more cautious before
 007 (0.5)
 008 CL4 sure
 009 CO1 yes [wha]t is it that allows you to be er more courageous now
 maybe also more

010 CL4 [sure]
 011 CO1 courageous more outspoken
 012 (1.0)
 013 CO1 you are more courageous and outspoken you come across as
 being more courageous and outspoken
 014 CO1 what what is that in fact
 015 (0.5)
 016 CL4 so [what]
 017 CO1 [what] what gives you the
 018 (1.9)
 019 CL4 what
 020 CL4 on the one hand helped a
 021 (0.5)
 022 CL4 a lot was the the
 023 (0.5)
 024 CL4 our discussion our
 025 CL4 discussions about it or the recognition
 026 (0.5)
 027 CL4 um of what
 028 (1.5)
 029 CL4 and in which form
 030 (0.25)
 031 CL4 i express my sensitivities or
 032 (0.25)
 033 CO1 hmhm
 034 (0.75)
 035 CL4 can m[ay]
 036 CO1 [hm]hm
 037 CL4 should

CO1 shifts between asking the client why he is more courageous, stating that he is more courageous and offering her personal experience of the client as more courageous (line 013: *you come across ... as being more courageous and outspoken*) and finalizes this detailing via the general and open question as regards the reasons of this changed behavior: *What is that in fact?* (line 014). In his response to the coach's corroborating practices, the client discursively links his changed behavior to their coaching conversation, which he evaluates as *what helped a lot was our discussion about it ...* (lines 019ff).

Résumé – Communicative task 'Securing Transfer'

The communicative task of 'Securing Transfer' as part of the basic activity of 'Co-Constructing Change' entails the core components 'Developing Transfer Practices' and 'Corroborating Learning and Development'.

Table 15. Communicative task 'Securing Transfer' – Core components

Communicative task	Core components
Securing Transfer	Developing Transfer Practices Corroborating Learning and Development

This communicative task in particular attests to the performativity and purposefulness of executive coaching which requires (immediate) translation of the clients’ learning and development into concrete and ideally measurable actions outside-the-coaching context. Such necessary tangibility for the act of diagnosing and intervening is yet another criterion to differentiate executive coaching from psychotherapy.

7.4 Summary – ‘Co-constructing change’

To sum up, the basic activity of ‘Co-Constructing Change’ entails the three communicative tasks: ‘Diagnosing’, ‘Intervening’ and ‘Securing Transfer’. Table 16 summarizes these communicative tasks and the core components that coach and client engage in in the basic activity of ‘Co-Constructing Change’.

Table 16. Basic activity ‘Co-Constructing Change’ – Communicative tasks and core components

Communicative tasks	Core components
Diagnosing	Eliciting and Presenting the Concern Exploring the Concern and Defining the Goal Mapping the Current State
Intervening	Practicing Mindfulness Processing the Concern on the Intra-Personal Level Processing the Concern on the Inter-Personal Level Linking the Intra-Personal and Inter-Personal Level
Securing Transfer	Developing Transfer Practices Corroborating Learning and Development

As regards the interactive morphology of the basic activity of ‘Co-Constructing Change’ with its communicative tasks ‘Diagnosing’, ‘Intervening’ and ‘Securing Transfer’, the following recurring structures and principles of interaction have emerged as patterned, yet contextually applied communicative problem-solving strategies to discursively establish, process and find solutions for the clients’ coaching objects and to transfer these coaching insights gained in-situ to the outside-the-coaching realm.

This activity epitomizes the interactive, thematic and quantitative centerpiece of coaching interaction. As regards the coaching-specific application of diagnostic and interventive activities, presenting, negotiating and co-constructing the concern by coach and client evince the oscillating character of executive coaching

between therapeutic and managerial discourse. In particular, we find ‘Processing the Concern on the Intra-Personal Interaction Field’, ‘Processing the Concern on the Inter-Personal Interaction Field’ and ‘Linking the Intra-Personal and the Inter-Personal Interaction Field’ as the major interactive procedures to process the clients’ concern(s).

As regards the thematic dimension, the centrality of emotions and emotional experiences as the underlying focal theme of the coaching approach *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is most explicitly displayed here in this activity: emotions, often translated and worked on in the context of ‘personality parts’ following the underlying theory of the *Internal Family Systems Model* (Schwartz 1995) are considered both an essential ‘object of working’ and a ‘means while working’ in the context of ‘Co-Constructing Change’. Concerns in the context of clients’ (inappropriate) emotionality are often presented via troubles tellings and thus require less transformation work from clients’ inter-personal to their intra-personal interaction fields by the coaches according to their underlying professional agenda of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*. Another case in point here is the diagnostic and interventive actions with clients who are familiar with both the professional theory of IFS and *Emotional Intelligence* and their personality parts due to their prior or parallel experience from *Emotional Intelligence* training. In contrast, external concerns in the context of position fixing or managerial performance, i.e. more facts-oriented issues, are either tackled in different communication formats or re-framed and re-located on the clients’ intra-personal interactional fields and – in continuation – tackled in the context of feelings-talk via therapeutic interventions like ‘topicalizing feelings’ or ‘validating feelings’ etc.

Finally, as regards the quantitative dimension, the diagnostic and interventive activities by coach and client make up by far the largest part of the participants’ interaction, given that primary concerns are the very reason why people seek coaching in the first place. However, as argued throughout the book, if the basic activity ‘Co-Constructing Change’ and its communicative tasks were not embedded and framed by the other activities, namely ‘Building the Relationship’ and ‘Defining the Situation’ and re-embedded in the organizational context via the activity of ‘Evaluating the Coaching’, its structural, interactive and thematic layout could not account for the discursive particularities of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*.

Evaluating the coaching

The final component of coaching interventions calls for the client and the coach to evaluate the process and assess the dimensions of success or failure.

(Kilburg 2000: 64f)

‘Evaluating the Coaching’ is the fourth basic activity executive coaching is built on. This activity attests to the character of coaching as a goal-directed organizational intervention: executive coaching is initiated for the sake of the executive clients’ development or change as regards their managerial performativity, their leadership qualities, their self-reflexivity and, in particular, their professionally adequate dealing with emotions. For this purpose coaching is initiated and paid for by the clients’ companies, which have an organizational self-interest in its success, i.e. in clients’ professional learning and development or goal attainment.⁴⁷ Given that clients’ coaching goals do not exist irrespective of their verbal co-construction in the coach-client interaction, their attainment must also be tackled verbally and locally by the participants: “the link between intervention and outcome is established through descriptive accounts given by [...] participants” (McLeod 2001: 177). This link is discursively established and assessed by coach and client via communicative acts of evaluation. Once again, clients’ narratives and accounts have the status of evidence (cf. Sarangi 2001: 6), yet are professionally processed and thematically steered by the coaches according to their underlying professional agenda. Whether or not clients truly implement the solutions or changes they have discursively co-constructed with their coaches during their interaction remains, however, in their personal responsibility and is not an integral part of the coaching engagement: “(i)t is noteworthy [...] that counseling merely aims to ‘guide a client to find the solution to a problem’, and not to find the solution itself, which takes place after the counseling and depends on an appropriate autonomous decision on the part of the person seeking help” (Habscheid 2003: 130; translated HH). One possible

47. The question as to whether coaching is efficient or not is one of the most crucial issues for the coaching industry as a service provider and for the organizational world as a service consumer and as such motivates outcome research in coaching as the (still) predominant research paradigm (see e.g. Theeboom et al. 2014 and Kotte et al. Möller 2016 for a up-to-date overview on research issues and results in the context of the efficacy of coaching).

way of ensuring the sustainability of the clients' reported changes is to discursively corroborate them in the here-and-now of the coaching context.

In *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* such a discursive evaluation of change and development primarily centers on clients' advanced dealing with their emotions and emotional experiences. Whereas verbalizing and understanding one's emotions and emotional experiences often suffices in a therapeutic context to allow for the reframing of a hurtful past and thus to alleviate patients' sufferings, 'learning to control or adapt one's emotions' in the professional realm must be added in coaching due to the underlying business and profit orientation of its organizational context. To put it differently, "feelings-talk in coaching not only serves clients' self-reflection and self-enhancement, but is also systematically employed to enhance clients' understanding of their business-related issues and thus improve their professional performance" (Graf and Pawelczyk 2014: 61).

'Evaluating the Coaching' also orients to the underlying coaching tenet of dialogue-at-eye-level: Inviting clients to assess the method and the procedure (as well as the setting) – especially intermittently – gives them a certain say in how the coaching process unfolds, and thus attests to the non-hierarchical part of the asymmetrical business relationship which coach and client engage in. In their evaluating actions, the participants also assess the quality of their coach-client relationship. This points to the importance of the coaching alliance for the overall success of the intervention and also stresses the personal dimension of the coach-client relationship along with its professional dimension. Moreover, given that the coach-client relationship is, at times, functionalized as a mirror for the client's concern, the client's development also shows locally in his/her in-situ interaction with the coach. The relationship between coach and client then serves as another matrix against which the client's development may materialize, here in the form of a changed participation in the coaching-alliance (see Voutilainen 2010: 16ff) for a similar argument in the context of psychotherapy). This dimension of their coaching work then requires evaluation, too.

The coaching participants can only engage in evaluating practices on those interaction fields that have previously been opened up and discursively constituted by coach and client as part of their framing, diagnosing and intervening practices in the context of clients' primary concerns or goals. To put it differently, the clients' change and learning can only be evaluated for those coaching objects that have previously been discursively established and tackled as such. Coaching in general and the current approach in particular thereby define change and development first and foremost as growth in self-reflection, self-awareness and a (more) conscious dealing with one's emotions on the intra-personal level according to the tenets of *Emotional Intelligence*. This conceptualization of change functions as the matrix against which coaches primarily evaluate and give feedback as regards clients' development and

learning. Concurrently, most clients, as a result of coach's professional agendas and his/her (re-)focusing clients on their emotionality and personality parts, orient to their achievements and progress on the intra-personal level and comment on their changed, i.e. professionally more appropriate, emotional experiences and behavior.

In the context of 'Evaluating the Coaching', the participants tackle the following communicative tasks: the participants retrospectively evaluate the clients' change (i.e. their learning and development) as regards their original concern(s) and/or goal(s) and the participants evaluate the coaching interaction on the methodological and relational level.

Table 17. Basic activity 'Evaluating the Coaching' – Communicative tasks

Evaluating Clients' Change as regards their Goal(s)
Evaluating the Coaching Interaction

8.1 Evaluating clients' change as regards their goal(s)

As outlined above, clients' change and development as regards their concerns are assessed on those interaction fields that have discursively been opened up during prior actions in the context of the basic activities of 'Defining the Situation' and 'Co-Constructing Change'. Besides changes as regards the clients' factual or emotional concerns on interaction fields outside the coaching realm, their (changed) in-situ behavior in the local interaction with their coach also functions as a reference object of evaluative practices: coaches at times evaluate clients' changed behavior on the basis of their first-hand-experience with them in the here-and-now of their coaching interaction, i.e. on the inter-personal interaction field 'coach – client in their real-time interaction'.

8.1.1 Evaluating clients' change on the inter-personal level

One thematic focus of the evaluating practices as regards the clients' learning and development (in coaching) is assessing their changed behavior or experiences with external facts or referents, in particular with situations or people from their professional (or private) realm. Given the general organizational context of executive coaching, questions of changed ways of interacting with their colleagues, their superiors or inferiors for managerial or organizational purposes are of core importance. While in the majority of cases in the current data, such behavioral changes result from an internal re-organization of their emotional experiences (see 'Evaluating Clients' Change on the Intra-Personal Level'), there are instances where the clients

were on the look-out for concrete tips as regards possible solutions for immanent and clearly demarcated problems.

Excerpt65_CO1CL3_1

Prior to the excerpt the participants discussed the client's workplace organization. Given the client's explicitly expressed and interactionally pursued wish to receive concrete advice and ideas for clearly-defined organizational problems, coach and client have developed an alternative work schedule where the client would invest more time on Friday afternoon in the office and prepare everything for his regular meetings on Monday morning in order to have no preparation work left for Sunday nights. In what follows, towards the end of their first meeting, the coach invites the client's opinion on the next thematic or procedural steps for the remaining time in order to proceed further. The client, however, initiates another activity: he sets out to evaluate his interim learning.

001 CO1 well
002 (1.1)
003 CO1 what would be good for you
004 CO1 when we achieve something else today if we have maybe already
005 CO1 considered something if we have
006 (0.75)
007 CO1 well made a bit of progress with
008 CO1 that
009 CL3 hm[hm]
010 CO1 [go]t further than so far right so there_s still a bit more
time
011 CO1 today
012 (0.5)
013 CO1 what w[ould be good for today]
014 CL3 [well actually as far as i_]m concerned i_ve already found
015 CL3 don_t know what_s still to come of course but er er well
actually i_ve already
016 (0.5)
017 CL3 found
018 (0.5)
019 CL3 my highli[ght]
020 CO1 [yes]
021 CL3 and [that was namely]
022 CO1 [good yes yes]
023 (0.5)
024 CL3 also the
025 (1.5)
026 CL3 that idea with the sunday
027 (0.25)
028 CL3 right
029 CO1 yes
030 CL3 so that is that is one thing for me which
031 (0.25)
032 CL3 has become incredibly
033 (1.0)
034 CL3 clear for me [now]
035 CO1 [yes]

Via an open-topic elicitation, the coach prompts the client to formulate his thematic wish for the remaining time of their meeting in the context of a prospective action (lines 003f: *what would be good for you when we achieve something else today?*), whereby she implies an additional gain as regards the client's learning and advancing. The client turns down the coach's agenda offer (relativizing his act via his ignorance as regards the possible outcomes of the session: *don't know what's still to come* (line 015)) and instead embarks on retrospective evaluative actions (using the past tense throughout): he accounts for this alternative agenda via pre-announcing his already gained insight in the form of an extreme case formulation: *well actually I've already found my highlight* (lines 015ff). He then elaborates further on *my highlight*, reformulating it into *and that was namely also that idea with the Sunday* (lines 021ff), a theme or insight he positively evaluates as *has become incredibly clear* (lines 032ff) via another upgrade and extreme case formulation. The client's interim positive evaluation of this external, factual issue attests to his personal definition of coaching as an additional source to optimize his managerial performance, where he receives concrete advice and solutions to improve his executive output.

Clients do not only offer positive assessments of the achieved; retrospective acts of evaluation entail negative assessments in the sense of Kilburg's (2000) 'dimensions of failure', too, as illustrated in the following excerpt.

Excerpt66_CO1CL3_5

In what follows, the same client as in the above excerpt engages in the less-dominant discourse of 'failing to achieve his goals' during the overall retrospective actions at the beginning of the fifth and last meeting.

```

001 CL3   that was
002       (0.25)
003 CL3   well timewise everything was v
004       (0.75)
005 CL3   well
006       (0.5)
007 CO1   tight
008 CL3   ((swallows)) precisely
009 CL3   very er
010       (0.25)
011 CO1   [hm]
012 CL3   [very] close and
013       (0.5)
014 CL3   right
015       (0.5)
016 CO1   [(yes)]
017 CL3   [well]
018       (0.5)
019 CL3   even the weekends [well there]
020 CO1   [hmhm]
021 CL3   wasn_t actually
022       (0.75)

```

023 CL3 erm
024 (0.5)
025 CL3 much of a change there
026 (0.5)
027 CO1 hm [hm]
028 CL3 [right]
029 CL3 (hm) well so this this
030 (0.25)
031 CL3 taking off the pressure
032 (0.25)
033 CL3 hm (well in) hm
034 (1.5)
035 CL3 in the family to put it like this that
036 (0.25)
037 CL3 that is acutally non existent
038 (0.5)
039 CL3 i have to say
040 (0.75)
041 CL3 ah
042 (0.25)
043 CL3 although that isn_t meant in a negative sense right [now so]
044 CO1 [hmhm]
045 CL3 we[ll you ca]n_t
046 CO1 [hmhm]
047 CL3 control that
048 (0.5)
049 CL3 well now in the run up to christmas
050 (0.5)
051 CL3 this evening is the

During the prior session, one issue that coach and client tackled was what he could undertake to have some time for himself. In the context of recounting the past weeks, the client first describes his days as (still) very densely packed and then, focusing on his weekends, negatively evaluates the intended change: *well there wasn't actually much of a change there* (lines 019ff). He further details and reformulates his failure to achieve via *well, so this taking off the pressure in the family, to put it like that, that is actually non-existent, I have to say* (lines 029ff). The client marks the answer as dis-preferred action via the use of hedges and down-toners; immediately following this negative evaluation, he engages both in relativizing his comment or evaluation (line 043: *although that isn't meant in a negative sense right now*) and in holding external facts accountable for his failure (lines 043ff: *so, well you can't, well, control that now, in the run-up to Christmas*). In reporting his non-achievements, the client thus engages in a delicate balancing of negatively assessing his not achieving his set goals and of avoiding both criticizing the coach or the coaching and admitting his own failure.

8.1.2 Evaluating clients' change on the intra-personal level

The primary thematic and interactive focus of processing the clients' concern lies on the intra-personal, emotional level, even in the context of those concerns that are apparently located on the inter-personal, factual dimension, i.e. in those cases where part of the intervening work is to re-focus the clients from their inter-personal interaction field to the professionally intended intra-personal on (see 'Linking the Intra-Personal and the Inter-Personal Level' in Chapter 7). 'Evaluating Clients' Change on the Intra-Personal, Emotional Level' thus epitomizes the very core of the assessment activities in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, both as regards its quantitative proportion and its interactive relevance for the overall process.

The data evinces instances of such evaluative practices as regards the intra-personal, emotional level both as interim evaluations (see Excerpt 67) and as final evaluations (see Excerpt 68 and 69).

Excerpt67_CO1CL4_1

In the following excerpt, the coach initiates an interim evaluation as regards possible first insights during her first session with CL4.

```

001      (0.75)
002 CO1  hmhm °h have you already
003      (0.25)
004 CO1  in this wh what maybe
005 CO1  half an hour now we_ve taken or however long we_ve been
        talking about it now °h
006 CO1  is there anything where you would say aha we_re on the right
        track or
007 CO1  it_s making more sense to me or or °h some point where you_ve
        had
008 CO1  the feeling so far °h hmhm
009      (1.5)
010 CO1  an another point has come up where
011 CO1  you_d say that would be worthwhile °h dwelling on that for a
        while or
012 CO1  that could be °h part of the key when we take another look
013 CO1  at what we are in the process of °h unfolding ((laughs
        lightly)
014      (1.0)
015 CL4  erm
016      (2.0)
017 CL4  °h the topic of
018      (1.5)
019 CL4  helplessness
020      (0.25)
021 CO1  hmhm
022      (2.0)
023 CL4  and
024      (0.5)

```


025 CL4 power in other people_s hands
 026 CO1 hm
 027 (0.25)
 028 CL4 yes
 029 (3.5)
 030 CO1 that is a
 031 CL4 that (.) yes
 032 CO1 that resonates with you as well th[at_s a]ttracting
 033 CL4 [yes]
 034 CO1 you t[oo hmhm}
 035 CL4 [hm hm]
 036 (5.5)
 037 CO1 yes
 038 (1.5)
 039 CO1 °h yes that was the same for me too so that is like a core °h
 core element
 040 CL4 hmhm [appears so yes
 041 CO1 [hmhm]
 042 CO1 yes
 043 (3.0)
 044 CO1 hm
 045 (4.5)
 046 CO1 anything else
 047 CL4 °h
 048 CL4 ((laughs briefly)) um nothing that isn_t ne[w and n]othing
 that that i
 049 CL4 haven_t already thought about or what
 050 CO1 hmhm
 051 (16.0)
 052 CO1 okay then let_s

Via an extended question (in the form of various reformulations as regards possible first insights (e.g. line 006: *we're on the right track* or line 007: *it's making more sense to me*) and via speaking for the client (line 006: *where you would say "Aha, we're on the right track"*) the coach invites the client to reflect on his learning up to this moment. Given that they have been working on the client's emotionality, the thematic focus of the invited interim evaluation is pre-set despite the coach's open topic invitation (as regards a possible inter-personal, factual or intra-personal, emotional focus). The client offers two relevant intra-personal or emotional topics *helplessness* and *power* (lines 019 and 025). Next, the coach reformulates and translates the client's answer into interactionally relevant concepts such as *that resonates with you as well* (line 032) and offers – after the client agrees with her thematic translation – a personal confirmation and assessment of the client's chosen topics as *core elements* (line 039). After further inquiring into more learning (line 046: *anything else?*), which is negated by the client, the coach – after a marked pause of 16 seconds and marked by the transition marker *okay* – shifts back to her diagnosing actions.

Excerpt68_CO1CL4_4

During their fourth and last meeting the evaluative sequences are initiated by the client. In this context, he first reports positive experiences in his professional realm due to his changed internal and external experiencing and interacting. Next, the client thematically refocuses on the private realm and retrospectively reports of positive experiences regarding his new emotional expressiveness, i.e. his (changed) interaction, with his step-daughters:

```

001      (0.75)
002 CL4  that was really good that was a very positive experience
003      (1.1)
004 CL4  because i
005 CL4  told her really really personally how it what it really
        triggers off inside
006 CO1  hmhm
007      (0.5)
008 CO1  [hmhm]
009 CL4  [of me]
010      (0.75)
011 CL4  because (.) yes precisely
012      (1.4)
013 CL4  because what i understood was well
014 CL4  in that case she won_t come at all and if we don_t want to
        see her
015      (0.75)
016 CO1  [((laughs briefly))]
017 CL4  [and]
018      (1.1)
019 CL4  then i
020 CL4  did tell her that well (.)
021 CO1  how important that is to you so you simply speak
022 CO1  more
023      (0.25)
024 CO1  about yourself and your feelings
025      (0.25)
026 CL4  precisely
027 CO1  and wishes and your
028 CO1  feelings and
029      (0.5)
030 CL4  y e[s i t]old her i_d like to celebrate christmas with her
        and if
031 CO1  [yes]
032 CL4  she doesn_t want to celebrate with me but with her dad th[en
        she s]hould sort something
033 CL4  out with him
034 CO1  ye[s]
035 CL4  [b]ut not with me
036 CO1  yes
037      (1.7)
038 CL4  right
039      (0.5)
040 CL4  and

```

041 (0.5)
 042 CL4 that
 043 CO1 clear message
 044 CL4 simply worked
 045 (0.25)
 046 CO1 yes
 047 (0.5)
 048 CL4 and without any fuss she really
 049 CL4 recovered on the phone within five minutes
 050 CO1 yes yes
 051 CL4 that was
 052 (0.25)
 053 CL4 remarkable
 054 (1.6)
 055 CL4 yes
 056 (2.8)
 057 CL4 so it erm
 058 (0.25)
 059 CL4 it does work well too
 060 (0.75)

The client embarks on a positive evaluation of the situation ‘Christmas with his step-daughter’ via first offering two general, positive assessments *that was really good*. *That was a very positive experience* (line 002). He specifies *positive experience* in the following via detailing the conversation he had with his step-daughter and his changed, more emotional, way of interacting with her (e.g. *because I told her really personally what it really triggers off inside of me*, lines 004ff). In his granulated reporting in the past tense, he uses various positive evaluative adjectives and adverbs as in e.g. *that was really good*, *that was a very positive experience*, *worked really well*, *that was remarkable* (lines 002ff) and finalizes his retrospection from the private realm via the gist formulation *so it does work well too* (lines 057ff), which is presented in the present tense as a sign of how ‘normal’ this changed behavior has already become for the client. Throughout this sequence the coach acknowledges and agrees with the client’s accounts, collaboratively completes his utterances *then I did tell her that* (lines 019f) as *how important that is to you* (line 021) and professionally summarizes his elaborations via *so you simply speak more about yourself and your feelings and wishes* (lines 021ff).

Excerpt68/2_CO1CL4_4

As she did throughout her coaching encounter with CL4, the coach explicitly validates the client’s reports of the changed emotional quality of his family experiences with his wife and his step-daughters and links them back to his issues of emotionality in the professional realm.

001 (0.5)
 002 CO1 yes °h that that is of course um
 003 (0.75)
 004 CO1 um um

005 (1.9)
 006 CO1 ((laughs briefly)) just as important
 007 (0.5)
 008 CO1 your
 009 (0.25)
 010 CO1 private
 011 CO1 life because the patterns
 012 (0.25)
 013 CO1 right
 014 (0.5)
 015 CO1 are the same after all
 016 (0.25)
 017 CO1 [right]
 018 CL4 [they a]re
 019 (0.5)
 020 CO1 and that is then
 021 CO1 simply that the two things reinforce each other in turn
 because you in [whe]n you have
 022 CL4 [yes]
 023 CO1 these experiences in both areas then
 024 CL4 hmhm
 025 CO1 you just notice for
 026 CO1 yourself
 027 (0.5)
 028 CO1 as a person
 029 CL4 hmhm
 030 CO1 that you are acquiring something
 031 (0.5)
 032 CO1 if you want to
 033 CO1 completely new and y[our environ]ment
 034 CL4 [yes sure]
 035 CO1 no matter wh[ich]
 036 CL4 [hm]hm
 037 CO1 can cope with that
 038 CO1 really well [yes]
 039 CL4 [yes]

Again she explicitly acknowledges and validates the importance of one's private life (for executives), professionally assesses the similarity of emotional patterns in both realms (lines 011ff: *because the patterns are the same after all*) and the importance of having feeling and experiencing as a 'human being' (lines 025ff: *for yourself as a person*). She thus further emotionally orients to the client's sensitive character and personality. Yet, concurrently, the coach subscribes to the underlying discourse of the functionality of executive coaching as she stresses the consolidating effect of positive experience in the private realm for the client's security and thus his professional performance in the business context.

Excerpt68/3_CO1CL4_4

Next, the coach offers her own evaluation as regards the client's changed behavior and being according to her personal and immediate experience with him in the here-and-now of their coaching interaction:

001 CO1 yes you give me the impression of being
 002 (0.75)
 003 CO1 very forceful and very relaxed
 004 CO1 so when you say so relaxed
 005 (0.25)
 006 CO1 i can sense that
 007 CL4 hmhm
 008 CL4 yes
 009 CO1 (0.75)
 010 CO1 um and um v um what (.) of course it is s also something very
 nice that you um that
 011 CO1 you are reporting on
 012 (0.5)
 013 CO1 erm a er a but that also comes across when you
 014 (0.25)
 015 CO1 talk about it
 016 CO1 so you appear more animated a[s well]
 017 [hmh]m
 018 (0.25)
 019 CO1 yes so mo[re animated mo]re cheerful right
 020 CL4 [yes i also feel]
 021 CL4 much better
 022 CO1 yes
 023 (0.25)
 024 CO1 yes

Besides acknowledging, affiliating with and corroborating the client's reports of his positive experiences in both his professional and private realm, the coach also initiates her own evaluation as regards the client's change or changed behavior. She frames her subjective evaluation as her personal, experiential knowledge on the inter-personal interaction frame, to which she has direct access due to their in-situ coaching relation (lines 001ff: *you give me the impression of, I can sense that, that also comes across*). In her positive evaluation the coach focuses both on how she experiences the client in their face-to-face interaction (lines 001ff: *you give me the impression of being very forceful and very relaxed ...*; lines 016ff *you appear more animated, cheerful*) and on the client's reports of his overall positive experiences with his new form of showing and expressing his emotions (lines 010f: *of course it is also something very nice that you are reporting on*). The coach's positive evaluation is met by the client's uptake and elaboration *yes, I also feel much better* (lines 020f).

This (long) excerpt (covering 68, 68/2 and 68/3) exemplifies the interactive trajectory and build-up of 'Evaluating the Clients' Change as regards their Goal(s)' across a number of interactive steps and including various core components:

while it is discussed here in the context of ‘Evaluating the Clients’ Change on the Intra-Personal Level’, it also contains evaluative practices in the context of another core component (see below), i.e. ‘Evaluating the Clients’ Change on the Inter-Personal Level with their Coach’.

While Excerpt 68 exemplifies a client-initiated evaluation by the client as regards his changes on the intra-personal, emotional level, the next example illustrates a coach-initiated evaluation by the client as regards her learning and development on the intra-personal, emotional level.

Excerpt69_CO1CL2_9

In the ninth and last session of this long and highly emotional process CO1CL2 (both as regards the client’s concern(s) / goal(s) and the relationship between the female participants), the coach explicitly invites the client to ‘look back’ on the whole coaching process and to assess the important and valuable moments:

```

001      (1.1)
002 CO1  yes maybe let_s take another look
003 CO1  at it to start with
004      (0.25)
005 CO1  what was important and valuable
006      (4.7)
007 CL2  well i really am sensing
008 CL2  how it makes my throat tighten i_m getting really sad now
009      (1.6)
010 CL2  erm
011      (2.7)
012 CL2  well here with
013      (0.25)
014 CL2  with you i_ve become aware of er my feelings
015 CL2  in a very intense way in a way that
016      (1.6)
017 CL2  erm
018      (1.8)
019 CL2  i hadn_t become aware of them
020 CL2  before
021      (1.1)
022 CL2  and i_ve also
023      (0.5)
024 CL2  come to grips with that this
025 CO1  h[m]
026 CL2  [to] become aware of
027 CL2  this feeling in this process too now where it went back and
        forth
028      (0.5)
029 CL2  i also
030 CL2  tried on several occasions
031      (1.2)
032 CL2  when i was so extremely agitated
033      (1.7)
034 CL2  to yield to this agitation and not to push it away

```

035 CO1 hm[hm]
036 CL2 [a]nd
037 CO1 [hmhm]
038 CL2 [to sense]
039 CL2 it
040 (0.5)
041 CL2 and
042 (0.25)
043 CL2 to bear it
044 (0.5)
045 CL2 and that way er it often became easier
046 (0.25)
047 CO1 hmhm
048 CL2 the way in which i
049 CO1 hm
050 (0.25)
051 CL2 integrated it in me [and] and
052 CO1 [hm]
053 (0.5)
054 CL2 incorporated
055 CL2 it in me
056 (1.0)
057 CO1 yes
058 (0.5)
059 CL2 so noticing my feelings and working with that
060 (0.75)
061 CL2 erm i learnt to do that in a completely
062 (0.5)
063 CL2 different way before
064 (0.75)
065 CL2 feelings
066 CL2 were always something negative for me that i wanted to push
away now they_re
067 CL2 something
068 (1.2)
069 CL2 that simply also show me the the w[ay]
070 CO1 [hm]hm
071 CL2 and that is actually also
072 CL2 also something very
073 CO1 hm
074 CL2 posit[ive]
075 CO1 [yes]
076 (2.1)
077 CO1 [yes]
078 CL2 a[nd er]
079 CO1 [yes]
080 CL2 i did learn that in the seminar
081 CL2 already but er went into it again more deeply in in a
completel[y dif]ferent way
082 CO1 [hm]
083 CL2 you can_t do that in a seminar
084 (0.5)
085 CO1 hm
086 CL2 as intensively [as as on an individual basis like]

087 CO1 [yes yes yes ye]s
 088 (0.75)
 089 CL2 like we [er di]d
 090 CO1 [yes]
 091 CL2 it here
 092 CO1 yes

Pre-announcing the agenda point of ‘Evaluation’ via *yes, maybe let’s take another look at it to start with* (lines 002f), the coach invites the client’s evaluation of their coaching interaction via an open question, which is, however, thematically geared towards those aspects that were *important* and *valuable* (line 005). After a marked pause of nearly 5 seconds, the client first addresses her immanent emotions in the here-and-now with the coach *well, I really am sensing how it makes my throat tighten. I’m getting really sad now* (lines 007f), thereby implicitly evaluating her interaction and relationship with the coach as close, positive and personally touching (later on in the session, this is done in extensive and explicit ways, not in transcript). In doing so, the client concurrently proves her learning effect by acting out change:⁴⁸ not just talking about emotions meta-communicatively but allowing them to show (marked in the present tense: *I’m getting really sad now*), whereby she corroborates the following statement that she now allows her feelings to show, while before she tried to fight them. Next, she embarks on an overall positive evaluation of the coaching process, both on the thematic dimension as regards her dealing with her emotionality and the interactive dimension as regards the coaching (in contrast with the *Emotional Intelligence* seminar, which the client attended in parallel to the coaching): explicitly addressing her coaching interaction with the coach *here with you* (lines 012ff), the client positively evaluates the new intensity of experiencing her feelings (lines 014ff: *I’ve become aware of my feelings in a very intense way, in a way that I hadn’t become aware of them before*) and the fact that she is now accepting and allowing these feelings to show (lines 022ff: *I’ve also come to grips with that, to become aware of this feeling*, or line 034: *to yield to this agitation and not to push it away*), which makes the feeling softer: *and that way it often became easier* (line 045). She reformulates her positive evaluation as a different kind of experiencing and working with her feelings *so noticing my feelings and working with that, I learnt to do that in a completely different way* (lines 059ff), explicitly topicalizing this positive development as an act of learning (line 061). She also opposes her prior-to-coaching dealing with emotions: *before, feelings were always something negative for me that I wanted to push away* (lines 063ff) with her current after-coaching dealing with emotions: *now they’re something that simply also show me the way. And that is actually also something very positive* (lines 066ff). The client finalizes her positive

48. I want to thank Johanna Lalouschek for pointing this out to me.

evaluation via comparing her learning and development as regards her emotionality in coaching to her learning during the seminar and explicitly evaluates the intensity of the face-to-face work with the coach as more efficient, leading to a deepening of the insights: *you can't do that in a seminar as intensively as on an individual basis like we did it here* (lines 083ff).

In positively evaluating her emotional learning, the client concurrently (indirectly) engages in evaluative practices of her interaction and relationship with the coach and of coaching as a method and procedure (in comparison with training). Evaluation is thus here (and in other cases in the data) acted out with respect to more than one 'object of evaluation'.

While the evaluation practices at times refer to "finalized" learning and development projects as regards the clients' concerns and/or goals, change and development is also topicalized in the context of something that is initiated, but not finalized, during the coaching process. The following excerpt illustrates such a case.

Excerpt70_CO1CL3_5

Prior to the transcript, the client reports of a leadership seminar in which he has participated lately and where a particular interaction style with members of staff was proclaimed that the client refuses to adopt.

001 CL3 but i will do it differently
 002 CO1 yes
 003 CL3 definitely
 004 CO1 ye[s]
 005 CL3 [b]ecause that also
 006 (0.5)
 007 CL3 actually fits
 008 CL3 the image that you
 009 (0.5)
 010 CL3 also
 011 (0.25)
 012 CL3 well reflected
 013 (0.25)
 014 CL3 for me
 015 (0.5)
 016 CL3 in
 017 (0.25)
 018 CL3 [(the last)] half year in the last
 019 CO1 [hmhm]
 020 CO1 [hm]
 021 CL3 [few] sessions
 022 CO1 hm
 023 CL3 erm m m m
 024 (0.5)
 025 CL3 yes pretty accurately which one should
 026 CL3 take a look at that there are also sequences in that
 027 (0.5)
 028 CL3 right so

029 (0.75)
 030 CL3 er what
 031 CL3 mindset should i take with me into discussions
 032 (0.75)
 033 CL3 right before again
 034 (0.5)
 035 CL3 er it was
 036 (0.25)
 037 CL3 not done
 038 (0.25)
 039 CL3 in so much detail as you have
 040 (0.25)
 041 CO1 h[m]
 042 CL3 [a]lso showed me
 043 CO1 [(hm)]
 044 CL3 [(base]d on)
 045 (0.75)
 046 CL3 to calm down to think to myself what mindset am i taking
 047 CL3 with me into the discussion with the branch manager
 048 (0.5)
 049 CL3 erm
 050 (0.25)
 051 CL3 to collect myself
 052 CL3 hm to set myself a goal
 053 (0.25)
 054 CL3 and so forth so that was
 055 (0.5)
 056 CL3 [sequent]ially part of it
 057 CO1 [hmhm]
 058 CL3 as well
 059 CO1 hmhm
 060 (0.5)
 061 CL3 and erm
 062 (1.5)
 063 CL3 that_s why i_m very positive that it_s
 064 CL3 going in the right direction

The client starts out with a declaration of intent of handling things (= the interaction with his staff) differently in the future *but I will do it differently. Definitely!* (lines 001ff). He accounts for his (planned) dissimilar behavior as an executive via referring to his sessions with the coach and the issues raised by her as important: *because that also actually fits the image that you reflected for me in the last half year, in the last few sessions* (lines 005ff). He thereby implicitly evaluates the coach's input and suggestions (e.g. lines 046f: *to calm down, to think to myself*: "What mindset am I taking with me into the discussion with the branch manager?") as positive and helpful and frames the input as concrete support from the coach *as you have also showed me* (lines 039ff). The sequence is finalized by the client via a positive evaluation (using the grading adverb *very* and the positive adjective *positive* (line 063)) of his ongoing development and learning.

The client, as he has done throughout the coaching process, thereby functionalizes his self-reflection and intra-personal insights for his professional performance as a manager and explicitly relates concrete and (isolated) insights and moments of learning to concrete situations in his professional realm.

8.1.3 Evaluating clients' change on the inter-personal level with their coach

The core component of 'Evaluating Clients' Change on the Inter-Personal Level with their Coach' is predominantly entailed in those processes where the interaction field 'coach – client relationship' has been discursively opened up, i.e. in those processes where the particular relationship and interaction between coach and client is explicitly and strategically used as a mirror of the client's (relational) concern. Unlike the other types of evaluating change, these evaluating acts focus on the coach's personal experience with the client's changed behavior, etc. in situ in their interaction. Clients' development and learning are thus situated in their own territory of experience (Heritage 2011) and do not represent a B event in Labov and Fanshel's (1977) sense. According to Heritage (2011), the relationship between knowing something and having experienced it is thereby deeply entrenched in interactional practices associated with assessment and evaluation: coaches show a different evaluative behavior as regards the clients' reported changes and learning and their personal experience of clients' changed behavior in their face-to-face coaching.

Excerpt71_CO1CL3_5

During the final meeting with the male client, the coach has initiated the overall evaluation of their coaching via the open question *when you now look back on where you're standing in comparison to the beginning of the coaching process* (not in transcript). In the excerpt, which follows the client's evaluation as regards his achieving or non-achieving of goals in the private and the profession realm, she focuses on his local interaction pattern with her in the context of his evaluation acts:

```
001 CO1  what strikes me is
002 CO1  that you
003      (0.5)
004 CO1  ask me less often
005      (0.25)
006 CO1  how i see it
007      (0.25)
008 CO1  and instead
009      (0.75)
010 CO1  have (an o)
011      (0.5)
012 CO1  your er er
013      (0.25)
014 CO1  er own opinion on it
```

015 CL3 hm [hm]
 016 CO1 [yes]
 017 (0.75)
 018 CO1 i find that er
 019 CO1 ((unintelligible)) er i find that very positive
 020 (1.5)
 021 CO1 yes so i have the feeling that
 022 CO1 there is
 023 (0.25)
 024 CO1 more
 025 (0.5)
 026 CO1 more er
 027 (0.5)
 028 CO1 security er
 029 CL3 hmhm
 030 CO1 er er hm in rel er as far as
 031 (0.25)
 032 CO1 your own standpoint is concerned or how you asses something
 033 (0.5)
 034 CL3 hmhm
 035 (1.0)
 036 CO1 so that
 037 (0.75)
 038 CO1 strikes me
 039 (0.5)
 040 CO1 er strongly [so far]
 041 CL3 [hmh]m
 042 CO1 in what
 043 (0.75)
 044 CO1 you've just

Introducing and framing it as her personal subjective impression via the ego-referential expression *what strikes me* (line 001), the coach addresses the client's changed way of interacting with her: *that you ask me less often how I see it and instead have your own opinion on it* (lines 002ff) and explicitly evaluates this changed interaction style as positive *I find that very positive!* (lines 018f). She continues to re-interpret this changed behavior as a sign of more security in the client as regards his point of view, again framing this interpretation as her personal opinion via the ego-referential expression *so I have the feeling* (line 021). The coach finalizes these acts of evaluating the client's change on the inter-personal level with her via repeating her introductory meta-pragmatic framing *so that strikes me strongly (so far) in what you've just ...* (lines 036ff), this time via the upgrade *strongly*.

This positive evaluation as regards the client's changed way of interacting with her, i.e. asking her less and having more confidence in his own knowledge, attests to her underlying coaching definition of 'help for self-help' and the interaction consequences of little advice and concrete input and instead more initiation of self-reflection in the clients. This understanding was explicitly questioned by the client CL3 towards the beginning of their interaction, where he has explicitly asked

for the coach's feedback and input during their defining acts as regards the client's personal understanding of coaching (see also Excerpt 77).

The data also reveal instances where the clients openly call for the coach's evaluation and feedback as illustrated in the following case of Excerpt 72.

Excerpt72_CO2CL5_8

After CL5, during the eighth and last session, has offered his personal evaluation as regards his learning and development, he next explicitly invites the coach's feedback based on the latter's observation of him during their coaching process.

001 CL5 but maybe there are again maybe a few
 002 CL5 things which
 003 (0.75)
 004 CL5 which you can tell me so er also er
 005 (0.5)
 006 CL5 now from your
 007 CL5 supporting me as well and maybe
 008 (0.25)
 009 CL5 that would be the second thing in general
 010 CL5 °h what your observations are you have now accompanied me
 011 CO2 hmhm
 012 CL5 now yes for a
 013 (0.25)
 014 CL5 for over a year
 015 (0.5)
 016 CL5 [m m]
 017 CO2 [yes]
 018 CL5 °h (er yes) also these
 019 (0.25)
 020 CL5 sequences ((unintelligible)) i think could maybe be gone
 through again
 021 CL5 °h erm
 022 (2.5)
 023 CL5 could you maybe give me some kind of
 024 CL5 hints well hints in the sense of you saying i observed
 something there
 025 CL5 i would simply like to share that with you °h
 026 CO2 hmhm
 027 CO2 hmhm

Explicitly referring to their interaction, the coach's company or monitoring (lines 006f: *now from your supporting me* and lines 010ff: *you have now accompanied me now, yes, for over a year*) and the video recordings (lines 018ff: *also these sequences I think could maybe be gone through again*) as a possible source of knowledge, the client invites the coach's observations and possible advice. Given the delicacy of the action (both as regards explicitly 'demanding' the coach to do something and as regards inviting or receiving a potentially negative assessment or answer), the client mitigates his wish for the coach's action via the frequent use of the modal adverb *perhaps*, short pauses and interjections.

Excerpt 72/2_CO2CL5_8

The coach – as an immediate reaction to the client's invitation to give him feedback – turns down the client's invitation and, instead of offering his observations, inquires into the client's own experience as regards his current state of emotionality:

```

001 CO2  yes
002      (0.25)
003 CO2  °h hm i would be interested in
004      (0.75)
005 CO2  what your cond well how your [conditio]n now as you_re
         sitting right
006 CL5  [(yes)]
007 CO2  here and tell[ing m]e about that how you are experiencing it
         yourself
008 CL5  [yes]
009 CL5  °h
010      (0.75)

```

According to underlying coaching theory ('help-for-self-help' instead of passing on one's professional expertise), the coach returns the ball and prompts the client's own assessment of his current state of being via framing it as his personal interest *I would be interested* (line 003). The coach explicitly re-orientes the client to their encounter (lines 005ff: *as you're sitting right here and telling me about that*) and thereby implies the mirroring functioning of their in-situ coach-client interaction.

Only after several additional invitations to the client to self-assess, where the coach repeatedly prompts the client's refocusing towards his own feelings in the here-and-now of their interaction (not in transcript), does the coach finally offer his evaluation of the client's personality, etc..

Excerpt 72/3_CO2CL5_8

```

001 CO2  ((laughs, 2.5s)) °h
002      (1.5)
003 CO2  well really al[so n]ow that you_re showing your
004 CL5  [hm]
005 CO2  joy t[hat]_s simply
006 CL5  [yes]
007      (0.25)
008 CO2  nice to see as the person sitting opposite you
009 CO2  ((laughs))
010 CL5  i[_m happy]
011 CO2  [((laughs))]
012 CL5  about that too ((laughs))
013 CO2  °h
014      (0.5)
015 CO2  yes because
016      (0.5)
017 CO2  because that really is the thing that enhances your impact
018      (0.5)
019 CO2  immensely
020      (0.5)

```

In his evaluation, the coach explicitly focuses on his in-situ experience of the client and his observable emotionality, i.e. joy: *also now that you're showing your joy* (lines 003ff). Next, the coach positively evaluates his own emotions as conversational counterpart in the face of such joy (lines 005ff: *that's simply nice to see as the person sitting opposite you*) and, after the client's agreement and paralleling positive evaluation (lines 010ff: *I'm happy about that too!*), links this locally observed client development to outside-coaching issues: *because that really is the thing that enhances your impact immensely* (lines 017ff).

The coach then uses an affiliative stance, by using emotional language himself, by laughing etc., to counter the client's (emotional) development as a strategy to translate the method into discursive practices (= verbalizing the method). At the same time, we can observe here, too, how the client's emotional development is not only positively assessed for the local context of the coach-client interaction, but is also linked back to the overall result-oriented and managerial focus of executive coaching.

As is the case with co-constructing the clients' concern, where the individual, subjective experience of the client is fitted into the institution's categories, structures and terminologies (Lalouschek 2005b), we witness how the clients' individual, subjective evaluations as regards the focal themes of 'change' and 'development' are professionally categorized by the coaches according to the underlying professional agenda of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, too. The next excerpt, which structurally follows CO2's evaluation of CL5's changed behavior as it shows in their local interaction (see Excerpt 72/3) – thereby illustrates the balancing act between the more therapeutic and the more managerial dimension of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* as an executive coaching intervention.

Excerpt73_CO2CL5_8

Besides evaluating the client's changed behavior from his personal, immediate perspective as an interaction partner who locally experiences the client's new way of interaction in the here-and-now of their coaching encounter, the coach also categorizes and re-interprets the client's advanced emotionality with the help of his personality parts.

```
001 CO2 °h
002      (0.5)
003 CO2 er maybe the first point
004 CL5 hm
005 CO2 well that you now
006 CO2 allow the childlike side or the
007      (0.25)
008 CL5 hm
009 CO2 childlike vulnerable
010 CO2 side of [your being]
011 CL5 [hm hm]
```

012 CO2 °h
 013 CL5 hmhm
 014 CO2 erm
 015 (0.25)
 016 CO2 not only as
 017 (0.25)
 018 CO2 well in your
 019 CO2 professional setting not just to see it as the
 020 (0.25)
 021 CO2 danger that you
 022 CL5 hmhm
 023 CO2 feel in[secure]
 024 CL5 [((clears throat))]
 025 CO2 but as a res[our]ce
 026 CL5 [hm]
 027 CO2 tha[t]
 028 CL5 [h]m
 029 CO2 [gives]
 030 CL5 [hmh]m
 031 CO2 you creativity and imagination °h [that] is well
 032 CL5 [hm]
 033 (0.25)
 034 CL5 hm
 035 CO2 a
 036 CO2 change of paradigm

The coach next accounts for the client's changed (in-situ) behavior of showing his emotions with the help of the underlying theoretical IFS model of personality parts: he re-frames the client's emotionality in the context of this therapeutic model as *thechildlike, vulnerable side of your being* (lines 009f) and opposes the client's prior behavior of experiencing these (emotions) as dangerous with experiencing them as a resource offering the client creativity and imagination. The client's change from experiencing them as a danger to experiencing them as a resource is professionally classified via the gist formulation: *that is, well, a change of paradigm* (lines 031ff).

8.1.4 Corroborating clients' reported change

Change, learning and development in coaching is discursively constructed in the clients' reports and other verbalizations, yet – apart from a possible changed in-situ interaction with their coach – such development is not (objectively) observable or quantifiable within the coaching realm. To this end a further discursive inquiry about how these changes came about, how and where they are noticeable, etc. is an essential practice of corroborating and anchoring these positive developments. The final core component of the communicative task 'Evaluating Clients' Change as regards their Goal(s)' is thus 'Corroborating Clients' Reported Change'.

Excerpt74_CO2CL5_8

In the following excerpt, the coach initiates the client's self-reflection as regards the implementation of his newly learned interaction pattern of being more expressive and emotionally flexible:

```
001 CO2  have you already noticed that in the meantime that you have
        made
002 CO2  an effort
003      (0.5)
004 CO2  to be more
005      (0.25)
006 CO2  expressive more flexible °h
007      (0.5)
008 CO2  in whatever
009 CO2  way to [be more presen]t
010 CL5  [((unintelligible))]
011      (0.5)
012 CL5  have experience[d no]w in
013 CO2  [yes]
014 CO2  [((unintelligible))]
015 CL5  [in]
016 CL5  discussions yes well in one
017      (0.25)
018 CL5  that (.) well in one of these
019 CL5  staff appraisals [yes]
020 CO2  [yes]
021 CO2  °h and
022      (2.5)
023 CO2  wa e er
024      (0.25)
025 CO2  was that then something
026 CO2  where you experienced it inwardly as
027      (0.75)
028 CO2  yes this
029      (2.5)
030 CO2  consciously
031 CO2  being courage[ous]
032 CL5  [hm]hm
033 CO2  con[sciously]
034 CL5  [((clears throat))]
035      (0.25)
036 CO2  coming out of yourself did you experience
037 CO2  it like that or was it rather °h
038      (0.25)
039 CO2  natural
040      (0.25)
041 CO2  for you
042      (0.25)
043 CO2  like now
044 CL5  well at t at the
045 CL5  actual point in time it was then also natural for me but in
        the preparation phase it was
```

046 CL5 for me er to a certain extent the fact that the the brave
 thing °h
 047 CO2 hmhm
 048 CL5 (0.5)
 049 CL5 that i had decided i don_t want to deal with that on a
 050 CL5 rational level
 051 CO2 hmhm
 052 CL5 but
 053 CO2 (hm)
 054 (2.0)
 055 CL5 i want to do
 056 CL5 (that) with my entire personality as i as i present it [°h
 just l]ike
 057 CO2 [hmhm]
 058 CL5 i also °h fight with emotions
 059 (0.25)
 060 CL5 inwardly that i say i
 061 CL5 don_t agree with that i am angry about that °h
 062 CO2 hmhm
 063 CL5 or
 064 (0.5)
 065 CL5 things make
 066 (2.0)
 067 CL5 me unhappy in whatever way well to also get across
 068 CL5 affective states that that_s what i decided i_[d do]
 069 CO2 (hm)
 070 (0.25)
 071 CO2 hmhm

The coach first inquires whether the client has had concrete experience with his new form of being (lines 004ff: *to be more expressive, more flexible, more present*) and, once this is confirmed by the client (lines 018f: *in one of these staff appraisals*), further investigates the client's experiences with this behavior: via offering the alternatives *consciously being courageous, consciously coming out of yourself* (lines 030ff) and *or was it rather natural* (lines 037ff), the coach pursues the client's self-reflection as regards the naturalness or spontaneity of this new behavior. The client, in second position, offers a detailed answer as regards his experiences during the concrete situation with his member of staff: like a 'good pupil' and very much in line with the embraced coaching approach, he reports on his plan to not tackle the issue rationally (lines 049f: *I don't want to deal with that on a rational level*), but instead to engage with his whole personality, his emotions etc.: *but I want to do that with my entire personality as I present it, just like I also fight with emotions inwardly* (lines 052ff). The client has thus internalized the coach's credo of also tackling professional situations on the emotional rather than on the rational level in order to achieve better results for themselves and for others. These results are addressed by the coach in the next step:

Excerpt74/2_CO2CL5_8

001 CO2 okay °h
002 (0.5)
003 CO2 and what effects
004 CO2 did that have or are you happy so to speak with the emerg
then
005 CO2 resulting resonance °h
006 CL5 °h
007 (0.25)
008 CL5 yes the resonance was
009 CL5 er immediate also emotionally affected
010 CO2 hmhm
011 CL5 in my
012 CL5 counterpart so the person i was talking to
013 (0.5)
014 CL5 er i simply notice that
015 CL5 also because of his
016 (0.25)
017 CL5 physical reactions body langu[age]
018 CO2 [hm]hm hm[hm]
019 CL5 [°h]

CO2 next inquires into the effects of the client's conscious decision to handle the situation on the emotional, instead of the rationale level: he first does so via an open question and immediately reformulates and explores into the client's satisfaction with these effects, again via an open question. In an immediate reply, the client reports about emotional effects in his conversation counterpart: *yes, the resonance was immediate, also emotionally affected, in my counterpart ...* (lines 008ff).

In corroborating the client's changes, the coach has thus prompted the client to self-reflect upon his newly acquired emotional behavior and to explicitly name, and thus internalize, the positive effects of expressing one's emotions in the professional realm.

Excerpt75_CO1CL4_4

In the following excerpt, the client reports on positive changes in his behavior – expressing his emotions openly also with colleagues in the context of business meetings – and the coach invites the client's self-reflection as regards the origin of his being more courageous and open now as opposed to having been more tentative and cautious before.

001 (0.25)
002 CL4 yes
003 (0.5)
004 CL4 yes
005 (0.75)
006 CL4 i was much more cautious before
007 (0.5)
008 CL4 sure
009 CO1 yes [wha]t is it that allows you to be er more courageous now
010 CL4 [sure]

011 (0.5)
 012 CO1 maybe also more
 013 CO1 courageous more outspoken
 014 (1.0)
 015 CO1 you are more courageous and outspoken
 016 (0.25)
 017 CO1 you come across as being more courageous and outspoken
 018 CO1 what what is that in fact
 019 (0.5)
 020 CO1 [what]
 021 CL4 [what]
 022 CO1 what gives you the
 023 CL4 so
 024 (1.9)
 025 CL4 what
 026 CL4 on the one hand helped a
 027 (0.5)
 028 CL4 a lot was the the
 029 (0.5)
 030 CL4 our discussion our
 031 CL4 discussions about it or the recognition
 032 (0.5)
 033 CL4 um of what
 034 (1.5)
 035 CL4 and in which form
 036 (0.25)
 037 CL4 i express my sensitivities or
 038 (0.25)
 039 CO1 hmhm
 040 (0.75)
 041 CL4 can [may]
 042 CO1 [hm]hm
 043 (0.5)
 044 CL4 should

The coach shifts between asking the client why he is more courageous, stating that he is more courageous and offering her personal experience of the client as more courageous (line 017: *you come across ... as being more courageous and outspoken*) and finalizes this detailing via the general and open question as regards the reasons for this changed behavior: *what is that in fact?* (line 018). In his response, the client discursively and explicitly links his changed behavior to their coaching conversation, which he evaluates as *what helped a lot was our discussion about it ...* (lines 025ff).

Résumé – Communicative task ‘Evaluating Clients’ Change as regards their Goal(s)’

The communicative task ‘Evaluating Clients’ Change as regards their Goal(s)’ entails the core components ‘Evaluating Clients’ Change on the Inter-Personal Level’ and ‘Evaluating Clients’ Change on the Intra-Personal Level’. Although

categorized here as two separate components in analogy with the categorization of the intervening practices in Chapter 7 on ‘Co-Constructing Change’, the data also evinces instances where the participants concurrently focus on the inter- and the intra-personal level in their evaluative practices. In addition, the participants engage in ‘Evaluating Clients’ Change in their Local Interaction with the Coach’ and finally in ‘Corroborating Clients’ Reported Change’.

Table 18. Communicative task ‘Evaluating Clients’ Change as regards their Goal(s)’ – Core components

Communicative task	Core components
Evaluating Clients’ Change as regards their Goal(s)	Evaluating Clients’ Change on the Inter-Personal Level
	Evaluating Clients’ Change on the Intra-Personal Level
	Evaluating Clients’ Change on the Inter-Personal Level with their Coach
	Corroborating Clients’ Reported Change

In what follows next, the communicative task ‘Evaluating the Coaching Interaction’ is illustrated in its discursive realization with the help of more excerpts from the data.

8.2 Evaluating the coaching interaction

The second communicative task of the basic activity ‘Evaluating the Coaching’ is ‘Evaluating the Coaching Interaction’, which entails the following core components: ‘Evaluating Methods and Procedures’ and ‘Evaluating the Relationship between Coach and Client’.

8.2.1 Evaluating methods and procedures

Along the sessions (and as part of evaluating the coaching interaction as such), the clients are invited to give their opinion as regards how comfortable they are with the applied methods and procedures or how appropriate they experience them to be. Such an evaluation of methods and procedures is more often done along the coaching process, especially after the first session, to allow for changes in the techniques should the client not feel comfortable etc. with how coach and client have worked together so far.

Excerpt76_CO2CL7_2

During their second session, the male coach invites the client's opinion with respect to a concrete interventive practice, i.e. he has so far during their meeting given the female client many concrete ideas or pieces of advice.

```

001      (5.0)
002 CO2  °h ((huffing)) what_s it like for you when i come up with
003 CO2  such ideas
004 CL7  good you've always got such nice images always very
      ((laughing a bit))
005 CL7  illustrative
006      (2.1)
007 CO2  °h yes i_ll so that means they_re ok for you
008 CL7  hmhm
009 CO2  (1.1)
010 CO2  and
011      (1.1)
012 CO2  mh ((rasping)) for the people or for the situations
013      (0.25)
014 CO2  maybe
015      (0.5)
016 CL7  yes
017      (3.4)
018 CO2  what i just noticed is that i've somehow
019      (1.0)
020 CO2  well in our work too at the moment taken on more of the lead
021 CO2  and [°h am foll]owing my intuition there so in the sense of
022 CL7  [((laughing))]
023      (0.75)
024 CO1  i simply tell you about things where i think it could be
      [useful]
025 CL7  [hmhm]
026 CO2  [°h oh]
027 CL7  [hmhm]
028 CO2  how do you feel about that
029 CL7  good
030      (1.1)
031 CO2  so you have
032 CO2  the feeling that it_s a good
033      (0.5)
034 CO2  p[ath]
035 CL7  [yes] i am
036      (0.25)
037 CL7  already totally relaxed [feel]
038 CO2  [((laughs))]

```

Prior to the excerpt, the participants discussed the client's challenging professional situation of being torn between two departments and not knowing who is leading them. In this context, the coach has been very pro-active, also thematically, and has offered the client his own assessment of her professional situation. After a marked pause of 5 seconds, he re-focuses the client from the thematic to the interactive

level in an implicit agenda move and invites her opinion as regards his pro-active intervening behavior: *what's it like for you when I come up with such ideas?* (lines 002f). In her immediate answer, the client positively evaluates his procedure with *good* (line 004) in the form of an exclamation and further elaborates her general, positive evaluation via *you've always got such nice images. Always very illustrative* (lines 004f). The coach reassures himself of his procedure via reformulating his question into an assessment *yes, so that means they're OK for you* (line 007), which is again met by the client's agreement. Pre-announced via an ego-referential epistemic expression *what I just noticed is* (line 018), he next explicitly topicalizes and defines his way of interacting as taking over the lead: *that I've somehow, well, in our work too at the moment taken on more of the lead and am following my intuition there* (lines 018ff). Again he invites the client's evaluation of this procedure via another open question *how do you feel about that* (line 028). This procedural-evaluation question is again positively answered by the client, and her positive answer is again reformulated by the coach into *so you have the feeling that it's a good path?* (lines 031ff). This reformulation, in turn, again meets with the client's approval (line 035: *yes*) and her (positive) elaboration as regards her emotional state: *I am already totally relaxed* (lines 035ff). The positive, affiliative atmosphere is furthered by the participants' laughter.

The extensive negotiation and evaluation process as regards the coach's interactive behavior, to be more precise, his taking over the more active parts as regards the thematic input, too, attests to the underlying professional understanding of coaching as help-for-self-help and 'the client knows best', which contrasts strongly with his current stance.

The next example illustrates an instance in the data where evaluating methods and procedures are of particular interactional relevance, given that coach and client explicitly discussed the client's wish for concrete advice as part of negotiating his individual definition of coaching as part of the basic activity of 'Defining the Situation'.

Excerpt77_CO1CL3_5

The excerpt is taken from the final phase of the fifth and last session between CO1 and CL3. Here the coach offers her evaluation (of the methods and procedures) as a follow-up on the client's evaluation (not in transcript).

001 (0.75)
 002 CO1 i am ju always
 003 (0.5)
 004 CO1 very in the
 005 (0.25)
 006 CO1 er here and now
 007 (0.5)
 008 CO1 and i also found just now

009 CO1 that the
 010 (0.25)
 011 CO1 today even now again this
 012 (0.25)
 013 CO1 conclusion is also again very
 014 (0.25)
 015 CO1 very
 016 (0.25)
 017 CO1 good
 018 (0.5)
 019 CO1 very nice yes
 020 (0.5)
 021 CO1 i have the feeling that we
 022 (0.5)
 023 CO1 er
 024 (0.5)
 025 CO1 well that you
 026 CO1 there
 027 (0.75)
 028 CO1 what we_re working with hm erm
 029 (0.75)
 030 CO1 er that you er also find
 031 CO1 access very quickly
 032 (0.75)
 033 CO1 yes very quickly and
 034 (0.75)
 035 CO1 could also put it
 036 CO1 [into effect
 037 CL3 [hmhm]
 038 (0.75)
 039 CO1 yes
 040 (0.75)
 041 CO1 that was my impression and
 042 (0.75)
 043 CO1 er the hm
 044 (0.5)
 045 CO1 perception that i er reported back to you today
 046 (0.25)
 047 CO1 that i experience you
 048 (0.5)
 049 CO1 there
 050 (0.5)
 051 CO1 even
 052 (0.5)
 053 CO1 more clearly
 054 CL3 hmhm
 055 CO1 in what
 056 (0.5)
 057 CO1 hm who you are and what you wa[nt]
 058 CL3 [hm]hm
 059 (0.5)
 060 CO1 er
 061 (0.5)
 062 CO1 that

063 (0.75)
 064 CO1 hm i would simply like to underline that again [that is]
 065 CL3 [hmhm]
 066 CO1 naturally a very good result for coaching
 067 CL3 hmhm
 068 (0.75)
 069 CO1 er (because) in the

In the first part of her professional evaluation, the coach explicitly orients to her personal and in-situ impression of the client (lines 002ff: *I am always very in the here and now*) and to the current meeting (lines 011ff: *today, even now, again, this conclusion*) as the objects of her evaluation and first offers a general positive evaluation via *very, very good* and *very nice* (lines 013ff). She next details this general positive evaluation by focusing on the client's easy access to and implementation of the practiced methods (lines 025ff: *that you there, what we're working with, that you also find access very quickly ... and could also put it into effect*). Instead of 'talking from expertise', the coach frames this positive evaluation as her personal impression via ego-referential sensational expressions such as *I have the feeling* (line 021) and *that was my impression* (line 041); her slow and granulating style, interspersed by many short pauses and reformulations, both verbalizes the method of 'slow motion' and frames the evaluation as more personal and subjective. Next, she repeats her (previously stated) personal impression of the client as *that I experience you there even more clearly in who you are and what you want* (lines 047ff) and re-interprets this changed impression the client gives as *this is naturally a very good result for coaching* (lines 064ff). This second part of her very positive and explicit evaluation (of coaching) is offered in a more confident, 'talking from expertise' manner; the coach thereby prepares the ground for accounting for her overall interventive style:

Excerpt77/2_CO1CL3_5

001 CO1 naturally a very good result for coaching
 002 CL3 hmhm
 003 (0.75)
 004 CO1 er (because) in the
 005 CO1 beginning
 006 (0.5)
 007 CO1 you had
 008 (0.75)
 009 CO1 said
 010 (0.25)
 011 CO1 you want
 012 (0.5)
 013 CO1 (a) sparring partner [and]
 014 CL3 [hmh]m
 015 (0.75)
 016 CO1 also an appraisal
 017 (0.25)
 018 CO1 now i_ve

019 (0.25)
 020 CO1 talked about it a little bit of course
 021 CO1 but essentially
 022 (0.75)
 023 CO1 you know yourself what you want
 024 (0.75)
 025 CO1 and have a feeling yourself for what is coherent
 026 CL3 hmhm
 027 (0.75)
 028 CO1 and what
 029 CO1 your path is
 030 (0.75)
 031 CO1 and i simply would like to once again (.)

Syntactically linking the two parts via *because* (line 004), the coach contrasts the client's initially expressed wish to have a sparring partner in the coach and to receive her input with the client knowing best for himself: *but essentially you know yourself what you want. And have a feeling yourself for what is coherent. And what your path is!* (lines 021ff). In categorizing the client's knowing for himself what he wants and trusting his gut feelings as a very good result of their coaching, she indirectly justifies her applied methods and procedures.

Excerpt77/3_CO1CL3_5

The relevance of topicalizing methods and procedure for CO1CL3 is further illustrated with the client's reply:

001 (0.75)
 002 CL3 no well right from the start it was also er hm something that
 i actually m m
 003 CL3 hm
 004 (0.5)
 005 CL3 wanted to to
 006 CO1 hm[hm]
 007 CL3 [get] input as well
 008 CO1 hm[hm hm]hm hmhm
 009 CL3 [yes so]
 010 CL3 when you get things reflected back of course now after the
 sessions hm
 011 CL3 [hm]
 012 CO1 [yes]
 013 CL3 a lot
 014 CO1 yes
 015 (0.5)
 016 CL3 so
 017 CL3 (0.5)
 018 CO1 [((coughs))]
 019 CL3 [of yourself] there too a lot inside hm hm that mu
 020 CL3 you only have to become aware of that
 021 CO1 yes
 022 CL3 then it_s naturally for me [too]
 023 CO1 [hmh]m

024 (0.5)
025 CO1 [hmhm]
026 CL3 [nice] feedback
027 CO1 yes
028 (0.75)
029 CL3 er where i_d say okay [erm] hm true
030 CO1 [hm]
031 (0.5)
032 CL3 i see it like that that i
033 (0.5)
034 CL3 m m have taken up
035 CO1 hm
036 CL3 quite a lot from you [despite t]hat
037 CO1 [hmhm]
038 CO1 hmhm
039 CL3 erm
040 (0.5)
041 CL3 even when you [may]be
042 CO1 [yes]
043 CL3 only contributed to [that]
044 CO1 [hmh]m
045 CL3 somehow being [brought]
046 CO1 [hm]
047 CL3 to light [again] (then)
048 CO1 [hm]
049 (0.5)
050 CO1 [hm]
051 CL3 [i am]
052 (0.25)
053 CL3 very [thankful]
054 CO1 [hmhm]
055 CL3 for that
056 (0.5)
057 CL3 to be very honest
058 (0.75)
059 CL3 because
060 (0.25)
061 CL3 these these impulses from outside
062 (0.5)
063 CL3 you
064 CO1 [hmh]m
065 CL3 [need] them i think don_t you
066 CO1 yes [yes]
067 CL3 [so] that is erm
068 (0.5)
069 CO1 hmh[m]
070 CL3 [ve]ry important and
071 CO1 hmhm
072 CL3 as i said i_m very satisfied and erm
073 (0.75)
074 CL3 also hope that we

The client – after thanking the coach for her positive evaluation as regards his learning (not in transcript) – confirms his initial wish to receive input from the coach: *no, well, right from the start it was also something that I actually wanted, to get input as well* (lines 002ff) and then positively evaluates the coach's feedback that he himself knows the way: *so when you get things reflected back, of course, now, after the sessions, a lot of yourself there too, a lot inside, you only have to become aware of that, then it's naturally, for me too, nice feedback* (lines 009ff). Yet, in order to justify his initial wish (concerning methods and procedure) to receive concrete input from the professional, he offers his (contrasting) personal view as regards his development: *I see it like that, that I have taken up quite a lot from you, despite that, even when you maybe only contributed to that somehow being brought to light again* (lines 032ff). He thanks the coach for this input (lines 051ff: *I am very thankful for that*) and accounts, once again, for his methodological wish by classifying it as very important: *because these impulses from outside, you need them ... so that is very important* (lines 059ff). The coach agrees with the client along his accounting and evaluating acts via minimal agreements such as *hmhm* and *yes*. The evaluation sequence is finalized by the client, who repeats his overall satisfaction with the coaching (line 072: *as I said, I'm very satisfied*) and by expressing his wish to continue the coaching in the new year (not in transcript).

Both participants offered an overall positive evaluation of the client's learning and development, yet in evaluating the methods and procedure responsible for that, implicitly or explicitly explained the aspired change via stressing and pursuing self-reflection (on the part of coach) and input and stimuli (on the part of the client).

8.2.2 Evaluating the relationship between coach and client

During or, in particular, towards the end of their coaching engagement, the participants explicitly refer to the quality of their relationship and thus thematically and interactionally corroborate the acclaimed importance of the coaching relationship for the success of the process; i.e. coach and client explicitly evaluate or topicalize their relationship. The emotional depth of these evaluative practices thereby depends on the emotional coloring of their relationship as initiated and maintained during acts of 'Building the Relationship'.

Excerpt78_CO2CL5_8

Towards the very end of a process that lasts 8 sessions, the male coach initiates an evaluation sequence as regards their relationship and coaching encounter.

```
001 CL5  ((breathes in, 2.0s))
002 CO2  i really enjoyed working together with you
003 CO2  and i am very pleased
004      (0.25)
```

005 CO2 with the result ((giggles))
 006 CL5 i_m glad about
 007 CL5 that i_d like t thank you too
 008 (0.5)
 009 CL5 it was a lot of fun for me too
 010 CL5 to have this
 011 (0.75)
 012 CL5 dialogue with you here and erm also erm
 013 (2.5)
 014 CL5 well to get
 015 CL5 a a very °h er interesting outsider_s view and above all
 016 CL5 a very effective outsider_s view well that that is well also
 this this

The coach first positively evaluates his collaboration with the client by emotionally framing it as having enjoyed their collaboration (line 002: *I really enjoyed working together with you*); next and syntactically aligned via the conjunction *and*, he positively evaluates the result of their cooperation by expressing his personal satisfaction with it: *and I am very pleased with the result* (lines 003ff). The client – in second position – also offers an overall positive evaluation of their relationship and cooperation: he first expresses his delight in receiving such a positive evaluation (lines 006f: *I'm glad about that*), thanks the coach (for their working together) and offers a matching emotional evaluation of their coaching interaction *it was a lot of fun for me too* (line 009): he reframes their coaching interaction as a *dialogue* (line 012) and further details it as being an *interesting outsider's view and above all a very effective outsider's view* (lines 015f).

In what follows, we witness another positive evaluation of the coach-client relationship at the end of a coaching process, yet of a very different emotional coloring.

Excerpt79_CO1CL2_9

It is the female client who explicitly invites the coach's evaluation as regards their relationship (after she herself offered her positive evaluation of their relationship).

001 CO1 [((laughs)) becomes even clearer]
 002 CL2 [recount it becomes (clear) to me ((laughing))]
 003 CL2 ((laughs))
 004 (1.0)
 005 CO1 ye[s nice]
 006 (1.0)
 007 CL2 [how about] you
 008 CL2 then maybe we can also (.)
 009 CO1 yes
 010 CL2 it would would be [impor]tant for me too
 011 CO1 [well]
 012 CL2 you s[ee]
 013 CO1 [yes]
 014 (1.2)
 015 CO1 i must say i
 016 (0.5)

017 CO1 yes speaking of the heart you really grew
 018 (0.25)
 019 CO1 dear
 020 CO1 to my heart
 021 (0.5)
 022 CL2 [((laughs a bit))]
 023 CO1 [i also found] it to be a very
 024 (0.25)
 025 CO1 close
 026 (0.5)
 027 CO1 er contact with you
 028 CO1 very
 029 (0.5)
 030 CO1 personal very
 031 (1.5)
 032 CO1 close personally yes
 033 (0.25)
 034 CO1 [yes]
 035 CL2 [nice]
 036 (0.25)
 037 CO1 yes
 038 (0.25)
 039 CO1 and i yes
 040 CO1 always had a very good feeling with you had a lot of
 confidence in
 041 (0.25)
 042 CO1 in your
 043 CO1 path and
 044 (1.2)
 045 CL2 re[ally]
 046 CO1 [yes]
 047 (0.5)
 048 CO1 yes
 049 (0.5)
 050 CO1 y[es]
 051 CL2 [so] ma[n]y people say that to me]
 052 CO1 [you_re maybe more afraid]
 053 CL2 i am m[aybe]
 054 CO1 [yes]
 055 CL2 a lot more afraid myself
 056 (0.25)
 057 CL2 well b[ecau]se at work many people said
 058 CO1 [yes]
 059 CL2 well that you_ll surely get something good
 060 CO1 yes
 061 CL2 and i think to myself why how do they
 062 CL2 all get onto
 063 CO1 y[es i] had i had completely detached myself from where you
 would land
 064 CL2 [that]
 065 CO1 i simply had a really good feeling
 066 (0.75)
 067 CO1 m
 068 (0.25)

069 CO1 m for your process
070 (0.5)
071 CL2 hm[h]m
072 CO1 [y]
073 (0.5)
074 CO1 es
075 CL2 yes that
076 CL2 is som[ething)
077 CO1 [for yo]ur
078 CL2 [different]
079 CO1 [for your d]evelopment
080 (0.5)
081 CO1 yes and that
082 (1.4)
083 CO1 and er
084 (0.5)
085 CO1 yes
086 (0.25)
087 CO1 well the way in which you
088 (0.5)
089 CO1 m increasingly came into
090 (0.5)
091 CO1 contact with your
092 (0.25)
093 CO1 feelings as well and
094 (1.7)
095 CO1 clearly knew what you no longe[r want th]at became
096 CL2 [hm hm]
097 (0.25)
098 CO1 clearer and clearer
099 (0.25)
0100 CO1 right
0101 (2.1)
0102 CO1 where you maybe hid yourself where you didn_t
0103 CO1 have the support right where
0104 (1.5)
0105 CO1 things were devalued
0106 (0.75)
0107 CO1 what you are no
0108 CO1 longer prepared to play along with and
0109 (0.25)
0110 CO1 there i have the feeling
0111 (0.5)
0112 CO1 again something
0113 CO1 has
0114 (0.25)
0115 CO1 really clearly
0116 (0.5)
0117 CO1 matured and grown there
0118 (1.4)
0119 CO1 what i would like to offer you

Via the open question *how about you then?* (lines 007f), the female client thematically opens up the slot for the coach's personal evaluation of their relationship, a perspective she meta-pragmatically marks as relevant to her: *it would be important for me too* (line 010). After explicitly agreeing with the client's wish (line 013: *yes*), the coach offers her personal evaluation. She first thematically aligns with the client's prior reference to her affectionate and heartfelt experience of their relationship (not in transcript): *yes, speaking of the heart* (line 017) and embarks on an evaluation of her feelings towards the client using various emotion expressions such as *you really grew dear to my heart* (lines 017ff), *I also found it to be a very close contact with you* (lines 023ff), *very personal, very close personally* (lines 028ff). In her next step, the coach re-focuses from evaluating her more personal relationship with the client to her relationship with the client as a coach accompanying the client's process towards learning and development: e.g. *had a lot of confidence in your path* (lines 040ff) or *I simply had a really good feeling for your process, yes, for your development* (lines 065ff). Then, the coach embarks on explicating and positively evaluating the client's change by reformulating *process* into *well, the way in which you increasingly came into contact with your feelings* (lines 087ff). The coach finalizes this first part of her evaluation via the gist formulation *and there I have the feeling, again, something has really clearly matured and grown there* (lines 0108ff). In her second-position evaluation, the coach thus moves from focusing on her personal feelings for the client to her positive feeling of trust in the client's development to finishing off her evaluation via positively commenting on the client's learning and development in the context of the latter's emotionality.

After she has finalized her evaluation of the client's learning and development, the coach offers the client the option of contacting her again whenever she wants to or feels the need to do so in order to recap her development or to discuss new issues (not in transcript):

Excerpt79/2_CO1CL2_9

```
001 CO1 or in two years or whenever
002      (0.5)
003 CL2 well i_d [like] to in
004 CO1 [then]
005      (0.25)
006 CL2 in [any] case simply get in touch
007 CO1 [hm]
008      (0.25)
009 CL2 with you
010 CL2 [agai]n
011 CO1 [yes]
012 CL2 depending on [how] things
013 CO1 [yes]
014 CL2 develop no[w in order]
```


015 CO1 [yes yes]
016 CL2 to tell you how [thin]gs are going as well
017 CO1 [yes]
018 CL2 because th[at i wou]ld find
019 CO1 [good]
020 CL2 it otherwise [someho]w a bit of a shame if
021 CO1 [hmm]
022 (0.5)
023 CL2 if we had [expe]rienced that
024 CO1 [yes]
025 CL2 so intensively
026 (0.25)
027 CO1 y[es]
028 CL2 [toge]ther and then
029 (0.5)
030 CL2 then you don_t know any more
031 CO1 yes [yes]
032 CL2 [and i] don_t
033 CL2 know anything about you what [you_r]e up to
034 CO1 [true]
035 CL2 so i_d like to do that
036 (0.5)
037 CO1 we can
038 CO1 certainly do that simply [((unintelligible))]
039 CL2 [then then i_ll si]mply get in touch with you again
040 CL2 maybe in half a year [how it_s]
041 CO1 [that_s ni]ce
042 (0.75)
043 CL2 how it_s [whether i_m] still so
044 CO1 [that_s great]
045 CL2 happy with mister [[NAME]]
046 CO1 [that]
047 (0.25)
048 CL2 [((laughs))]
049 CO1 [that wou]ld be really nice and what i still wanted to

The client accepts this invitation explicitly and emphatically *well, I'd like to, in any case, simply get in touch with you again* (lines 003ff) and offers the following emotional explanation for her wish: *because that, I would find it otherwise somehow a bit of a shame if we had experienced that so intensively together and then you don't know any more ... and I don't know anything about you, what you're up to* (lines 018ff). Both the reciprocity as regards the exchange of information and the abrupt ending of an emotionally intense encounter represent challenging issues in the context of an inherently professional relationship which is neither based on reciprocity nor on (endless) continuation, once the primary purpose of the encounter is over. However, the coach agrees with the client's wish to call her and – after the client's declaration of intent *then I'll simply get in touch with you again, maybe in half a year* (lines 039f) – positively assesses this declaration of intent via a three-part

assessment *that's nice* and *that's great* with a final upgrade to *that, that would be really nice* (lines 046ff).

Given the professional context of their interaction, where the coach is paid and hired for her services to the client by the client's company, the explicit invitation of the coach's assessment as regards her relationship with the client attests to the quality of CO1 and CL2's relationship as quasi-friendship; in their thematic and interactive layout, the participants' acts of evaluation are in harmony with the overall discursive conceptualization of their encounter as non-hierarchical. Concurrently, the coach as the professional agent re-focuses towards a more coaching-goal based evaluation in her second-position evaluative practices. However, towards the end of this sequence and by explicitly and positively assessing the client's declaration of intent to call her after some time to catch up on the latest developments on both sides, the coach implicitly frames their relationship more in the sense of a non-hierarchical friendship than in the sense of a temporally limited professional encounter.

To sum up, while Excerpts (78) and (79) are structurally similar, they illustrate clearly different relational work. While the latter represents evaluating practices in the context of a quasi-friendship discourse, the evaluation practices in Excerpt (78) are much more in line with an asymmetrical-hierarchical expert-client relationship or interaction: the client's evaluating acts are more matter-of-fact and business-like and address their relationship on a more general or abstract level.

Résumé – Communicative task 'Evaluating the Coaching Interaction'

To sum up, the communicative task of 'Evaluating the Coaching Interaction' evinces the following core components in the data: the participants evaluate the coaching interaction as regards the applied methods and procedures and the participants evaluate their relationship as coach and client.

Table 19. Communicative task 'Evaluating the Coaching Interaction' – Core components

Communicative task	Core components
Evaluating the Coaching Interaction	Evaluating Methods and Procedures
	Evaluating the Relationship between Coach and Client

To focus on the interaction itself, both as regards the methods and procedures and their relationship, stresses the service encounter dimension of coaching where the clients' satisfaction is a relevant issue. Concurrently, by explicitly evaluating the quality of their relationship, the participants locally pay tribute to the theoretical and interactional importance of their coaching alliance.

8.3 Summary – ‘Evaluating the coaching’

To sum up, ‘Evaluating the Coaching’ as the fourth basic activity that helps define executive coaching as a proper discourse type and interaction type is acted out via retrospective acts or reassessments (Pain 2009: 111) in the context of two communicative tasks, ‘Evaluating Clients’ Change as regards their Goal(s)’ and ‘Evaluating the Coaching Interaction’. The former communicative task assesses the clients’ learning and development vis-à-vis their original concern and thus attests to the goal orientation of executive coaching as an organizational intervention. In its evaluative practices of clients’ change it entails the core components of ‘Focusing on the Inter-Personal Level’, ‘Focusing on the Intra-Personal Level’, ‘Focusing on the Inter-Personal Level with their Coach’ and, finally, ‘Corroborating Clients’ Reported Change’. The latter communicative task attests (more) to the character of coaching as a service encounter: instead of being passive recipients of a precast service, clients have a certain say in molding this service themselves and thus are also invited to evaluate it. What is more, the relationship between coach and client as an attested success factor in coaching (Greif 2008) is also explicitly evaluated by the participants. As such, ‘Evaluating the Coaching Interaction’ is acted out via the core components ‘Evaluating Methods and Procedures’ and ‘Evaluating the Coaching Interaction’ (see Table 20).

Table 20. Basic activity ‘Evaluating the Coaching’ – Communicative tasks and core components

Communicative tasks	Core components
Evaluating Clients’ Change as regards their Goal(s)	Focusing on the Inter-Personal Level Focusing on the Intra-Personal Level Focusing on the Inter-Personal Level with their Coach Corroborating Clients’ Reported Change
Evaluating the Coaching Interaction	Evaluating Methods and Procedures Evaluating the Relationship between Coach and Client

In retrospective, evaluating acts the clients’ (emotional) behavior and experiences of the present are compared with those of past situations and the differences are discursively established as forms of change and development. Given that the clients’ change is not objectively measurable and only partly evident in the local interaction with their coach, its discursive topicalization and evaluation is of utmost importance for the organization intervention of ‘executive coaching’ as such. In analogy with the primary focus on the clients’ intra-personal, emotional interaction field in the context of ‘Co-Constructing Change’, we witness the majority of evaluative practices in the data focusing on the clients’ changed emotional experiences on the

intra-personal interaction field. In these cases, coach and client have predominantly engaged more in therapeutic or reflexive discourse than in managerial discourse across the process and the clients often have, in their evaluative comments on their learning and development, thereby adopted the discourse of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*. If, however, the primary object of the clients' evaluation is situations or incidents on the inter-personal interaction field (in their professional, but also in their private realm), coach and client have engaged in less therapeutic or reflexive discourse, but more managerial discourse, across the process.

While the clients report on their personal experiences in the context of their evaluative acts, the object of the coaches' evaluation is either the clients' reports or narratives of their changed (emotional) behavior or experiences, which thus serve as evidence in the sense of Labov and Fanshel's (1977) B-event. Or their evaluation is based on their personal and subjective experience of a (changed) client in the here-and-now of the coaching interaction. In the latter case, the object of the coaches' evaluation is located in their own territory of experience (Heritage 2011), i.e. they have direct experiential access to the clients' changed behavior as expressed in the following quote from the female coach in the data: *the way in which I'm experiencing you now*.

As regards their structural position, evaluating acts dominate the final parts of individual coaching sessions and in particular the final session of a coaching process.⁴⁹ However, participants also engage in evaluating practices along or during individual sessions. This allows – in theory – for changes in the coaches' method or procedure along the process in case the clients do not agree with it; as such it attests to the character of coaching as a service encounter (cf. Greif 2008: 278).

As regards the participation framework of the basic activity of 'Evaluating the Coaching', the following picture has emerged from the data: while it is predominantly the case that the coaches initiate the evaluation sequences by inviting the clients' evaluation, we also witness cases where the clients themselves set out to evaluate their learning and development without prior invitation by the coach. Coaches, in turn, initiate and engage in evaluation themselves only as regards those aspects of clients' learning or development which they themselves have immediate access to, i.e. where the clients' change shows on the inter-personal level of the coach-client interaction. Irrespective of the issue of initiation, the data evinces practically no negative evaluation in the corpus. Given that clients in the face-to-face situation with their coaches might feel the social pressure to satisfy their coaches or their coaches' expectations, clients might evaluate their development in a more

49. In general, resuming and evaluating practices are characteristic features of closing phases of professional interactions (see e.g. Maier-Gutheil 2009 for start-up consultations or Brandner 2012 for doctor-patient interaction).

positive way or report about more change than they have actually felt or experienced. McLeod addresses this issue in the context of qualitative outcome studies in counseling and psychotherapy: "(i)n many of these cases they had been unable to tell their counselors about their dissatisfaction, instead adopting a strategy of 'pretending to be better' (McLeod 2001: 176f).

The basic activity of 'Evaluating the Coaching' attests first of all to the goal orientation of executive coaching as an organizational intervention where clients' learning and development, i.e. change, not only serves the individual client's self-reflection, but also serves an underlying goal and output orientation in accordance with the interests of the paying organization. Besides such goal orientation, 'Evaluating the Coaching' – in particular in the context of its communicative task 'Evaluating the Coaching Interaction' – stresses the character of executive coaching as a service encounter, where the executive clients' satisfaction and positive evaluation are relevant factors to guarantee their participation and thus to support the success of the coaching.

While 'Evaluating the Coaching as regards the Clients' Goal(s)' represents proper coaching discourse, given that the concern or goal is further processed and/or evaluated (by contrasting its current state with its initial state at the onset of coaching), 'Evaluating the Coaching Interaction' with its components 'Evaluating Methods and Procedures' as well as 'Evaluating the Relationship between Coach and Client' transpires in the context of the participants' meta-discourse of coaching, i.e. in those discursive practices where the participants talk about their coaching-talk.

Executive coaching – A hybrid and interdiscursive professional format

This book set out to systematically investigate and describe “what makes coaching unique”, i.e. to find out about its endemic discursive practices as a helping profession and organizational intervention. A process-oriented, action-based and discursive understanding of coaching and an interprofessional research perspective framed the current study. The study centered on the Basic Activity Model of coaching. This model emerged from a preliminary case study that worked with a phase-model as put forth across the coaching practice literature. The case study had revealed that sequentially and temporally ordered phases are no adequate categories to capture the interactional and communicative nature of coaching. Alternatively, four basic activities were developed and applied on authentic coaching data in the current study.⁵⁰ A detailed description of executive coaching thereby materialized in and across a great number of excerpts.

50. Although the Basic Activity Model claims that all four basic activities need to be tackled in order to do ‘coaching’, these endemic constituents differ as regards their quantitative, qualitative and structural share in the activity type of ‘executive coaching’: Whereas the communicative tasks that participants tackle in order to co-construct clients’ change represent a large majority of the overall interactions between coach and client, both ‘Building the Relationship’ (at least in its explicit realization) and ‘Defining the Situation’ quantitatively account for only a relatively small proportion of the interaction. ‘Evaluating the Coaching’ quantitatively occupies a less prominent position than ‘Co-Constructing Change’, yet has a larger share in the overall amount than the other two activities given that clients’ change and development need to be established discursively as there are no materialistic assessment or evaluation measures in executive coaching. Moreover, the organizational background with its focus on output and success also shows in the extensive evaluation practice and thus “(a)ssessment is an essential element of executive coaching” (Peltier 2010: 1).

The activities and the discursive practices in and through which they are realized are organized both sequentially and in communicative loops and are thereby adapted to the progressive course of the coach-client interaction (in the sense of Bercelli, Rossano, and Viaro’s (2013) supra-session courses of action) (see Graf and Jautz under review). As coaching transpires in and across a number of sessions, new communicative tasks such as tying in the previous meeting thematically with the current one, need to be tackled by the participants. The relationship between coach and client also changes along the process as the participants get to know each other better. The interaction thereby usually becomes more intimate, which shows, for example, in a more

This final chapter brings together the major findings re the conceptualization of executive coaching as activity type by abstracting from the conversational micro-perspective of the previous chapters and instead focusing on the overall functions of the basic activities for the individual coaching session, the individual process as well as for coaching as organizational intervention. The findings are also re-interpreted re conceptualizing executive coaching as discourse or discourse type: the framing, processing and evaluating practices as the discursive translation of the basic activities together with their coaching-specific functions, interactive trajectory and discursive hierarchization account for the overall discursive morphology of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* as hybrid and interdiscursive professional and institutional discourse. The analysis thereby evinced three main spaces of hybridity and interdiscursivity: Executive coaching as discourse of power and equality, executive coaching between therapeutic and managerial discourse and, finally, executive coaching between discourse and meta-discourse.

9.1 Coaching as activity type

Reinterpreting the findings as regards executive coaching as activity type focuses first of all on the functions the four basic activities serve for the individual session and / or the individual process: The basic activity of ‘Defining the Situation’ establishes, maintains and adapts the interaction frame of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* for the individual coach-client dyad. While such establishing of the interaction frame takes place during the beginning of the first session, maintaining and adapting the interaction frame takes place during the follow-up sessions along the process in the sense of Becker-Mrotzek and Brünner’s (2007) updating the interaction and conversational context. Within this interaction frame coach and client work on the coaching objects, i.e. co-construct the client’s change. In establishing the interaction frame, the participants concurrently determine the frame-appropriate interaction rules and discursively open up the various interaction fields on which *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is acted out. This (later on)

extended exchange of private information at the boundaries of the coaching sessions. Participants also engage in more than one basic activity at a time. A case in point is the basic activity of ‘Building the Relationship’ which – according to Watzlawick et al. (1967) and others – classifies and frames all other activities. Finally, basic activities do show a certain preference organization as regards their occurrence along the individual sessions and along the whole process: ‘Defining the Situation’, for example, is most prominently, yet not exclusively, found in the initial phases of (first) sessions, while ‘Evaluating the Coaching’ is an activity situated more towards the end of individual sessions and in particular towards the end of the whole coaching process.

decides on the depth of processing the client's concern (i.e. determines on what interaction field(s) the client's concern or change is co-constructed). The interaction frame of coaching is externally established via social acts such as offering drinks and discussing seating arrangements, etc. and is internally established as regards its interactional dimension by informing the client about methods and procedures, appropriate topics etc. and as regards its temporal dimension via setting the time frame for the coaching interaction. The framing practices of 'Defining the Situation' thereby set coaching globally apart from surrounding professional helping frames such as psychotherapy, while more locally they help to establish the individual coach-client interaction frame that pays tribute to the individual client's needs, prior experience with coaching, Emotional Intelligence, etc.. The primary function of 'Defining the Situation', then, is to both globally and locally orient the client as regards the structure, interaction and length of the coaching process and thereby to create a common ground for the ensuing interaction between coach and client. By providing a structural, thematic and temporal agenda for the current as well as the subsequent meetings, the coach offers the necessary orientation in an interactionally unfamiliar and thus insecure environment.

The basic activity of 'Building the Relationship' establishes, maintains and adapts the relationship between the interactional partners 'coach' and 'client'. While establishing the coach-client relationship is initiated during the prior-to-coaching telephone conversation between the participants, maintaining and adapting the relationship takes place perpetually along the coaching process across its various sessions as a permanent communicative activity. The relationship must both be defined between coach and client as a dyad in the context of their coaching alliance and as part of the larger triadic relationship coach – client – client's paying organization (Graf and Jautz in prep.). The coaching alliance represents the immediate matrix for the work on the client's concern in the context of 'Co-Constructing Change' and as such it functions as an affective frame that creates the necessary stability and security for the clients to deal with insecurity and challenge on a thematic level. Besides functioning as a stabilizing and affective frame, the relationship also functions as a possible mirror for the clients' concern and, as such, represents a proper coaching intervention on the 'coach-client' interaction field; last, but not least, the relationship between coach and client functions as an immediate and safe practice field for trying out new behavior. In order to fulfill these functions, 'Building the Relationship' in the context of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* entails – in addition to the pre-established roles and identities of 'coach' and 'client' as professional expert and layperson and their respective interactional rights and responsibilities due to the professional and institutional setting of coaching – the possibility for participants to negotiate hierarchy in the overall asymmetrical set-up and to topicalize the embeddedness of their dyad in the larger organizational context.

The fuzziness of coaching as an organizational intervention and most clients' lack of familiarity with coaching turn the explicit topicalization of its relational, methodological and procedural layout into a necessary precondition for successfully working on the clients' concerns. 'Building the Relationship' and 'Defining the Situation' thus prepare the necessary ground for the core work of coach and client, i.e. working on the clients' concern in order to initiate the client's emotional change and development; these basic activities are therefore turned from predominantly back-stage activities (as is the case in more established formats that follow the professional agency model (Schön 1991)) to front-stage activities in executive coaching.

The basic activity of 'Co-Constructing Change' functions as the core of coaching, given that clients come to coaching to learn, to develop and to reflect, i.e. to change their behavior, their attitudes and their emotionality, etc.. To this end, the clients' concern is first diagnosed, i.e. discursively established, then worked on, i.e. discursively processed, on the various interaction fields that have previously been opened up as part of the basic activity of 'Defining the Situation'. Finally, the transfer of the clients' newly gained insights from inside coaching to outside coaching, i.e. to the clients' organizational background, is secured. More specifically, in the context of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* and its professional theory and vision, the function of 'Co-Constructing Change', as regards diagnosing, intervening and securing transfer, is to re-focus the clients from an inter-personal and factual perspective on their concern to an intra-personal and emotional perspective on their concern. 'Change' is thereby defined as gaining access to one's emotionality and emotional experiences, understanding and accepting one's emotions, but also learning to develop a more appropriate or controlled emotional behavior on the outside, i.e. on the inter-personal level, in and through the locally and sequentially organized sequences that allow for such transformation (Voutilainen et al. 2011; Voutilainen et al. 2018; Graf under review; Graf and Jautz under review).

Finally, the basic activity of 'Evaluating the Coaching' assesses the client's learning and development: the clients' change is evaluated in relation to his/her co-constructed concern(s) on the various interaction fields that have previously been opened up during 'Defining the Situation' and that have been worked on during 'Co-Constructing Change'. Given that the principal coaching interaction ends with the last session, to verbally and explicitly evaluate the clients' learning and development functions as an important assessment measure of the success or failure of coaching for the interactants. Besides evaluating the clients' change as regards their concern, the basic activity of 'Evaluating the Coaching' serves yet another function: 'Evaluating the Coaching' also attests to the importance of the coaching relationship as an essential success factor in coaching, given that the participants explicitly evaluate its quality. Finally, the service character of the professional format

of ‘executive coaching’ is stressed, given that the clients are invited to evaluate the coaching procedure as such besides evaluating their learning and change.

Next, the findings must be reinterpreted as regards the functions of the four basic activities for coaching as organizational intervention: Both ‘Defining the Situation’ and ‘Building the Relationship’ locally and globally set the interaction frame of ‘coaching’ and prepare the ground for processing the executive clients’ concern (predominantly) on the intra-personal interaction field via (therapeutic) interventions in the context of those clients’ emotional experiences. In the global context of coaching as an organizational intervention, this framing allows the executives and their concerns to be taken out of the external, organizational context and to be physically and experientially re-located in the intimate coaching frame, where an internalization and emotionalization of the clients’ concern via therapeutic interventions becomes possible in the safe space with their coaches. Concurrently, the adaptiveness of the situation of ‘coaching’ and the relationship ‘professional coach – executive client’ as regards their individual definition, length and emotional intensity pays tribute to the executive clients’ particularly challenging professional situation, but also to their intellectual demands and individuality.

In the context of ‘Co-Constructing Change’ the character of coaching as an organizational intervention shows most prominently in the goal orientedness of processing the executive clients’ concern. Although the predominant intervening or processing work on the clients’ concern happens on the clients’ intra-personal, emotional level in the context of their emotional experiences and personality parts, clients’ insights and learning as regards their inner, emotional dynamics are always discursively linked back to the larger organizational context of executive coaching: in addition to co-constructing ‘change’ for the executive’s personal satisfaction and advancement, the participants see to its functionalization in the client’s professional life as executive managers and to managerial issues such as peak performance, pre-empting emotional crisis in the context of large projects, appropriate emotionality in dealing with one’s staff, etc..

And finally, ‘Evaluating the Coaching’ re-locates and re-integrates the clients’ (emotional) learning and development back in the organization by transferring the clients’ insights from the coaching frame back into the organizational frame: while evaluating their change is discursively tackled inside the coaching frame, the results of coaching, i.e. the clients’ learning and development, (predominantly) materialize outside coaching, in the clients’ organizations, where they might show a changed behavior as executive managers. Moreover, the results of the coaching are literally transported from inside coaching to outside coaching, i.e. to the client’s HR manager, etc., in the form of a report written by the coach. The basic activity of ‘Evaluating the Coaching’ thus transcends the local coach-client dyad as evaluating

as a discursive practice happens within the coach-client dyad but takes the client out of the coaching realm and back into the organization.

Given the centrality of emotions in executive coaching in general, and in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* in particular, the findings must also be reinterpreted as regards the particular role of emotions in the basic activities: The overall design of the particular coaching interaction, i.e. the underlying professional agenda with its tenets of Emotional Intelligence, its generous time-frame of two to three hours for each session as well as the length of the process itself, the intimate setting of a red couch and a red rocking chair facing each other in a relatively small and cozy room (Martens-Schmid 2015) – all of these features mold the context in which the four basic activities display their specific interactional morphology. In particular, the centrality of emotions as the all-embracing focal theme influences the discursive design of the four basic activities: in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, emotions are both the object of work, a means while working and a condition of work (cf. Sieben and Wettergren 2010: 10f). More specifically, the underlying agenda of (re-)focusing executive clients from rationalizing about external facts to feeling and experiencing internal facts is linked to the four basic activities in the following manner:

In the context of ‘Defining the Situation’, emotions are considered an ‘object of work’. In explaining their method and procedure and in establishing the interaction frame of ‘coaching’ on the various interaction fields, the coaches more or less explicitly topicalize the clients’ emotional experience as the primary focus of their work.

In the context of ‘Building the Relationship’, emotions represent an essential ‘condition of work’. The relationship between coach and client must show a particular (emotional) quality to create the necessary atmosphere and self-space for clients to feel safe and to open up. The particular emotional coloring of the coaching relationship is the necessary prerequisite, i.e. affective frame, for clients to face their emotions, especially against the backdrop of the organizational context of executive coaching.

Both ‘Building the Relationship’ and ‘Defining the Situation’ take the executive out of his/her organizational context due to their respective emotional coloring and create the necessary coaching frame and self-space within which clients’ emotional experiences, often in the sense of less-dominant discourses, can turn center stage and can be worked on with the help of particular (therapeutic) interventions.

In the context of ‘Co-Constructing Change’, emotions are considered both an essential ‘object of working’ and a ‘means while working’. The coaching frame is set with the help of the particular emotional coloring of the relationship and the global orientation due to the situation definition and coaches can pursue their professional agenda, i.e. to influence their clients’ (dealing with) emotions by discursively (re-) orienting them towards their inner experiences on the intra-personal interaction

field and thus to categorize and recontextualize them according to their underlying professional vision. In doing so, the coach's emotional repertoire functions as the primary means to verbalize their method.

And finally, in the context of 'Evaluating the Coaching', emotions function as a 'meta-object of work'. The participants – in intermittently and retrospectively evaluating the clients' (emotional) progress during their coaching interaction – topicalize the clients' emotional experiences on a meta-level, that is, they discuss the effect and the quality of their interactive work on emotions. By addressing the effect of their interactive work on emotions, not only for the client's personal advancement, but also for his/her advancement as an executive manager, the organizational context of the coaching intervention is discursively brought back into the coaching interaction. Emotional work is thus omnipresent in the interaction between coach and client.

9.2 Coaching as discourse type

While the data analysis and argumentation so far has centered on the concept of 'basic activity' and 'activity type', in what follows the findings shall be summarized and re-interpreted from the perspective of coaching as 'discourse' or 'discourse type'.

To recap, executive coaching was, in analogy with Sarangi's (2000) argument for the overlap of 'activity type' and 'discourse type' in counseling and therapy, framed both as 'activity type' and 'discourse type'. Coaching thereby draws on and integrates activities and discourse types from surrounding counseling formats such as psychotherapy, counseling and management consulting, and rearranges these interactive and discursive practices into a new and distinctive language game (Sarangi 2000). In other words, the basic activities 'Defining the Situation', 'Building the Relationship', 'Co-Constructing Change' and 'Evaluating the Coaching' are discursively translated into discursive framing, processing and evaluating practices whose coaching-specific functions, the interactive trajectory and the discursive hierarchization account for the overall discursive morphology of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*. The activity type and discourse type 'executive coaching' is characterized by its interdiscursivity and hybridity; i.e. coaching represents a hybrid form of professional and institutional discourse.

This circumstance is both recognized by coaching practitioners, who talk about "put[ting] old wine into new bottles, so that more can appreciate the vintage" (Peltier 2010: xxviii) and by coaching researchers, who state that "(i)t is clear that the parts that make up the whole practice of executive [...] coaching are not new – what is, is the whole, the package and its application" (Grant 2005: 10). Concurrently, as reported by researchers on other types of professional and

institutional discourse, this claimed hybridity and interdiscursivity is not, per se, a unique feature of coaching. Instead, it emerges as a linguistic consequence of a larger socio-cultural re-appraisal of values: in sight of the plurality and fragmentation of post-modern times, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999: 83) thus more generally claim that “a pervasive discursual hybridity in interactions and text – the mixing together of different genres and discourses – is a significant facet of the flux of late modern social life”. A case in point here is the colonization of ‘discursive technologies’, defined as “context-free techniques or skills which can be applied in various different domains” (Fairclough 1992: 8). In their ability to be applied across many different discursive domains and to pursue various institutional goals and purposes, such discursive technologies function as a key resource for cultural and social engineering.

The fact that executive coaching has emerged in the analysis as a discursive and interactional hybrid then is neither endemic to the coaching format nor does it represent an unexpected finding. Moreover, it is recognized as such by the coaching practitioners and must more generally be attributed to late modern society. Yet, the particularities of such hybridity and interdiscursivity in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* still await their detailed portrayal and interpretation. As Sarangi (2000: 23) argues that “in the light of the multiple levels at which activity types and discourse types configure in talk and text, hybridity is most likely to be manifest at the interactional level”, let us now zoom in on the level of ‘discursive practice’ in order to fully illuminate the hybridity and interdiscursivity of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*.

Three main spaces of hybridity and interdiscursivity will thereby be juxtaposed against the overall complexity of coaching as a discursive practice:

- Executive Coaching: the Discourses of Power and Equality
- Executive Coaching: between Therapeutic and Managerial Discourse
- Executive Coaching: between Discourse and Meta-discourse

The portrayal of these spaces of hybridity and interdiscursivity sheds light on the discursive reality behind the paradoxes of executive coaching and shows its creative, yet purposeful moments; it thereby unfolds moments of discrepancy between its representation in the coaching practice literature and the empirical findings in the current study. What is more, coaching-endemic discursive practices that have so far received little if any attention in the theoretical discussion on coaching, yet which locally translate and amend the undefined professional status of coaching in the here-and-now of the coaching encounter, will be recognized in their constitutive function for executive coaching.

9.2.1 Executive coaching: The discourses of power and equality

The first interdiscursive and hybrid space in executive coaching is formed by its underlying discourses of power and equality. Issues such as ‘(a)symmetry’, ‘power’ and ‘(non-)directiveness’ refer to the dimensions of ‘knowledge and expertise’ and ‘relationship’; they represent analytic themes in linguistic research on professional interaction and, concurrently, feature as focal themes in the coaching practice literature. As such, their detailed consideration in the context of executive coaching is both illuminating and mandatory.

A common denominator of executive coaching across its theory- and practice-informed literature is its potential to foster self-help in the clients. To speak with Peterson and Hicks (1995: 41), coaching can be defined as a “process of equipping people with the tools, knowledge, and opportunities they need to develop themselves and become more effective”. And Schreyögg (2012) argues that a basic component of coaching as professional interaction is not to direct or guide the client, but to foster their potential to self-guidance. As regards the relational aspect, coaching is often conceptualized as co-active, as ‘dialogue-at-eye-level’ or a symmetric relationship, which – according to Schreyögg (2012) – even turns into an asymmetric one in the course of the coaching encounter, yet in favor of the client, not the coach (but see Jautz 2017).

Let us now turn to the discourses of power and equality as they have emerged in the coaching data. The institutional and professional setting of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* turns the encounter between the coaches and their executive clients into an inherently asymmetric one; i.e. the coaches as professional agents exert power on the structural, thematic and interactive level in the analyzed coaching encounters with their clients. What is more, we witness an overall unequally acted out participation framework within which the coaches as primary speakers ‘do power’ according to their professional theory and professional vision. Coaching-specific power dynamics thereby emerge via the coaching encounter, not in the sense of any large-scale exercise of oppression on the part of the coach, but in the sense of a micro-level negotiation, co-construction and instantiation of more or less hierarchical and non-hierarchical activity patterns. To speak with Holmes et al. (1999: 355), “(o)ppressive discourse involves the open expression of coercive or ‘top-down’ power; while repressive discourse is a covert and often more positive means of exercising power, in which speakers minimize the over expression of differences in status or expertise and create solidarity in order to gain their interlocutors’ willing compliance and goodwill”.

‘Asymmetry’ in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* needs – first of all – to be differentiated along the dimension ‘coaching external factors’ and ‘coaching internal factors’: while the former type of asymmetry refers to unchangeable facets of this

professional format such as the professional's payment, the embeddedness of the coach-client dyad in the larger triadic relationship 'coach – client – client's organization' or the client's, instead of the coach's, mobility, the latter type refers to more flexible facets of the professional interaction itself such as participation rights and responsibilities or the distribution of knowledge. Here, 'asymmetry' must be further specified according to 'power and expertise as regards the coaching process and the interaction' and 'power and expertise as regards the thematic dimension and the relevant knowledge'. While the former – due to the institutional and professional setting of executive coaching – by definition remains largely, yet not completely, in the hands of the coach, the latter, i.e. the thematic dimension of coaching in the context of the client's primary concerns, witnesses a more subtle management of power and expertise between coach and client: here, the asymmetry emerges in both asymmetric-hierarchical and asymmetric-non-hierarchical forms of interaction.

In more detail, the following realizations of the discourses of power and equality have emerged in and through the four basic activities:

- In their primary function to locally and globally frame the interaction of 'coaching' and the coaching alliance, the basic activities 'Defining the Situation' and 'Building the Relationship' fall under the above-mentioned dimension of 'power and expertise as regards the coaching process and the interaction'. As such, the framing power rests predominantly on the coach.
- To be more specific, in 'Defining the Situation', the coach establishes the coaching realm via offering drinks, for example, and – in her/his role as professional expert – frames coaching methodologically and procedurally. In sketching out the thematic scope of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, the coach sanctions or invites a particular thematic focus by the client in his/her concern presentation and as such also exerts power on the thematic level. Concurrently, such thematic focusing can be experienced by the client as necessary orientation in an unfamiliar setting; the related negative connotation of 'exerting power' must therefore be reconsidered. Finally, the communicative task 'Temporal Framing of Coaching' bears witness to a stronger equality between the participants: the client initiates arranging dates for subsequent meetings or sets the time frame for the current meeting. Moreover, instead of being offered one or two options for the next meeting, as is often the case in therapeutic encounters or medical appointments, for example, coach and client, as busy professionals, negotiate their timetables – at times in lengthy sequences – in order to find an appropriate time and date for their next session. Yet, even here we witness that coach and client – in their respective roles and due to their respective repertoires – use different linguistic strategies to achieve their goals.

- A noteworthy, coaching-endemic realization of the discourse of equality is the participants' explicit negotiation of a more or less hierarchical orientation of their (asymmetrical) relationship in the context of the basic activity 'Defining the Relationship': topicalizing the quality of their relationship and expressing their feelings of closeness for one another, reframing the professional relationship (more) as friendship via switching to first names, etc. introduces non-hierarchical moments in the asymmetric relationship between coach and client. Here we witness a convergence of the discourse of coaching with the category of 'quasi-conversational professional encounters' as envisioned by Peräkylä (1995) or Vehviläinen (1999); *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* represents an "institutional setting, where 'sociable' or 'conversational' talk is an integral part of the achievement of institutional goals" and as such, "such talk is in a sense both ordinary and institutional" (Ehrlich and Freed 2010: 16). Yet again, the underlying asymmetry is never suspended as it is the coach who suggests switching to first names, for example, and is thereby 'doing power'. Concurrently, such "democratized discourse", i.e. the elimination of asymmetries in terms of address, being informal, moving onto the common ground of conversation, etc., can also be used strategically as a discursive technology to foster the relationship as an affective matrix against which the clients' concern can be processed more successfully on the intra-personal emotional level.
- Another moment of apparent reciprocity and equality in the context of the basic activity 'Building the Relationship' is the coach's self-disclosure of personal topics. While such sharing on equal terms is an endemic feature of female friendship (Coates 1996; Pawelczyk and Graf 2011), here such thematic reciprocity and equality serves the underlying professional goal of the interaction, i.e., "conversational discourse practices which traditionally belong in the private sphere are being systematically simulated within organizations" in the context of "synthetic personalization" (Fairclough 1992: 8).
- The basic activity 'Co-Constructing Change' entails those discursive practices that help process the clients' concerns and foster learning and development: the client acts as the expert for this thematic dimension of coaching, given that the relevant knowledge about the concern is located in his/her territory of information. However, the data evince acts of power by the coaches in the context of both diagnosing and intervening: via re-interpretations, reformulations and topic-closing questions, etc., the presented concern in its subjective life-world perspective is fragmented, transformed and categorized according to the underlying professional theory of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, i.e. according to the professional and institutional perspective, and thus turned into a coaching object. A case in point here is the omnipresent re-focusing of the clients

towards their intra-personal, emotional interaction field via ‘feelings-talk’. While the professionals must be doing power, given that the clients’ failure to solve their problem or tackle their concern leads to coaching in the first place (apart from those cases in the data where clients are offered coaching as an incentive in the context of a new managerial position), the processing strategies are not applied in a top-down manner, but the individual procedural steps are negotiated and the clients’ agreement and uptake is actively sought.

- Finally, the question of power and equality in the context of ‘Evaluating the Coaching’ is particularly interesting as regards its communicative task ‘Evaluating the Coaching Interaction’: unlike in many other professional formats, the clients are explicitly invited to assess the quality of their relationship with the coach and to advance their opinion on the applied methods and procedure. While such evaluating sequences as regards methods and procedure are (usually) invited by the coaches, once again in their role as professional expert, they do empower the clients, too: given that such evaluations are also acted out intermittently along the coaching process, a possible criticism or disagreement expressed by the client can lead to a changed form of interaction. The data also include instances where the clients – in an act of reciprocity and equality – invite the coaches’ evaluation of their relationship. Again, however, the clients make use of a linguistic repertoire that differs from that of the coaches.

To conclude, the overall result that executive coaching, too, cannot be too distant from the exercise of power by its coaches should neither come as a criticism of nor as a challenge to the very self-concept of coaching as a helping profession that fosters the emancipation and self-reflection of its clients: “a recognition that any form of professionalism cannot be too distant from the exercise of power – an exercise which sometimes all parties might recognize as appropriate and indeed useful” (Silverman 1997: 9). The appropriateness and usefulness of the discourses of power thereby refer in particular to their capacity to orient the clients due to a format-inherent insecurity and lack of established routine and to their capacity to find and develop solutions for clients who – at least in parts – lack this capacity. Peräkylä (2006: 246f) thereby adds that the professional’s authority is a constitutive feature of professional interaction and further argues that such authority does not exclude the building of a genuine partnership or alliance between professional and client.

In its overall asymmetrical layout that nevertheless allows for a negotiation of hierarchy and equality, both as regards the interaction framework and the thematic dimension, *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* exemplifies the paradigm shift in professional interaction from ‘expert-lay relationship’ to that of ‘co-participants’.

This differentiation goes hand and hand with the conceptualization of the client as a passive recipient of pre-defined services in contrast with (more) symmetric relationships where shared decision making and a more active participation of the client is the norm. The latter understanding goes back to Carl Rogers (1951), whose client-centered approach to therapy represents much more than a mere technique; alongside non-directiveness it has come to be considered an underlying norm or overarching professional value (Sarangi 2010) and interactional philosophy late modern times. In its quasi-conversational design, the discourses of power and (un) equality in this institutional and professional interaction allow coaches to bridge the gap between facilitation and guidance and control as the underlying professional treatment theories of executive coaching.

9.2.2 Executive coaching: Between therapeutic and managerial discourse

The next interdiscursive and hybrid space of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is formed by its underlying amalgamation of therapeutic and managerial discourses. A phrase that nicely captures these two opposing poles, i.e. the therapeutic realm and the managerial realm, within which the discourse of coaching oscillates, is Greif's (2008) definition of coaching as 'result-oriented self-reflection': while 'self-reflection' captures the idea of exploring more deeply one's feelings, emotional experiences and attitudes in the context of one's present, but also past, life, 'result-oriented' entails notions of output-orientation, high performance and feasible or measurable results in the present. The hybridity thereby affects both the level of executive coaching as an organizational intervention and its surrounding larger socio-cultural discourses and the level of coaching as a concrete discursive phenomenon locally acted out by coach and client.

The former has recently received critical appreciation in the work of Schulz (2013, 2016), Schulz and Graf (2011) and Schulz and Steyaert (2011, 2014) from an organization-psychological perspective, and it has also been discussed in the context of the therapeutic habitus (Costea et al. 2008), soft or emotional capitalism (Hochschild 1983; Thrift 1997; Illouz 2007) and more generally the commodification of emotions in modern times. In his analysis of interviews with agents involved in executive coaching, i.e. coaches, coached managers and HR managers, Schulz (2013) came up with the following four interpretative repertoires as regards the conceptualization of coaching as an organizational intervention: 'controlling performance', 'developing potentials', 'restraining symptoms' and 'nurturing the psyche' (see Table 21).

Table 21. Interpretative repertoires in executive coaching (adapted from Schulz 2013)

Interpretative repertoires	Controlling performance	Steering development	Restraining symptoms	Nurturing the psyche
Subject position of coach	assesses gaps and yields change techniques	facilitates reflection	assesses symptoms and yields healing techniques	creates intimate setting for conversation
Subject position of coached manager	has gaps, needs to be optimized and repaired	searches for clarity in an ever faster changing world	needs to be healed from symptoms	self-disclosing conversation partner
Theory of change	linear learning model: classical behaviorism	open-ended reflection of conflicts and roles: systemic model	medical model: classical psychiatry and psychoanalysis	dialogical model: contemporary psychotherapeutic models
Aims of intervention	improving performance	creating autonomous employee	healing and preventing psychological symptoms	resolving tensions in personal narratives and creating options
Metaphor	improving resources	sparring fight	medical treatment	equal partnership
Possible political effects	used as means of governance and disciplinary practice	increase in self-surveillance and self-management	individualization of organizational symptoms	emancipation against dominant discourse of performativity
Type of discourse	managerial discourse (distancing)		(psycho-)therapeutic discourse (narrowing / feeling)	

Whereas ‘controlling performance’ and ‘developing potential’ can be subsumed under the meta-level of ‘managerial discourse’, ‘restraining symptoms’ and ‘nurturing the psyche’ are subsumed under the meta-level of ‘therapeutic discourse’. While both types of discourse, i.e. managerial and psychotherapeutic, feature in coaching as claimed by Schulz (2013), ‘restraining symptoms’ and ‘nurturing the psyche’ are prominent, yet not openly or proactively acknowledged!

Executive coaching as a relatively new intervention format, then, is embedded in an organizational context that fosters particular dominant discourses such as optimizing performance or functionalizing emotions: the interactive discursive practices of executive coaching relate, replicate and translate these dominant discourses into the in-situ interaction between coach and client. This more local practicing of the dialectic between (therapeutic) self-reflection and (managerial) result-orientation has been addressed in the context of the current analysis.

We witness an explicit distancing from psychotherapy, both in the local here-and-now of the coaching interaction and in the theory-and-practice based literature on coaching, and yet therapeutic practices are applied excessively in the context of processing the clients' concerns on the intra-personal, emotional interaction field. This contradiction possibly represents the most striking paradox in executive coaching in general and *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* in particular: While it is stressed time and again in the literature on coaching and other helping professions that change is prompted and accompanied by feelings, the often stigmatizing connotations of therapy such as weakness, failure and dysfunction that still linger in the management world require a relatedness between executive coaching and psychotherapy to be avoided at all costs as "(t)herapy is seen as appropriate for Woody Allen types who would rather sit around and whine than go out and make things happen. This is hardly an attractive image for the corporate executive charged with the task of moving 'market mountains' (Peltier 2010: xxxvii). The difference between these two formats is therefore explicitly addressed in detailed treaties across both practice- and theory-oriented books on coaching.

According to Sorjonen and Peräkylä (2012: 11), "(i)n some institutional settings, emotion displays and explicit talk about emotions are central for the main goal of the activity". While working with clients' emotions originates in psychotherapy, discursive strategies applied by professionals to engage their clients in 'feelings-talk' have colonized many other professional helping formats and thus represent 'discourse technologies' in Fairclough's (1992) sense, i.e. supra-contextual techniques or skills which are applied in various different professional domains in order to pursue the underlying goals of the respective institutions. Feelings-talk, i.e. various aspects of emotional work that transpire in the interaction between a professional (practitioner) and an individual (client, patient, etc.) who is in need of some kind of assistance or the discourse of emotions as represented in the therapeutic narrative is "widely pervasive because is performed in a wide variety of social sites such as support groups, talk shows, counseling, rehabilitation programs, for-profit workshops, therapy sessions, the Internet: all are sites for the performance and retooling of the self" (Illouz 2007: 48). *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is such an institutional setting in Sorjonen and Peräkylä's (2012) sense: according to its underlying professional theories the clients' emotions or emotional experiences are the predominant focal theme of this professional practice.

The questions that remain to be answered here are how exactly is the discourse on clients' emotionality acted out locally, i.e. how is this "psy-practice and -discourse" (Rose 1990) locally framed and embedded in the organizational intervention by the participants in their local communicative management of coaching, and what are the coaching-specific features of feelings-talk as discursive technology of late modern society?

The reflective or therapeutic practices in the context of processing the clients' concern are the predominant discursive practices to act out the basic activity 'Co-Constructing Change' locally; more specifically, during the communicative tasks of 'diagnosing' and 'intervening' the coaches (re-)focus their clients from an external, facts-oriented perspective on their concern to an internal, emotional, experience-oriented perspective on their concern. At times, the clients' emotionality or problematic emotionality is not necessarily presented by them as their primary concern, yet as a consequence of the coaches' re-interpretations, reformulations or questioning behavior during both the diagnosing and intervening practices, we witness a thematic shift as regards the clients' concern according to the underlying professional theory of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*. In analogy with Goodwin's (1994) 'professional vision' and Hutchby's (2007) 'therapeutic vision', it is claimed here that the coaches in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* apply a particular coaching vision throughout the data: to a greater or lesser degree across the various processes which were analyzed, the coaches interactively pursue a way of seeing and understanding events according to professionally-relevant, i.e. *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*-relevant, norms. This implies that the coaches highlight or home in on emotional or experiential issues in the raw material offered by the clients and code or discursively transform this according to their underlying professional theory of Internal Family System and Emotional Intelligence. The diagnosing and intervening practices of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* on the intra-personal level display the whole gamut of reflexive or therapeutic practices also reported for psycho-therapeutic interaction (Pawelczyk 2011; Pawelczyk and Graf 2011; Graf and Pawelczyk 2014; Graf 2017a; Spranz-Fogasy et al. under review).

Yet, such reflective work on the clients' emotional experiences via therapeutic practices such as verbalizing emotions and re-experiencing emotions in the here-and-now of the coaching encounter as core elements of 'Co-constructing Change' is particularly prepared and framed via the basic activities in conjunction with 'Building the Relationship' and 'Defining the Situation'. Moreover, the reflective work is functionalized beyond the benefits of the individual client and his/her self-reflection for the larger organizational purposes via securing the transfer of the clients' learning and development from the inside-coaching realm to the outside-coaching realm, i.e. the larger organizational background.

As regards 'Building the Relationship', the discursively established coaching alliance in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is characterized by a high emotional involvement and empathic overall stance on the part of the coach that creates the necessary safe space and emotional climate for the executive client to face his/her emotional experiences, also in the context of less-dominant discourses (less-dominant according to the larger organizational contexts of the intervention) such as longing for a significant other or psychosomatic health problems. Thus, the

relationship between coach and client epitomizes the patient-centered approach in helping professions based on the emotional connection and expression of its participants (Miller and Considine 2009: 410).

The overall coaching frame – discursively established in and through the basic activity ‘Defining the Situation’ and the outer, physical frame – prepare the necessary grounds for the successful acting out of therapeutic discourses despite the organizational motivation and origin of the intervention. In more detail, the set-up of the coaching realm, i.e. the cozy and intimate atmosphere of the coaching room, the extensive framing small talk and social talk at the borders of the coaching interaction that offer enough space to verbalize less-dominant discourses such as illness and thus do important relational work in order to achieve the interactional goals of the encounter, together with the generous time frame of the coaching sessions that allows for a step-by-step and cautious exploration of underlying feelings and emotional experiences, supports and facilitates the predominance of a particular communicative practice to evolve, in this case the transpiring of therapeutic or reflective discourse.

The managerial discourses in the form of output-oriented issues such as peak performance, securing one’s position as a newly promoted executive, but also displaying a professionally appropriate emotionality in one’s professional realm enter the picture both on the thematic level of the coach-client encounter and on the interactional and structural level: despite the (re-)focusing on the clients’ emotionality in the context of their concerns, ‘concern’ in coaching is discursively framed as a ‘goal’ rather than as a ‘problem’ and is predominantly tackled via prospective instead of retrospective intervening acts. Moreover, while the great majority of change-co-constructing discursive practices transpire on, or at least aim at, the clients’ intra-personal interaction field and are thus conceptualized here as therapeutic practices, the emotional insights gained are strategically linked back to the clients’ professional reality as an executive manager, i.e. they are re-framed in the context of their purpose for the paying organization. In other words, even though feelings-talk in executive coaching is largely accomplished using similar strategies to those reported for feelings-talk in the helping profession of ‘psychotherapy’ and even though feelings-talk also represents a constitutive feature of *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*, the organizational background requires additional strategies that support the functionalizing of the clients’ emotional experiences and learning for organizational purposes (Graf and Pawelczyk 2014; Graf under review).

This happens, on the one hand, via the communicative task ‘securing transfer’ as part of the basic activity ‘Co-Constructing Change’; here, the clients’ learning and development is corroborated and discursively transferred from the ‘inside-coaching realm’ to the ‘outside-coaching realm’, i.e. to the clients’ professional realm. On the other hand, this happens via the communicative task ‘evaluating clients’ change

as regards their concern(s)' as part of the basic activity 'Evaluating the Coaching'. The extensive evaluating practices underline the importance of (ideally) concrete, if not measurable, results of the coaching interaction against the background of the organization's financial investment in the clients.

The prospective, goal- and solution-oriented perspective on the clients' emotionality, the strategies to secure the transfer of the clients' insights from the coaching realm to their professional realm and the extensive evaluation and further corroboration of the clients' change and learning via explicit references to performance, for example, attest to the underlying business orientation of the coaching encounter.

We can conclude with Vehviläinen (1999: 51) that "(t)here are several professional practices through which the client's life situation and perspective are foregrounded in the interaction and in which the main goal is to 'help the client help her/himself' in relation to different fields of life". Executive coaching is one of those professional practices envisioned in Vehviläinen's quote: *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* aims to empower the clients and support them to develop their own insights and decisions in order to allow for their learning and development. Concurrently, executive coaching as an organizational intervention embeds such learning and development by the clients in the managerial realm. Clients' changes are (partly) initiated, pursued and paid for by the client's company. Hence, while coaching is predominantly experienced by the clients as emancipatory and agentive as it offers them the necessary self-space or reflection space beyond their demanding exigencies and tasks as executives, it also serves the functionalization of clients' emotionality and change for organizational purposes such as ensuring peak performance in its staff. Looked at it from a more critical perspective, it thus also entails a pernicious potential in the form of a functionalization, capitalization or de-humanization of emotions. Rephrased from a discourse perspective, the discourses of executive coaching oscillate between the two opposing poles of 'therapeutic discourse' (both as regards its concrete discursive practices and its larger underlying norms and values such as that of the personal benefit and relief of talking things through) and 'managerial discourse' with its focal themes of performativity, success and return on investment.

9.2.3 Executive coaching: Between discourse and meta-discourse

The third interdiscursive and hybrid space in *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* is formed by its amalgamation of discourse and meta-discourse: coaching in its local co-construction by coach and client oscillates between the discourse OF coaching and the discourse ABOUT coaching. 'Meta-discourse' is broadly understood here in Mey's (2001: 173) sense as metalanguage, i.e. "a 'metalanguage' indicates a language that is about language, one level 'up' from the language itself, the 'object

language’ [...] A metalanguage indicates, comments on, examines, criticizes, etc. what happens on the level of the object language”. However, drawing on the underlying three-dimensional discursive approach to coaching, the current definition of ‘meta-discourse’ does not refer to this textual level, but to the level of discursive practices and, as such, argues in the vein of Mauranen’s (1993) distinction between ‘metadiscourse’ and ‘text reflexivity’.

One of the major findings of the current analysis is that in order to be doing coaching, coaches and clients need to discursively and explicitly establish the interaction type as an endemic part of the interaction itself. Meta-discourse is reported to be a common feature of goal-oriented and work-related activity types, where it is used for the clarification of meanings, summaries and reformulations, but also for describing and labeling preceding, ongoing and subsequent speech activities, etc. (Penz 2011, 2014). In the context of psychotherapy, Bartesaghi (2009: 23) thus claims that “(t)alk about communication – how, when and why clients communicate, hear, talk, listen and mean – is at the core of session exchanges”. Yet, in the context of the activity type ‘executive coaching’, in addition to managing such textual aspects (Graf 2012, 2017b), meta-discourse serves a truly constitutive function.

Meta-discourse in executive coaching does not primarily help to clarify lexical meaning or increase the explicitness about topics discussed, about discourse structure or illocutionary intent, but first and foremost enables the creation of a common interactional ground on which ‘doing coaching’, i.e. the discourse of coaching, becomes possible in the first place. Coaching represents a relatively new discursive domain or, to come back to Bjorkeng et al.’s (2008) assessment, coaching is still in an embryonic state. The lack of clear-cut professional boundaries, i.e. the undefined professional and institutional status of coaching, leads to a lack of institutional routines for the participants at the level of the concrete interaction. The local consequence of this lack of professional establishment is that “defining the speech activity is part of the problem in getting the work done” (Roberts and Sarangi 1999: 227). Such defining practices usually transpire mainly back stage, “along the way”, in (more) established professional formats such as therapy or doctor-patient interaction (cf. Vehviläinen 1999: 88). Yet, the coaching data show that the discursive practices that orient the clients as regards the ongoing interaction along its internal set-up and thematic layout, but also as regards its time frame, etc. are part and parcel of coaching discourse. In other words, the basic activity ‘Defining the Situation’ and its communicative tasks ‘Establishing the Coaching Realm’, ‘Setting the Time Frame’ and in particular the communicative task ‘Methodological and Procedural Framing of Coaching’ with its meta-discursive information-delivery sequences during which coaching relevant procedural and methodological information is transferred to the clients, occupy front stage in the professional context of executive coaching. According to Sarangi (2000: 19), “explicit definitions

of situation are called for at times of interactional trouble". Looking at the current data we can reformulate the quote as follows: explicit definitions of situations are also called for in the context of uncertainty to offer orientation and stability and thus to preempt possible interactional trouble.

However, the omnipresent meta-discourse of 'coaching' fulfills a second relevant coaching-endemic function: engaging in such meta-discursive practices allows for the creative and flexible adaption of the professional format to the needs, requirements and personal pre-conditions of the individual client! Following Greif (2008: 231), each coach-client encounter represents a unique and irreproducible constellation with its particular prerequisites, prior experiences and specific context of situation. This flexibility as regards the thematic orientation, interactive procedure and temporal framing represents a relevant success factor in coaching. However, such flexibility can only be acted out within the confines of the surrounding professional theory and professional agenda. What is more, it needs to be locally negotiated by the participants in the here-and-now of their coaching encounter, i.e. coach and client engage in meta-discursive framing and defining practices as regards their individual set-up of coaching in order to engage in a successful interaction. While such meta-discursive framing and defining practices are acted out in the context of the basic activity 'Defining the Situation', the basic activity 'Evaluating the Coaching' in its communicative task 'Evaluating the Coaching Interaction' also entails coaching meta-discourse as the participants, in evaluating their interaction, i.e. the methods and procedures as well as their coaching alliance, also do coaching by 'talking about coaching'. This last type of meta-discourse fulfills yet another vital function for coaching as it empowers the client to play a (more) active role in defining the overall situation of 'coaching' and in building the coaching alliance.

Despite this multi-functional interactional relevance and omnipresence of coaching meta-discourse in the data, the phenomenon has gone largely unnoticed in the research on coaching and has received little attention in its constitutive function in the theory- and practice-oriented literature on coaching. While it is expounded, for example by Peltier (2010: xxix), that coaching is often defined *ex negativo* and as such "(i)t is no accident that management consultants often start by declaring what coaching is not", the reverse case, i.e. that coaches start by declaring what coaching is, is not found in the literature on coaching. As such, the findings of the current analysis bring to our attention discursive practices which coaches and in particular, coaching theory, are not explicitly aware of. To speak with Peräkylä et al. (2005: 106), "(g)enerally, it is clear that any professional theory is but one constituent of institutional interaction. Empirical interaction research, then, has the potential to analyze contextual features that participants orient to, even when professional theory does not mention them".

In Goodwin and Duranti's (1992) sense we can argue that coaching discourse IS and MUST be contextualized by other coaching discourse, i.e. by coaching meta-discourse, in order to locally make up for its lack of institutional routines and thus to guarantee the transpiring of the proper coaching discourse, that is, establishing and processing the clients' concern and evaluating their learning and development for themselves and for the larger organizational purpose of the intervention. It stays to wonder whether the growing familiarity of executive clients with the discursive event 'executive coaching' turns this aspect of the meta-discourse of coaching into a back-stage activity as is the case in more established professional helping formats. Besides, the contextualizing of coaching discourse by coaching meta-discourse guarantees the flexible adaptation of its tools and interventions to the individual coach-client dyad and the uniqueness of its coaching encounter and empowers the clients by offering them the necessary space to meta-discursively evaluate the coaching discourse.

To conclude, executive coaching has emerged from the data as a hybrid and interdiscursive professional format, whose activity based layout and multifaceted discursive morphology attest both to its developmental, socio-cultural and organizational status in the 21st century. Doing coaching means managing multiple activities and discourses on the side of coach and client. While the coaching practice literature discusses this hybridity and interdiscursivity to a certain extent, the current study could shed light on many seen but unnoticed discursive practices. This is an important first step in the context of an 'application-oriented basic research' such as the present one. Next steps, but beyond the scope of the current book, are to promote a discourse-and-communication based understanding of coaching amongst the coaching practitioners, i.e. to sensitize them to towards communicative and interactive processes and to raise their communicative awareness of action alternatives for managing (challenging) communicative situations with their clients (such as a lack of understanding for coaching as format). Concurrently, after sketching out the thematic map of executive coaching in its hybridity and interdiscursivity, a truly micro-linguistic look into its sequential and supra-sequential co-construction on a turn-by-turn basis represents another relevant next step to discover what makes coaching unique.

References

- Abu-Lughod, Lila, and Catherine Lutz. 1990. "Introduction: Emotion, Discourse, and the Politics of Everyday Life." In *Language and the Politics of Emotions*, Catherine Lutz, and Lila Abu-Lughod (eds.), 1–23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ainsworth-Vaughn, Nancy. 1998. *Claiming Power in Doctor-Patient Talk*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ainsworth-Vaughn, Nancy. 2001. "The Discourse of Medical Encounters." In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi Hamilton (eds.), 453–469. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Alessi, Glen, and Geert Jacobs (eds). 2015. *The Ins and Outs of Business and Professional Discourse Research. Reflections on Interacting with the Workplace*. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Alvesson, Mats, and Dan Kärreman. 2000. "Varieties of Discourse: on the Study of Organizations through Discourse Analysis". *Human Relations* 53/9: 1125–1149.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700539002>
- Arndt, Horst, and Richard Wanye Janney. 1987. *InterGrammar. Toward an Integrative Model of Verbal, Prosodic and Kinesic Choices in Speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110872910>
- Ashkanasy, Neal M., and Ronald H. Humphrey. 2011. "Current Emotion Research in Organizational Behavior". *Emotion Review* 3: 214–224.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073910391684>
- Bachkirova, Tatiana, and Elaine Cox. 2004. "A Bridge over Troubled Water: Bring Together Coaching and Counseling". *Internal Journal of Mentoring and Coaching* 11/1: 24–37.
- Bachkirova, Tatiana, and Elaine Cox. 2007. "Coaching with Emotion in Organisations: Investigations of Personal Theories". *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 28/7: 600–612.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730710823860>
- Bachkirova, Tatiana, and Carol Kauffman. 2009. "The Blind Man and the Elephant: Using Criteria of Universality and Uniqueness in Evaluation Our Attempts to Define Coaching". *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice* 2/2: 95–105.
- Bachkirova, Tatiana, Elaine Cox, and David Clutterbuck. 2010. "Introduction". In *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*, Cox, Elaine, Tatiana Bachkirova, and David Clutterbuck (eds.), 1–20. London: Sage.
- Bachkirova, Tatiana, Elaine Cox, and David Clutterbuck. 2014. "Introduction". In *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*, 2nd ed., Cox, Elaine, Tatiana Bachkirova, and David Clutterbuck (eds.), 1–20. London: Sage.
- Bachkirova, Tatiana, Elaine Cox, and David Clutterbuck. 2018. "Introduction". In *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*, 3rd ed., Cox, Elaine, Tatiana Bachkirova, and David Clutterbuck (eds.), xxix–xiviii. London: Sage.

- Bachkirova, Tatiana, Jonathan Sibley, and Adrian Myers. 2011. *Final Progress Report on the Research Project: Development of an Instrument for Microanalysis of Coaching Sessions*, 1–51. Oxford Brooks University: Institute for Coaching.
- Bachkirova, Tatiana, Gordon Spence, and David Drake (eds). 2017. *The SAGE Handbook of Coaching*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Bacon, Terry, and Karen Spear. 2007. *Adaptive Coaching. The Art and Practice of a Client-Centered Approach in Performance Improvement*. Mountain View: Davis-Black Publishing.
- Bartesaghi, Mariaelena. 2009. "How the Therapist Does Authority: Six Strategies to Substitute Client Accounts in the Session". *Communication & Medicine* 6: 15–25. <https://doi.org/10.1558/cam.v6i1.15>
- Becker-Mrotzek, Michael. 1992. *Diskursforschung und Kommunikation in Institutionen*. Studienbibliographie Sprachwissenschaft. Heidelberg: Groos.
- Becker-Mrotzek, Michael, and Gisela Brünner. 2007. „Anliegensklärung: Anliegen formulieren und explorieren“. In *Diskurse und Texte. Festschrift für Konrad Ehlich*, Angelika Redder (ed.), 665–682. Tübingen: Stauffenberg.
- Behn-Taran, Angelika. 2014. "I am My Worst Enemy". A Linguistic Analysis of Interactive Dynamics or Relational Patterns in Business Coaching Conversations. (Phil. Diss. Ludwig Maximilians Universität München).
- Benwell, Bethan, and Elizabeth Stokoe. 2006. *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bercelli, Fabrizio, Frederico Rossano, and Maurizio Viaro. 2013. "Supra-session Courses of Action in Psychotherapy". *Journal of Pragmatics* 57: 118–137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.08.001>
- Berger, Charles. 1997. *Planning Strategic Interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Berger, Charles. 2000. "Goal Detection and Efficiency: Neglected Aspects of Message Productions". *Communication Theory* 10: 156–166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2000.tb00185.x>
- Berglas, Steven. 2002. "The Very Real Dangers of Executive Coaching." *Harvard Business Review* 80/6: 86–92.
- Besnier, Niko. 1990. "Language and Affect." *Annual Reviews of Anthropology* 19: 419–451. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.19.100190.002223>
- Bhatia, Vijay K. 2017. *Critical Genre Analysis. Investigating Interdiscursive Performance in Professional Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Bjorkeng, Kjersti, Steward Clegg, Alexandra Pitsis, and Carl Rhodes. 2008. "The New Discipline of Organizational Coaching." *School of Management Working Paper Series* 2008/5: 2–23.
- Bluckert, Peter. 2005. "The Similarities and Differences between Coaching and Therapy." *Industrial and Commercial Training* 37/2: 91–96. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00197850510584241>
- Bolton, Sharon, and Carol Boyd. 2003. "Trolley Dolly or Skilled Emotion Manger?" *Work, Employment and Society* 17: 289–308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017003017002004>
- Böning, Uwe. 2002. „Coaching: Der Siegeszug eines Personalentwicklungs-Instruments. Eine 10-Jahres-Bilanz“. In *Handbuch Coaching*, Christopher Rauen (ed.), 21–43. Hogrefe: Göttingen.
- Böning, Uwe, and Claudia Kegel. 2015. *Ergebnisse der Coaching-Forschung. Aktuelle Studien – ausgewertet für die Coaching-Praxis*. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Brandner, Elke. 2012. Beendigungen von Arzt-Patienten-Gesprächen: Fallstudien vom Beginn und Ende physikalischer Therapieverläufe. Unveröffentl. Diplomarbeit. Universität Wien.
- Bresser, Frank (2009). *Global Coaching Survey 2008/2009. Executive Summary*. Köln: Frank Bresser Consulting & Associates.

- Brown, Brian, Paul Crawford, and Ronald Carter (2006). *Evidence-based Health-communication*. London: Open University.
- Bruner, Jerome. 2004. *Actual Worlds, Possible Minds*. Harvard: Cambridge University Press.
- Brünner, Gisela. 2005. "Arzt-Patient-Kommunikation als Experten-Laien Kommunikation". In *Psychosomatische Gesprächsführung in der Frauenheilkunde. Ein interdisziplinärer Ansatz zur verbalen Interaktion*, Neises, Mechthild, Susanne Ditz, and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.), 90–109. Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Brünner, Gisela. 2009. Die Verständigung zwischen Arzt und Patient als Experten-Laien-Kommunikation. In *Informiert und selbstbestimmt: Der mündige Bürger als mündiger Patient*, Norbert Klusen, and Anja Meusch (eds.), 170–188. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
<https://doi.org/10.5771/9783845216973-170>
- Brünner, Gisela. 2011. *Gesundheit durchs Fernsehen – Linguistische Untersuchungen zur Vermittlung medizinischen Wissens und Aufklärung in Gesundheitssendungen*. Duisburg: Universitätsverlag Rhein-Ruhr.
- Buckley, Anthony. 2007. "The Mental Health Boundary in Relationship to Coaching and Other Activities". *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring. Special Issue*: 17–23.
- Bühler, Karl. 1934. *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Stuttgart: UTB Verlag.
- Buttny, Richard. 1996. "Clients' and Therapists' Joint Construction of Clients' Problems." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29/2: 125–153. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi2902_2
- Button, Graham. 1991. "Conversation-in-a-series." In *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*, Boden, Deirdre, and Don Zimmerman (eds.), 251–277. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Byrne, Patrick, and B. Long. 1976. *Doctors Talking to Patients: A Study of the Verbal Behavior of Doctors in the Consultation*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Cameron, Deborah. 2000. *Good to Talk?*. London: Sage Publications.
- Cameron, Deborah. 2003. "Language: Designer Voices". *Critical Quarterly* 43/4: 81–85.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8705.00392>
- Candlin, Christopher. 1997. "General Editors' Preface". In *The Construction of Professional Discourse*, Britt-Luise Gunnarsson, Per Linell and Bengt Nordberg (eds.), viii–xiv. Harlow: Longman.
- Candlin, Christopher (ed). 2002. *Research and Practice in Professional Discourse*. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.
- Candlin, Christopher, and Srikant Sarangi (eds). 2011. *Handbook of Communication in Organisations and Professions*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214222>
- Cavanagh, Michael, Anthony Grant, and Travis Kemp (eds). 2005. *Evidence-based Coaching. Volume 1: Theory, Research and Practice from the Behavioural Sciences*. Bowen Hills: Australian Academic Press.
- Charan, Ram. 2009. "The Coaching Industry: A Work in Progress." *Harvard Business Review* 87/1: 93.
- Chiles, Tina. 2006. Constructing professional identity: Discourse and mentoring in the workplace. PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie, and Norman Fairclough. 1999. *Discourse in Late Modernity. Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh.
- Cicourel, Aaron. 1992. "The Interpretation of Communicative Contexts: Examples from Medical Encounters." In *Rethinking Context. Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, Alessandro Duranti, and Charles Goodwin (eds.), 292–310. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Clark, Herbert. H. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620539>
- Coates, Jennifer. 1996. *Women Talk. Conversations Between Women Friends*. London: Blackwell.
- Costea, Bogdan, Crump, N. and Kostas Armirides 2007. "Managerialism" and "Infinite Human Resourcefulness": A Commentary upon the "Therapeutic Habitus", "Derecognition of Finitude" and the Modern Sense of Self." *Journal of Cultural Research* 11/3: 245–264.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14797580701763855>
- Costea, Bogdan, Crump, N. and Kostas Armirides. 2008. "Managerialism, the Therapeutic Habitus and the Self in Contemporary Organizing." *Human Relations* 61/5, 661–685.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708091763>
- Coupland, John. 2000. "Introduction: Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Small Talk". In *Small Talk*, John Coupland (ed.), 1–25. London: Longman.
- Cox, Elaine, Tatiana Bachkirova, and David Clutterbuck (eds). 2010. *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*. London: Sage.
- Cox, Elaine, Tatiana Bachkirova, and David Clutterbuck (eds). 2014. *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*. 2nd edition. London: Sage.
- Cox, Elaine, Tatiana Bachkirova, and David Clutterbuck (eds). 2018. *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*. 3rd edition. London: Sage.
- Crowe, Trevor. 2017. Coaching and Psychotherapy. In *The SAGE Handbook of Coaching*, Tatiana Bachkirova, Gordon Spence, and David Drake (eds.), 85–101. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Ltd.
- D'Abate, Caroline, Erik Eddy, and Scott Tannenbaum. 2003. "What's in a Name? A Literature-Based Approach to Understanding Mentoring, Coaching and Other Constructs that Describe Developmental Interactions." *Human Resource Development Review* 2: 360–384.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484303255033>
- Davis, Susan. 2005. "Integrating an Emotional Intelligence Framework into Evidence-based Coaching." In *Evidence-based Coaching. Volume 1: Theory, Research and Practice from the Behavioural Sciences*, Michael Cavanagh, Anthony Grant, and Travis Kemp (eds.), 57–67. Bowen Hills: Australian Academic Press.
- De Haan, Erik, Colin Bertie, Andrew Day, and Charlotte Sills. 2010. "Critical Moments of Clients and Coaches: A Direct-comparison Study." *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 5/2: 109–128.
- De Haan, Erik, Anthony Grant, Yvonne Burger, and Paul Eriksson. 2016. "A Large-scale Study of Executive and Workplace Coaching: The Relative Contributions of Relationship, Personality Match, and Self-efficacy." *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research* 68/3: 189–207. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000058>
- Deplazes, Silvia. 2016. *KaSyCo – Kategoriensystem zur Analyse von Coachingprozessen. Instrument-Entwicklung und Anwendungsbeispiele*. Kassel: Kassel University Press.
- Deplazes, Silvia, Eva-Maria Graf, and Hansjörg Künzli. 2018. Das TSPP-Model. Eine Blaupause für die Coaching-Prozessforschung. *Coaching | Theorie & Praxis*.
- Deutscher Bundesverband Coaching (DBVC). 2008. *Leitlinien und Empfehlungen für die Entwicklung von Coaching als Profession*. Osnabrück: DBVC.
- Deutscher Bundesverband Coaching (DBVC). 2012. *Leitlinien und Empfehlungen für die Entwicklung von Coaching als Profession*. Osnabrück: DBVC.
- De Fina, Anna, Deborah Schiffrin, and Michael Bamberg (eds). 2006. *Discourse and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511584459>

- Diedrich, Richard, and Richard Kilburg. 2001. "Foreword: Further Consideration of Executive Coaching as an Emerging Competency." *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research* 53: 203–204. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1061-4087.53.4.203>
- Dörnyei, Zoltan. 2007. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Drath, Karsten. 2012. *Coaching und seine Wurzeln*. Freiburg/München: Haufe Gruppe.
- Drew, Paul. 2013. "Turn Design". In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, Jack Sidnell, and Tanya Stivers (eds.), 131–149. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Drew, Paul, and John Heritage (eds.). 1992. *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, Paul, and John Heritage. 1992. "Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction". In *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings*, Paul Drew, and John Heritage (eds.), 3–65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ehlich, Konrad. 1992. "HIAT – a Transcription System for Discourse Data." In *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*, Jane Edwards, and Martin Lampert (eds.), 123–148. Hillsdale, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum Ass.
- Ehrlich, Susan, and Alice Freed 2010. "The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse: An Introduction." In *"Why Do You Ask?" The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse*, Alice Freed, and Susan Ehrlich (eds.), 1–19. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ensink, Titus, and Christoph Sauer (eds). 2003. *Framing and Perspectivising in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.111>
- Ensink, Titus, and Christoph Sauer. 2003. "Social-functional and Cognitive Approaches to Discourse Interpretation: The Role of Frame and Perspective." In *Framing and Perspectivising in Discourse*, Titus Ensink, and Christoph Sauer (eds.), 1–21. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.111.02ens>
- Farber, Barry. 2006. *Self-Disclosure in Psychotherapy*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analyzing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Fambrough, Mary, and Rama Hart. 2008. "Emotions in Leadership Development: A Critique of Emotional Intelligence." *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 10: 740–758. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422308323542>
- Feldman, Daniel, and Melanie Lankau. 2005. "Executive Coaching: A Review and Agenda for Future Research." *Journal of Management* 31/6: 829–848. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279599>
- Fengler, Jörg. 2001. "Coaching: Definition, Prinzipien, Qualifikationen, illustriert anhand einer Fallvignette." *Gruppendynamik* 32/1: 37–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11612-001-0004-0>
- Ferrara, Kathleen W. 1994. *Therapeutic Ways with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fetzer, Anita. 2004. *Recontextualising Context. Grammaticality Meets Appropriateness*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.121>
- Fiehler, Reinhard. 2005. "Erleben und Emotionalität im Arzt-Patienten-Gespräch." In *Psychosomatische Gesprächsführung in der Frauenheilkunde. Ein interdisziplinärer Ansatz zur verbalen Interaktion*, Mechthild Neises, Susanne Ditz, and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.), 120–136. Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Fillery-Travis, Annette, and Elaine Cox. 2018. "Researching Coaching." In *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*, 3rd ed., Elaine Cox, Tatiana Bachirova, and David Clutterbuch (eds.), 518–535. Los Angeles: Sage.

- Fineman, Stephen (ed). 2000. *Emotion in Organization*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fineman, Stephen. 2000. "Commodifying the Emotionally Intelligent." In *Emotion in Organization*, Stephen Fineman (ed.), 101–114. London: Sage Publications.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446219850.n6>
- Flaherty, James. 2005. *Coaching. Evoking Excellence in Others*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Frijda, Niko. 2000. "The Psychologists' Point of View." In *The Handbook of Emotions*, Lewis, Michael, and Jeannette Haviland-Jones (eds.), 59–74. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Furedi, Frank. 2004. *Therapy Culture. Cultivating Vulnerability in an Uncertain Age*. Routledge, London.
- Gaik, Frank. 1992. Radio Talk-show Therapy and the Pragmatics of Possible Worlds. In *Rethinking Context. Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, Alessandro Duranti, and Charles Goodwin (eds.), 271–289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Galdynski, Karoline, and Stefan Kühn. 2009. *Black-Box Beratung?* Berlin: Springer VS.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-91560-9>
- Gale, J. E. 1991. *Conversation Analysis of Therapeutic Discourse: The Pursuit of a Therapeutic Agenda*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Garvey, Bob. 2010. Researching Coaching: A Critical Perspective. Keynote at the 1st International Coaching Congress – Coaching Meets Research. Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz: Olten.
- Garman, Andrew, David Whiston, and K. Zlatoper. 2000. "Media Perception of Executive Coaching and the Formal Preparation of Coaches." *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research* 52: 201–205. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1061-4087.52.3.201>
- Gee, James, Glynda Hull, and Colin Lankshear. 1996. *The New Work Order: Behind the Language of New Capitalism*. Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd.: St Leonards.
- Geißler, Harald. 2009. "Die inhaltsanalytische „Vermessung“ von Coachingprozessen." In *Coachingwissen. Denn sie wissen nicht, was sie tun?*, Bernd Birgmeier (ed.), 93–125. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Geißler, Harald. 2013. "Produkt- und Marktsegmentierung von Coaching." In: *Coaching-Praxisfelder. Forschung und Praxis im Dialog – Online-Teil*, Robert Wegener, Agnes Fritze, and Michael Loebbert (eds.), 260–271. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Geißler, Harald. 2017. *Die Grammatik des Coachens. Eine empirische Rekonstruktion*. Wiesbaden: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-09640-3>
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2002. "Narrative and Identity Management: Discourse and Social Identities in a Tale of Tomorrow." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 35/4: 427–451. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327973RLSI3504_2
- Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Polity Press: Cambridge.
- Goffman, Ervin. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, Ervin. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. New York: Northeastern University Press.
- Goffman, Ervin. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goleman, David. 1995. *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, David. 1998. *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Goodwin, Charles. 1994. "Professional Vision". *American Anthropologist* 96/3: 606–633.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1994.96.3.02a00100>
- Goodwin, Charles and Alessandro Duranti. 1992. "Rethinking Context: An Introduction." In *Rethinking Context. Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, Alessandro Duranti, and Charles Goodwin (eds.), 1–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gorby, C. B. 1937. "Everyone Gets a Share of the Profits." *Factory Management & Maintenance* 95: 82–83.
- Graf, Eva-Maria. 2007a. New Crossing for New Encounters. An Applied Pragmatic Glimpse at the Discourse of Coaching. In: Eva-Maria Graf and Allan James (eds.), *English Studies in Flux: New Peaks, New Shores, New Crossings. Arbeiten aus Amerikanistik und Anglistik*, 201–214. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Graf, Eva-Maria. 2007b. "'I'm Not Embarrassed' – 'A Little ... Uncomfortable? Is that Nearer?'" The Negotiation for Meaning in the Discourse of Coaching." In *Current Trends in Pragmatics*, Piotr Cap, and Joanna Nijakowska (eds.), 281–302. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholar Press.
- Graf, Eva-Maria. 2008. "Wir kommunizieren, also sind wir – Coaching aus kommunikativer und sprachwissenschaftlicher Sicht." *Zeitschrift für Organisationsberatung, Supervision, Coaching* 15/2: 156–168. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11613-008-0076-6>
- Graf, Eva-Maria. 2011. "'Yes Then I will Tell You May a Little Bit about the Procedure' – Constructing Professional Identity Where There Is Not Yet a Profession: The Case of Executive Coaching". In *Constructing Identities at Work*, Jo Angouri, and Meredith Marra (eds.), 127–148. Houndmills: Palgrave. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230360051_7
- Graf, Eva-Maria. 2012. "Narratives of Illness and Emotional Distress in Executive Coaching: An Initial Analysis of Their Forms and Functions". *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*. 48/1. *Special Issue: Narratives in Context*: 23–54.
- Graf, Eva-Maria. 2015. "Kommunikative Basisaktivitäten im Coaching-Gespräch: Ein linguistischer Beitrag zur Coaching-Prozessforschung." *Coaching | Theorie & Praxis*. <https://doi.org/10.1365/s40896-015-0001-1>
- Graf, Eva-Maria. 2016. "Von „so typisch Frau“ bis „jetzt nehmen wir mal Fußball als Beispiel“ – Praktiken der diskursiven Herstellung von Weiblichkeit(en) und Männlichkeit(en) im Führungskräfte-Coaching aus genderlinguistischer Sicht." *Coaching | Theorie & Praxis*. <https://doi.org/10.1365/s40896-016-0015-z>
- Graf, Eva-Maria. 2017a. "Management Coaching – Ein arbeitsweltliches Beratungsgespräch zwischen Selbst-Reflexion und Output Orientierung?" In *Beraten ist Sprechen. Eine linguistische Typologie zu Beratungsgesprächen in verschiedenen Handlungsfeldern*, Ina Pick (ed.), 77–95. F.A.L. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Graf, Eva-Maria. 2017b. "Forms and Functions of Metadiscourse in Goal-oriented Talk-in-interaction: The Case of Executive Coaching". In *The Polyphony of English Studies: A Festschrift for Allan James*, Alexander Onysko, Eva-Maria Graf, Werner Delanoy, Guenther Sigott, and Nicola Dobrić (eds.), 113–132. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Graf, Eva-Maria, 2018. Äußerung für Äußerung zum Coaching-Prozess: Das Potential einer gesprächsanalytisch fundierten Coaching-Prozessforschung. In *Coaching-Prozessforschung. Forschung und Praxis im Dialog*, Robert Wegener, Michael Loebbert, Agnes Fritze, and Marianne Hänseler (eds.), 141–161. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Graf, Eva-Maria (in press). *The Manager Who Struggles with His Emotionality – A Case Study of Emotionally Intelligent Coaching*. Radolfzell: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.
- Graf, Eva-Maria (under review). "Change for the Sake of the Client and the Organization. Discourse Analytic Insights into the Double Functionality of Change in Executive Coaching." *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice*.
- Graf, Eva-Maria, and Monika Wastian. 2013. Qualität im Coaching. *Zeitschrift für Organisationsentwicklung* 3/2013:102.

- Graf, Eva-Maria, and Joanna Pawelczyk. 2014. "The Interactional Accomplishment of Feelings-talk in Psychotherapy and Executive Coaching." In *The Discourses of Helping Professions*, Eva-Maria Graf, Marlene Sator, and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.), 59–89. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Graf, Eva-Maria, and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy. 2018a. Helfende Berufe – Helfende Interaktionen. In *Handbuch Text und Gespräch*, Karin Birkner and Nina Janich (eds.), 418–442. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Graf, Eva-Maria, and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy. 2018b. "Welche Frage, wann und warum? – Eine qualitativ-linguistische Programmatik zur Erforschung von Frage-Sequenzen als zentrale Veränderungspraktik im Coaching." *Coaching | Theorie & Praxis* 2018, 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1365/s40896-018-0021-4>
- Graf, Eva-Maria, and Sabine Jautz (under review). „Und wie, wie entsteht Veränderung. Und damit habens wir ja auch mit dir zu tun“ – Einblicke in die inter- und intra-aktivitätsspezifische Dimension der kommunikativen Basisaktivität "Veränderung ko-konstruieren" im Führungskräfte-Coaching. In *Pragmatik der Veränderung. Problem- und lösungsorientierte Kommunikation in helfenden Berufen*, Eva-Maria Graf, Claudio Scarvaglieri and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Graf, Eva-Maria, and Surur Abdul-Hussain (in prep.). "Wenn ich es nicht schaffe, liegt es an meiner Person und nicht an meiner Leistung" – Die Individualisierung struktureller Probleme im Rahmen von Coaching weiblicher Führungskräfte. Hermeneutische und diskurssanalytische Erkenntnisse."
- Graf, Eva-Maria, and Sabine Jautz (in prep.). Displays of Social Identities and Acts of Repositioning in Interactions between Executive Clients and Their Coaches.
- Graf, Eva-Maria, and Claudio Scarvaglieri (in prep.). Diskurse Praktiken der Beziehungsgestaltung in Therapie und Coaching. Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede aus gesprächsanalytischer Perspektive.
- Graf, Eva-Maria, Silvia Deplazes, and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (in prep.). *Form and Functions of Question-Answer Sequences in Executive Coaching. A Linguistic Typology*.
- Graf, Eva-Maria, Marlene Sator, and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.). 2014. *The Discourses of Helping Professions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.252>
- Graf, Eva-Maria, Claudio Scarvaglieri, and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.) (under review). *Pragmatik der Veränderung. Problem- und lösungsorientierte Kommunikation in helfenden Berufen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Grant, Anthony. 2005. "What is Evidence-based Executive, Workplace and Life Coaching?" In *Evidence-based Coaching. Volume 1: Theory, Research and Practice from the Behavioural Sciences*, Michael Cavanagh, Anthony Grant, and Travis Kemp (eds.), 1–12. Bowen Hills: Australian Academic Press.
- Grant Anthony. 2006. "An Integrative Goal-Focused Approach to Executive Coaching." In *Evidence Based Coaching: Putting Best Practices to Work for Your Clients*, Dianne Stober, and Anthony Grant (eds.), 153–192. New Jersey: Wiley and Sons.
- Grant, Anthony. 2009. *Workplace, Executive and Life Coaching: An Annotated Bibliography from the Behavioural Science and Business Literature*. Coaching Psychology Unit: University of Sydney.
- Grant, Anthony. 2013. "The Efficacy of Coaching." In *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring*, Jonathan Passmore, David Peterson, and Teresa Freire (eds.), 15–39. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Grant, Anthony. 2017a. "Coaching as Evidence-based Practice: The View Through a Multiple-perspective Model of Coaching Research." In *The SAGE Handbook of Coaching*, Tatiana Bachkirova, Gordon Spence, and David Drake (eds.), 62–84. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Grant, Anthony. 2017b. "The Contribution of Qualitative Research to Coaching Psychology: Counting Numbers Is Not Enough, Qualitative Counts Too." *The Journal of Positive Psychology: dedicated to furthering research and promoting good practice*, 12/3: 317–318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262616>
- Grant, Anthony. 2018. "Zielperspektiven in die Coaching-Praxis integrieren – Ein integratives Modell zielorientierten Coachings". *Coaching | Theorie & Praxis*. <https://doi.org/10.1365/540896-017-0020>
- Grant, Anthony, and Dianne Stober. 2006. "Introduction." In *Evidence Based Coaching: Putting Best Practices to Work for your Clients*, Dianne Stober and Anthony Grant (eds.), 1–14. New Jersey: Wiley and Sons.
- Greatbach, David, and Robert Dingwall. 1998. "Talk and Identity in Divorce Mediation." In *Identities at Talk*, Charles Antaki, and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), 121–132. London: Sage.
- Greenberg, Leslie S. 2015. *Emotion-focused Therapy: Coaching Clients to Work through Their Feelings*. American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14692-000>
- Greenberg, Leslie S., and Sandra Paivio. 1997. *Working with Emotions in Psychotherapy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Greene, Jane, and Anthony Grant. 2003. *Solution-focused Coaching. Managing People in a Complex World*. London: Momentum Press.
- Greif, Siegfried. 2008. *Coaching und ergebnisorientierte Selbstreflexion*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Greif, Siegfried. 2014. "Coaching und Wissenschaft – Geschichte einer schwierigen Beziehung." *Zeitschrift für Organisationsberatung, Supervision, Coaching* 21/3: 295–311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11613-014-0379-8>
- Greif, Siegfried. 2017. "Researching Outcomes of Coaching." In *The SAGE Handbook of Coaching*, Tatiana Bachkirova, Gordon Spence, and David Drake (eds.), 569–588. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Güllich, Elisabeth. 2003. "Conversational Techniques Used in Transferring Knowledge between Medical Experts and Non-experts." *Discourse Studies* 5/2: 235–263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445603005002005>
- Gumperz, John. 1992a. "Contextualization and Understanding." In *Rethinking Context. Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, Alessandro Duranti, and Charles Goodwin (eds.), 229–252. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John. 1992b. "Contextualization Revisited." In *The Contextualization of Language*, Peter Auer, and Aldo de Luzio (eds.), 39–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.22.04gum>
- Gumperz, John. 1995. "Mutual Inferencing in Conversation." In *Mutualities in Discourse*, Ivana Markova, K. Foppa, and K. Graumann (eds.), 101–123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John. 2001. "Contextualization and Ideology in Intercultural Communication." In *Culture in Communication: Analyses of Intercultural Situations*: Di Luzio, Aldo, Susanne Günthner, and Franca Orletti, 35–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.81.05gum>

- Gurman, Alan, and Stanley Messer (eds). 2011. *Essential Psychotherapies. Theory and Practice*. 3rd ed. New York: The Guildford Press.
- Haakana, Markku. 2001. "Laughter as a Patient's Resource: Dealing with Delicate Aspects of Medical Interaction." *Text* 21/1 & 2: 187–219.
- Habscheid, Stefan. 2003. *Sprache in der Organisation. Sprachreflexive Verfahren im systemischen Beratungsgespräch*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110201642>
- Hall, Christopher, Sarangi, Srikant, and Stefan Slembrouck. 1999. "The Legitimation of the Client and the Profession: Identities and Roles in Social Work Discourse." In *Talk, Work and Institutional Order. Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings*, Srikant Sarangi and Celia Roberts (eds.), 293–322. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208375.3.293>
- Hall, Michael, and Michelle Duval. 2004. *Meta-Coaching. Volume I: Coaching Change. For Higher Levels of Success and Transformation*. Clifton: Neuro-Semantics Publications.
- Hall, Michael, and Michelle Duval. 2005. *Meta-Coaching. Volume II: Coaching Conversations. For Transformational Change*. Clifton: Neuro-Semantics Publications.
- Hamilton, Heidi, and Wen-Ying Chou (eds). 2017. *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Health Communication*. London: Routledge.
- Hannafey, Francis, and Lawrence A. Vitulano. 2013. "Ethics and Executive Coaching: An Agency Theory Approach." *Journal of Business Ethics* 15/3: 599–603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1442-z>
- Harré, Ron. 1986. *The Social Construction of Emotions*. New York: Blackwell.
- Harvard Business Review. 2003. Breakthrough Ideas for Tomorrow's Business Agenda. <https://hbr.org/2003/04/breakthrough-ideas-for-tomorrows-business-agenda>.
- Hausendorf, Heiko (ed). 2011. *Therapeutisierung durch Sprache*. Gießen: Psychosozial-Verlag (Psychotherapie & Sozialwissenschaft).
- Have, Paul ten. 1991. "Talk and Institution. A Reconsideration of the 'Asymmetry' of Doctor-Patient Interaction." In *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*, Deirdre Boden and Don Zimmerman (eds.), 139–163. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hawkins, Peter, and Nick Smith. 2006. *Coaching, Mentoring and Organizational Consultancy. Supervision and Development*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Heelas, Paul. 2002. "Work Ethics, Soft Capitalism and the "Turn of Life"" In *Cultural economy*, Paul Du Gay and Michael Pryke (eds.), 78–97. London: Sage.
- Heller, Monica. 2007. "Distributed Knowledge, Distributed Power: A Sociolinguistics of Structuration." *Text & Talk* 27/5 & 6: 633–653.
- Hepburn, Alexa, and Jonathan Potter. 2012. "Crying and Crying Responses." In *Emotion in Interaction*, Anssi Peräkylä and Marja-Leena Sorjonen (eds.), 195–211. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199730735.003.0009>
- Heritage, John. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, John. 2011. "Territories of Knowledge and Experience." In *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*, Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada and Jakob Steensig (eds.), 159–183. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921674.008>
- Heritage, John, and Douglas Maynard (eds). 2006. *Communication in Medical Care: Interaction between Primary Care Physicians and Patients*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607172>

- Heritage, John, and D. Greatbatch. 1991. "On the Institutional Character of Institutional Talk: The Case of News Interview." In *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*, Deirdre Boden and Don Zimmerman (eds.), 93–137. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, John, and Jeffrey Robinson. 2006. "Accounting for the Visit: Giving Reasons for Seeking Medical Care." In *Communication in Medical Care: Interaction between Primary Care Physicians and Patients*, John Heritage and Douglas Maynard (eds.), 48–85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607172.005>
- Hochschild, Arlie. 1983. *The Managed Heart. Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Holmes, Janet. 2000. "Doing Collegiality and Keeping Control at Work: Small Talk in Government Departments." In *Small Talk*, John Coupland (ed.), 32–61. London: Longman.
- Holmes, Janet, Maria Stubbe, and Bernadette Vine. 1999. "Constructing Professional Identity: "Doing Power" in Policy Units." In *Talk, Work and Institutional Order. Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings*, Srikant Sarangi and Celia Roberts (eds.), 351–385. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208375.3.351>
- Hudson, Frederic. 1999. *The Handbook of Coaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hutchby, Ian. 2005. "Active Listening: Formulations and Elicitation of Feelings-talk in Child Counseling." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38/3: 303–329. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3803_4
- Hutchby, Ian. 2007. *The Discourse of Child Counselling*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.21>
- Hutchby, Ian, and Robin Wooffitt. 2008. *Conversation Analysis*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hutchby, Ian, Michelle O'Reilly, and Nicola Parker. 2012. "Ethics in Practice. Negotiating the Presence and Functions of a Video Camera in Family Therapy." *Discourse Studies* 14/6: 675–690. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445612457487>
- Ianiro Patrizia, and Simone Kauffeld. 2011. Black-Box Coaching-Prozess: Beziehungsaufbau und Gestaltung auf Grundlage interpersonaler Basisdimensionen. (Talk at 2nd LOCCS-Symposium, University of Munich)
- Illie, Cornelia and Stefanie Schnurr (eds.) 2017. *Challenging Leadership Stereotypes through Discourse*. Singapore: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4319-2>
- Illouz, Eva. 2007. *Cold Intimacies: The Making of Emotional Capitalism*. Polity Press: New York.
- Illouz, Eva. 2008. *Saving the Modern Soul. Therapy, Emotions and the Culture of Self-help*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- International Coach Federation. 2016. *ICF Global Coaching Study*. Executive Summary.
- Jackson, Peter. 2005. "How Do We Describe Coaching? An Exploratory Development of a Typology of Coaching Based on the Accounts of UK-based Practitioners." *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring* 3: 45–60.
- Jautz, Sabine. 2017. "Immer auf Augenhöhe? Ein Blick in den sprachlichen Werkzeugkoffer im Coaching." In *Linguistisches Wissen in Weiterbildungen zur Kommunikations-kompetenz*, Marcel Dräger and Martha Kuhnhehn (eds.), 47–64. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Lang.
- Jautz, Sabine. 2018. "In the Wind of Change: Wie Veränderungen im Coaching angestoßen werden können. Anhaltspunkte aus Coaching(trainings)gesprächen und deren Nachbesprechungen." *Coaching | Theorie & Praxis* 4, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1365/s40896-018-0022-3>

- Joo, Baek-Kyoo. 2005. Executive Coaching: A Conceptual Framework from an Integrative Review of Practice and Research. *Human Resource Development Review* 4/4: 462–488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305280866>
- Jourard, Sindney, and Paul Lasakow. 1958. Some Factors in Self-disclosure. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 56/1: 91–98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0043357>
- Judge, William, and Jeffrey Cowell. 1997. “The Brave New World of Executive Coaching.” *Business Horizon* 40: 71–77. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813\(97\)90042-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813(97)90042-2)
- Juhila, Kirsi, Tarja Pöso, Christopher Hall, and Nigel Parton. 2003. “Introduction: Beyond a Universal Client.” In *Constructing Clienthood in Social Work and Human Services*, Christopher Hall, Kirsi Juhila, Nigel Parton and Tarja Pöso (eds.), 11–24. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Kärreman, Dan, and Alvesson, Mats. 2004. “Cages in Tandem: Management Control, Social Identity, and Identification in a Knowledge-Intensive Firm.” *Organization* 11/1: 149–175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508404039662>
- Kauffman, Carol. 2016. *Having Impact and Quality using Positive Psychology in Your Coaching*. Keynote talk at the 4th International Coaching-Meets-Research Symposium, Olten, Switzerland.
- Kallmeyer, Werner. 1985. “Handlungskonstitution im Gespräch: Dupont und sein Experte führen ein Beratungsgespräch durch.” In *Grammatik, Konversation, Interaktion. Beiträge zum Romanistentag 1983*, ed. by Elisabeth Gülich, and Thomas Kotschi, 81–123. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Kallmeyer, Werner. 2000. “Beraten und Betreuen. Zur gesprächsanalytischen Untersuchung von helfenden Interaktionen.” *Zeitschrift für qualitative Bildungs-, Beratungs-, und Sozialforschung* 2: 227–252.
- Kamio, Akio. 1997. *Territory of Information*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.48>
- Kelle, Udo, and Susanne Kluge. 2010. *Vom Einzelfall zum Typus. Fallvergleich und Fallkontrastierung in der qualitativen Sozialforschung*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-92366-6>
- Kilburg, Richard. 2000. *Executive Coaching. Developing Managerial Wisdom in a World of Chaos*. Washington: American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10355-000>
- Knapp, Karlfried, and Gerd Antos. 2011. “Introduction to the Handbook Series. Linguistics for Problem Solving.” In *Handbook of Communication in Organisations and Professions*, Christopher Candlin and Srikant Sarangi (eds.), v–xv. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214222.V>
- Koester, Almut. 2006. *Investigating Workplace Discourse*. Abingdon: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203015742>
- Koester, Almut. 2010. *Workplace Discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Kotte, Silja, Katrin Oellerich, Denise Hinn, and Heidi Möller. 2015. “Das ambivalente Verhältnis von Coachingforschung und -praxis: Dezentales Ignorieren, kritisches Beäugen oder kooperatives Miteinander?” In *Die Professionalisierung von Coaching. Ein Lesebuch für den Coach*, Astrid Schreyögg and Christoph Schmidt-Lellek (eds.), 23–45. Wiesbaden: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-08172-0_2
- Kotte, Silja, Denise Hinn, Katrin Oellerich, and Heidi Möller (2016). Der Stand der Coachingforschung: Kernergebnisse der vorliegenden Metaanalysen. *Zeitschrift für Organisationsberatung, Supervision und Coaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11613-016-0444-6>

- Kurtz, Ron. 1990. *Body-Centered Psychotherapy. The Hakomi Method*. Mendocino: LifeRhythm.
- Künzli, Hansjörg. 2009. "Wirksamkeitsforschung im Führungskräfte-Coaching." *Zeitschrift für Organisationsberatung, Supervision, Coaching* 16: 1–15.
- Künzli, Hansjörg. 2013. "Die andere Seite von Coaching. Zu Risiken und Nebenwirkungen lesen Sie bitte die Packungsbeilage." *CoachingMagazin* 4/2013: 52–56.
- Künzli, Hansjörg (in prep.). *Spielstand 1:0 – Die Wirksamkeit von Coaching*.
- Labov, William, and David Fanshel. 1977. *Therapeutic Discourse. Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lalouschek, Johanna. 2005a. *Inszenierte Medizin. Ärztliche Kommunikation, Gesundheitsinformation und das Sprechen über Krankheit in Medizinsendungen und Talkshows*. Radolfzell: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.
- Lalouschek, Johanna. 2005b. "Medizinische Konzepte und ärztliche Gesprächsführung – am Beispiel der psychosomatischen Anamnese." In *Psychosomatische Gesprächsführung in der Frauenheilkunde. Ein interdisziplinärer Ansatz zur verbalen Interaktion*, Mechthild Neises, Susanne Ditz and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.), 48–72. Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Lalouschek, Johanna. 2008. "Ärztliche Gesprächspläne und Anliegen von PatientInnen in der chronischen Schmerzbehandlung." *Arbeitspapier zum Forschungsprojekt „Schmerzdarstellung und Krankheitserzählung“*, 1–65. Universität Wien.
- Lalouschek, Johanna. 2013. "Anliegensklärung im ärztlichen Gespräch. Patientenbeteiligung und neue Formen medizinischer Kommunikation." In *Migration und medizinische Kommunikation*, Florian Menz (ed.), 353–444. Wien: V&R unipress.
- Lane, David, Reinhard Stelter, and Sunny Stout-Rostron. 2018. "The Future of Coaching as a Profession." In *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*, 3rd ed., Elaine Cox, Tatiana Bachkirova and David Clutterbuck (eds.), 417–433. London: Sage.
- Lee, Robert. 2013. "The Role of Contracting in Coaching: Balancing Individual Client and Organizational Issues." In *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring*, Jonathan Passmore, David Peterson and Teresa Freire (eds.), 40–57. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Levinson, Steven. 1979. "Activity Types and Language." *Linguistics* 17: 356–399. (reprinted 1992 in *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings*, Paul Drew and John Heritage (ed.), 66–100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1979.17.5-6.365>
- Levinson, Steven. 1997. "Contextualizing 'Contextualization Cues'." In *Discussing Communication Analysis 1: John Gumperz, Susan Eerdman, Carlo Prevignano and Paul Thibault* (eds.), 24–39. Lausanne: Beta Press.
- Levinson, Steven. 2006. "Cognition Is at the Heart of Human Interaction." *Discourse Studies* 8/1: 85–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606059557>
- Lewis, Patricia, and Ruth Simpson (eds). 2007. *Gendering Emotions in Organizations*. Houndmills: Palgrave. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-07297-9>
- Linell, Per. 1998a. *Approaching Dialogue. Talk, Interaction and Contexts in Dialogical Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.3>
- Linell, Per. 1998b. "Discourse across Boundaries: On Recontextualizations and the Blending of Voices in Professional Discourse." *Text & Talk* 18/2: 143–157.
- Lock, Andrew and Tom Strong (eds.) 2012. *Discursive Perspectives in Therapeutic Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780199592753.001.0001>
- Lupton, Deborah. 1998. *The Emotional Self*. London: Sage.

- Maier-Gutheil, Cornelia. 2009. *Zwischen Beratung und Begutachtung. Pädagogische Professionalität in der Existenzgründungsberatung*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Marciniak, Agnieszka, Christoph Nikendei, Johannes Ehrenthal, and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (2016). „... Durch Worte heilen“ – Linguistik und Psychotherapie.“ *Sprachreport* 32/3: 1–11.
- Martens-Schmid, Karin. 2007. “Die „ganze“ Person im Coaching – Ambivalenzen und Optionen.“ *Zeitschrift für Organisationsberatung, Supervision, Coaching* 14/1: 17–29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11613-007-0003-2>
- Martens-Schmid, Karin. 2009. “Wissensressourcen im Coachingdialog.“ In *Coachingwissen. Denn sie wissen nicht, was sie tun?*, Bernd Birgmeier (ed.), 61–71. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Martens-Schmid, Karin. 2015. *Wo Coaching zu Hause ist. Beratungsräume und ihre Gestaltung im kulturell-gesellschaftlichen Kontext*. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.
- Maslow, Abraham. 1976. *Religions, Values and Peak Experiences*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Mauranen, Anna. 1993. *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- Mayer, John D. and Peter Salovey. 1997. “What is Emotional Intelligence?” In *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Educational Implications*, Peter Salovey and David Sluyter (eds.), 3–31. New York: Basic Books.
- McLeod, John. 2001. *Qualitative Research in Counselling and Psychotherapy*. London: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849209663>
- McLeod, John. 2003. *Doing Counselling Research*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- McLeod, Julie, and Katie Wright. 2003. “Shaping the Self through Psychtherapeutic Means: Gender and Cross-Generational Perspectives.” In *Educational Research, Risk and Dilemmas: NZARE Conference Proceedings*, E. von Til (ed.), 1–13. Coldstream: Australian Association for Research in Education.
- Mey, Jacob. 2001. *Pragmatics. An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Meyer, Michael. 2001. “Between Theory, Method, and Politics: Positioning of the Approaches of CDA.” In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. by Ruth Wodak, and Michael Meyer, 14–31. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Miller, G. (ed.). 1976. *Explorations in Interpersonal Communication*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Miller, Katherine, and Jennifer Considine. 2009. “Communication in the Helping Professions.” In *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Communication Research*, Lawrence Frey and Kenneth Cissna (eds.), 405–428. New York: Routledge.
- Miller, Gale, and David Silverman. 1995. “Troubles Talk and Counseling Discourse. A Comparative Study.” *Sociological Quarterly* 36/4: 725–747. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1995.tb00462.x>
- Mishler, Elliot. 1984. *The Discourse of Medicine. Dialectics of Medical Interaction*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Möller, Heidi, and Silia Kotte. 2011. “Die Zukunft der Coachingforschung.“ *Zeitschrift für Organisationsberatung, Supervision, Coaching* 18: 445–456. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11613-011-0256-7>
- Müller, Jutta. 2006. *Coaching, Biografie und Interaktion. Eine qualitative Studie zum Coach in Ausbildung*. Opladen: Verlag Barbara Buderich.
- Muntigl, Peter. 2004. *Narrative Counselling: Social and Linguistic Processes of Change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.11>
- Muntigl, Peter, and Adam Horvarth. 2005. “Language, Psychotherapy and Client Change.” In *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis*, Ruth Wodak and Peter Chilton (eds.), 213–239. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.13.14mun>

- Muntigl, Peter, Naomi Knight, and Ashley Watkins. 2014. "Empathic Practices in Client-centered Psychotherapies: Displaying Understanding and Affiliation with Clients." In *The Discourses of Helping Professions*, Eva-Maria Graf, Marlene Sator, and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.), 33–58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nadler, David. 2005. "Confessions of a Trusted Counselor." *Harvard Business Review*, 68–77.
- Neises, Mechthild, Susanne Ditz, and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.). 2005. *Psychosomatische Gesprächsführung in der Frauenheilkunde. Ein interdisziplinärer Ansatz zur verbalen Interaktion*. Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Nelson-Jones, Richard. 2005. *Introduction to Counselling Skills*. London: Sage Publications.
- Nothdurft, Werner. 1984. „Äh folgendes Problem äh“: Die interaktive Ausarbeitung „des Problems“ in Beratungsgesprächen. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Nothdurft, Werner, Ulrich Reitemeier, and Peter Schröder (eds.). 1994. *Beratungsgespräche. Analyse asymmetrischer Dialoge*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Nowak, Peter. 2010. *Eine Systematik der Arzt-Patient-Interaktion*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- O’Broin, Almuth, and Stephen Palmer (2010). "Introducing an Interpersonal Perspective on the Coaching Relationship." In *The Coaching Relationship. Putting People First*, Stephen Palmer and Almuth McDowall (eds.), 9–33. London: Routledge.
- Pain, Jean. 2009. *Not Just Talking. Conversational Analysis, Harvey Sacks’s Gift to Therapy*. London: Karnac Books.
- Palmer, Stephen, and Almuth McDowall (eds.). 2010. *The Coaching Relationship. Putting People First*. London: Routledge.
- Passmore, John, and Annette Fillery-Travis. 2011. "A Critical Review of Executive Coaching Research: A Decade of Progress and What’s to Come." *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*. 4/2: 77–80.
- Passmore, Jonathan, Peterson, David, and Teresa Freire (eds.). 2013. *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Passmore, Jonathan, Peterson, David, and Teresa Freire. 2013. "The Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring." In *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring*, Passmore, Jonathan, Peterson, David and Teresa Freire (eds.), 1–11. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Pawelczyk, Joanna. 2011. *Talk as Therapy. Psychotherapy in a Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781934078679>
- Pawelczyk, Joanna (under review). "The Therapist’s Emotional Presence and Its Interactional Functions in Promoting Client Change in Relationship-focused Integrative Psychotherapy." In *Understanding Change in Helping Professions*, Joanna Pawelczyk and Eva-Maria Graf (eds.). Special Issue for *Communication & Medicine*.
- Pawelczyk, Joanna and Eva-Maria Graf. 2011. "Living in Therapeutic Culture: Feminine Discourse as an Agent of Change." In *Living with Patriarchy – Discursive Constructions of Gendered Subjects Across Public Spheres*, Lise-Lotte Holmgreen and Inger Lassen (eds.), 273–302. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.45.15paw>
- Pawelczyk, Joanna, and Eva-Maria Graf (eds.). (under review). "Understanding Change in Helping Professions." Special Issue for *Communication & Medicine*.
- Peltier, Bruce. 2010. *The Psychology of Executive Coaching. Theory and Application*. New York: Routledge.
- Penz, Hermine. 2011. "“What Do We Mean by That?”: Metadiscourse in ELF Project Discussions." In *Latest Trends in ELF Research*, Archibald, Alasdair, Alessia Cogo and Jennifer Jenkins (eds.), 185–199. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press.

- Penz, Hermine. 2014. The Uses and Functions of Metadiscourse in Intercultural Project Discussions on Language Education. Talk presented at CALK 14, University of Klagenfurt.
- Peräkylä, Anssi. 1995. *Aids Counseling. Institutional Interaction and Clinical Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511597879>
- Peräkylä, Anssi. 2006. "Communicating and Responding to Diagnosis." In *Communication in Medical Care: Interaction between Primary Care Physicians and Patients*, John Heritage and Douglas Maynard (eds.), 214–247. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607172.010>
- Peräkylä, Anssi, and Sanna Vehviläinen. 2003. "Conversation Analysis and the Professional Stocks of Interactional Knowledge." *Discourse & Society* 14/6: 727–750. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265030146003>
- Peräkylä, Anssi, Johanna Ruusuvuori, and Sanna Vehviläinen. 2005. "Introduction: Professional Theories and Institutional Interaction." *Communication & Medicine* 2/2: 105–109. <https://doi.org/10.1515/come.2005.2.2.105>
- Peräkylä, Anssi, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen (eds). 2012. *Emotion in Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199730735.001.0001>
- Peräkylä, Anssi, Charles Antaki, Sanna Vehviläinen and Ivan Leudar (eds). 2008. *Conversation Analysis of Psychotherapy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511490002>
- Peterson, David, and Mary Hicks (1995). *The Leader as Coach: Strategies for Coaching and Developing Others*. Minneapolis: Personal Decisions.
- Peterson, David 2018. "Foreword." In *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*, 3rd ed., Cox, Elaine, Tatiana Bachkirova and David Clutterbuck (eds.), xxvii–xxvii. London: Sage.
- Pick, Ina. 2015. *Das anwaltliche Mandantengespräch. Linguistische Ergebnisse zum sprachlichen Handeln von Anwalt und Mandant*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang. <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-04785-1>
- Pick, Ina (ed). 2017. *Beraten ist Sprechen. Eine linguistische Typologie zu Beratungsgesprächen in verschiedenen Handlungsfeldern*. F.A.L. Bern: Peter Lang
- Potter, Jonathan. 1996. *Representing Reality. Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. London: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446222119>
- Prego-Vázquez, Gabriela. 2007. "Frame Conflict and Social Inequality in the Workplace. Professional and Local Discourse Struggles in Employee/Customer Interaction." *Discourse & Society* 18/3: 295–335. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926507075478>
- Prior, Matthew. 2016. *Emotion and Discourse in L2 Narrative Research*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Pudlinski, Charles. 2005. "Doing Empathy and Sympathy: Caring Responses to Troubles Telling on a Peer Support Line." *Discourse Studies* 7/3: 267–288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605052177>
- Quasthoff, Uta. 1990. "Das Prinzip des primären Sprechers, das Zuständigkeitsprinzip und das Verantwortungsprinzip. Zum Verhältnis von 'Alltag' und 'Institution' am Beispiel der Verteilung des Rederechts in Arzt-Patient-Interaktionen." In Konrad Ehlich, Armin Koerfer, Angelika Redder and Rüdiger Weingarten (eds.), *Medizinische und therapeutische Kommunikation: Diskursanalytische Untersuchungen*, 66–81. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Rauen, Christopher. 2003. *Coaching*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Raymond, Geoffrey, and John Heritage. 2006. "The Epistemics of Social Relations: Owning Grandchildren." *Language in Society* 35: 677–705. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506060325>

- Rehbein, Jochen, Thomas Schmidt, Bernd Meyer, Franziska Watzke, and Annette Herkenrath. 2004. "Handbuch für das computergestützte Transkribieren nach HIAT." *Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachigkeit* 56.
- Reisigl, Martin, and Ruth Wodak. 2016. "The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*, Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (eds.), 23–61. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Richards, Keith. 2006. *Language and Professional Identity. Aspects of Collaborative Interaction*. Houndsmills: Palgrave. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230505049>
- Roberts, Celia. 2000. "Professional Gatekeeping in Intercultural Encounters." In *Discourse and Social Life*, Srikant Sarangi and Malcolm Coulthard (eds.), 102–120. London: Longman.
- Roberts, Celia, and Srikant Sarangi. 1999. "Hybridity in Gatekeeping Discourse: Issues of Practical Relevance for the Researcher." In *Talk, Work and Institutional Order. Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings*, Srikant Sarangi and Celia Roberts (eds.), 473–503. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208375.4.473>
- Roberts, Celia, and Srikant Sarangi. 2003. "Uptake of Discourse Research in Professional Settings: Reporting from Medical Consultancy." *Applied Linguistics* 24/3: 338–359. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/24.3.338>
- Roberts, Celia, and Srikant Sarangi. 2005. "Theme-oriented Discourse Analysis of Medical Encounters." *Medical Education* 39: 632–640. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02171.x>
- Robinson, Jeffrey. 2006. "Soliciting Patients' Presenting Concerns." In *Communication in Medical Care: Interaction between Primary Care Physicians and Patients*, John Heritage and Douglas Maynard (eds.), 22–47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607172.004>
- Rogers, Carl. 1951. *Client-centered Therapy*. London: Constable & Robinson.
- Rogers, Carl. 1961. *On Becoming a Person. A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy*. London: Constable & Robinson.
- Rose, Nikolas. 1990. *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Routledge.
- Ruusuvuori, Johanna. 2005. "Comparing Homeopathic and General Practice Consultations: The Case of Problem Presentation." *Communication & Medicine* 2/2: 123–135. <https://doi.org/10.1515/come.2005.2.2.123>
- Ruusuvuori, Johanna. 2007. "Managing Affect: Integration of Empathy and Problem-solving in Health Care Encounters." *Discourse Studies* 9/5: 597–622. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607081269>
- Ryle, Gilbert. 1949. *The Concept of Mind*. London: Penguin.
- Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Talk." *Language* 50: 696–735. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1974.0010>
- Safran, Jeremy, and Les Greenberg (eds). 1991. *Emotion, Psychotherapy and Change*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Salovey, Peter and John Mayer. 1990. Emotional Intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality* 9 (3): 185–211.
- Sarangi, Srikant. 2000. "Activity Types, Discourse Types and Interactional Hybridity." In *Discourse and Social Life*, Srikant Sarangi and Malcom Coulthard (eds.), 1–27. London: Longman.
- Sarangi, Srikant. 2001. "On Demarcating the Space between 'Lay Expertise' and 'Expert Laity'." *Text* 21/1&2: 3–11.

- Sarangi, Srikant. 2002a. "The Language of Likelihood in Genetic Counselling Discourse." *Journal for Language and Social Psychology* 21/1: 7–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X02021001002>
- Sarangi, Srikant. 2002b. "Discourse Practitioners as a Community of Interprofessional Practice: Some Insights from Health Communication Research." In *Research and Practice in Professional Discourse*, Christopher Candlin (ed.), 95–135. Hong Kong: City of University of Hong Kong Press.
- Sarangi, Srikant. 2004. "Language/Activity: Observing and Interpreting Ritualistic Institutional Discourse." *Cahiers de Linguistique Française* 26: 135–150.
- Sarangi, Srikant. 2005. "Activity Analysis in Professional Discourse Settings: The Framing of Risk and Responsibility in Genetic Counselling." *Hermes* 41: 110–120.
- Sarangi, Srikant. 2006. "The Conditions and Consequences of Professional Discourse Studies." In *Language, Culture and Identity in Applied Linguistics*, Richard Keily, Pauline Rea-Dickens, Helen Woodfield and Gerald Clibbon (eds.), 199–220. London: Equinox.
- Sarangi, Srikant. 2008. "Research Methods in Interprofessional Contexts." University of Cardiff: COMET-Summer school.
- Sarangi, Srikant. 2010. "Practising Discourse Analysis in Healthcare Settings." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Methods in Health Research*, Ivy Bourgeault, Robert Dingwall and Ray de Vries (eds.), 397–416. Los Angeles: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446268247.n21>
- Sarangi, Srikant. 2011. "Role Hybridity in Professional Practice." In *Genre(s) on the Move. Hybridization and Discourse Change in Specialized Communication*, Srikant Sarangi, Vanda Polese, and Giuditta Caliendo (eds.), 271–296. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane.
- Sarangi, Srikant, and Celia Roberts. 1999. "The Dynamics of Interactional and Institutional Orders in Work-related Settings." In *Talk, Work and Institutional Order. Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings*, Srikant Sarangi and Celia Roberts (eds.), pp.34–57. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208375.1.1>
- Sarangi, Srikant, and Christopher Candlin. 2003. "Trading between Reflexivity and Relevance: New Challenges for Applied Linguistics." *Applied Linguistics* 24/3: 271–285. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/24.3.271>
- Sarangi, Srikant, and Christopher Candlin. 2011. "Professional and Organisational Practice: A Discourse/Communication Perspective." In *Handbook of Communication in Organisations and Professions*, Christopher Candlin, and Srikant Sarangi (eds.), 3–58. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214222.3>
- Sator, Marlene. 2011. *Schmerzdifferenzierung – Eine gesprächsanalytische Untersuchung ärztlicher Erstgespräche an der Kopfschmerzambulanz*. Wien: Vienna University Press.
- Scarvaglieri, Claudio. 2013. ›Nichts anderes als ein Austausch von Worten‹. *Sprachliches Handeln in der Psychotherapie*. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter (Reihe germanistische Linguistik, 98). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110319033>
- Schegloff, Emanuel. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511791208>
- Scheibler, Fülöp. 2006. *Shared Decision Making – Von der Compliance zur partnerschaftlichen Entscheidungsfindung*. Bern: Huber.
- Schein, Edgar. 1969. *Process Consultation*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1996. "Narrative as Self-portrait: Sociolinguistic Constructions of Identity." *Language in Society* 25: 167–203. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020601>

- Schlatter, Nicky, and Almuth McDowall. 2014. "Evidence-based EI Coaching: A Case Study in the Mining Industry." *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice* 7/2: 144–151.
- Schmidt, Thomas, Wilfried Schütte, and Jenny Winterscheid. 2016. cGAT. Konventionen für das computergestützte Transkribieren in Anlehnung an das Gesprächsanalytische Transkriptionssystem 2GAT 2
- Schnurr, Stephanie. 2013. *Exploring Professional Communication. Language in Action*. London: Routledge.
- Schnurr, Stephanie, and Olga Zayts. 2017. *Language and Culture at Work*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315541785>
- Schön, Donald. 1991. *The Reflective Practitioner. How Professionals Think in Action*. Farnham: Basic Books.
- Schreyögg, Astrid. 2003. *Coaching. Eine Einführung für Praxis und Ausbildung*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag.
- Schreyögg, Astrid. 2012. *Coaching. Eine Einführung für Praxis und Ausbildung*. 2nd ed. Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag.
- Schreyögg, Astrid. 2010. "Ist Coaching reine Prozessberatung oder sind hier auch andere Beratungsmodelle relevant?" *Zeitschrift für Organisationsberatung, Supervision & Coaching* 17(2): 119–132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11613-010-0185-x>
- Schreyögg, Astrid, and Christoph Schmidt-Lellek (eds). 2007. *Konzepte des Coaching. Sonderheft Organisationsberatung Supervision Coaching*.
- Schulz, Florian. 2016. "Ein organisationstheoretischer Ansatz zur Erforschung diskursiver Prozesse im Management Coaching." *Coaching | Theorie & Praxis* 2:1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1365/s40896-016-0009-x>
- Schulz, Florian. 2013. "The Psycho-Managerial Complex at Work: A Study of the Discursive Practice of Management Coaching." (PhD. Diss University of St. Gallen.)
- Schulz, Florian, and Eva-Maria Graf. 2011. "Fashioning Emotions in Soft Capitalism. An Empirical Analysis of Management Coaching." *OPSY Brown Bag Seminar*. University St. Gallen.
- Schulz, Florian, and Chris Steyaert. 2011. "Business Coaching: The Translation of the Therapeutic Habitus into the Managerial Realm." In: 27th EGOS Colloquium: Reassembling Organizations. Berlin: EGOS European Group for Organizational Studies. 27th EGOS Colloquium. Gothenburg.
- Schulz Florian, and Chris Steyaert. 2014. "Studying Talk-at-work: An Analysis of the Discursive Processes of Management Coaching Conversations." In *Language and Communication at Work: Discourse, Narrativity, and Organizing* (Perspectives on Process Organization Studies), Francois Cooren, Eero Vaara, Ann Langley and Haridimos Tsoukas (eds.), 173–196. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198703082.003.0008>
- Schütze, Fritz. 1996. "Organisationszwänge und hoheitsstaatliche Rahmenbedingungen im Sozialwesen: Ihre Auswirkungen auf die Paradoxien des professionellen Handelns." In *Pädagogische Professionalität. Untersuchungen zum Typus pädagogischen Handelns*, Combe, Arno and Werner Helsper (eds.), 183–275. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- Schwartz, Richard C. 1995. *Internal Family System Therapy*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Seligman, Martin, and Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (2000). "Positive Psychology: An introduction." *American Psychologist* 55/1: 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5>
- Seligman, Martin. 2007. "Coaching and Positive Psychology." *Australian Psychologist* 42/4: 266–267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00050060701648233>

- Selting, Margret. 2010. "Affectivity in Conversational Storytelling: An Analysis of Displays of Anger or Indignation in Complaint Stories." *Pragmatics* 20/2: 229–277.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.20.2.06sel>
- Sieben, Barbara, and Asa Wettergren (eds). 2010. *Emotionalizing Organizations and Organizing Emotions*. Houndmills: Palgrave. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230289895>
- Sieben, Barbara, and Asa Wettergren. 2010. "Emotionalizing Organizations and Organizing Emotions – Our Research Agenda." In *Emotionalizing Organizations and Organizing Emotions*, Barbara Sieben and Asa Wettergren (eds.), 1–20. Houndmills: Palgrave.
https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230289895_1
- Silverman, Dan. 1997. *Discourses of Counselling. HIV Counselling as Social Interaction*. London: Sage.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, and Anssi Peräkylä. 2012. "Introduction." In *Emotion in Interaction* Anssi Peräkylä and Marja-Leena Sorjonen (eds.), 3–15. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199730735.003.0001>
- Spiegel, Carmen, and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy. 2001. "Aufbau und Abfolge von Gesprächsphasen." In *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*. 2. Halbband, Klaus, Brinker, Gerd Antos, Wolfgang Heinemann and Sven Sager (eds.) 1241–1251. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Spranz-Fogasy, Thomas. 1992. "Ärztliche Gesprächsführung – Inhalte und Erfahrungen gesprächsanalytisch fundierter Weiterbildung." In *Kommunikationsberatung und Kommunikationstraining. Anwendungsfelder der Diskursforschung*, Reinhard Fiehler and Wolfgang Sucharowski (eds.), 68–78. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-322-85086-7_5
- Spranz-Fogasy, Thomas. 2003. "Kommunikationsstilistische Eigenschaften gesellschaftlicher Führungskräfte im Spiegel der Presse." In *Gruppenstile. Zur sprachlichen Inszenierung sozialer Zugehörigkeit*, Stefan Habscheid, and Ulla Fix (eds.), 171–188. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- Spranz-Fogasy, Thomas. 2005. "Kommunikatives Handeln in ärztlichen Gesprächen – Gesprächseröffnung und Beschwerdenexploration." In *Psychosomatische Gesprächsführung in der Frauenheilkunde. Ein interdisziplinärer Ansatz zur verbalen Interaktion*, Mechthild Neises, Susanne Ditz and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.), 17–47. Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Spranz-Fogasy, Thomas. 2014. *Die allmähliche Verfertigung der Diagnose im Reden. Prädiagnostische Mitteilungen im Gespräch zwischen Arzt und Patient*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Spranz-Fogasy, Thomas, Eva-Maria Graf, and Christoph Nikendei (under review). "Die Bedeutung von Beispielnachfragen im Kontext von Veränderung: Elizitierungs- und Prozessierungsstrategien im Vergleich von Therapie und Coaching." In *Pragmatik der Veränderung. Problem- und lösungsorientierte Kommunikation in helfenden Berufen*, Eva-Maria Graf, Claudio Scavagliari and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Stein, Irene. 2007. "Enacting the Role of Coach. Discursive Identities in Professional Coaching Discourse." (PhD. Dissertation, Fielding Graduate University.).
- Stivers, Tanya. 2008. "Stance, Alignment and Affiliation during Storytelling: When Nodding is a Token of Affiliation." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41/1: 31–57.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810701691123>

- Stober, Dianna, and Carla Parry. 2005. "Current Challenges and Future Directions in Coaching Research." In *Evidence-based Coaching. Volume 1: Theory, Research and Practice from the Behavioural Sciences*, Michael, Cavanagh, Anthony Grant and Travis Kemp (eds.), 13–19. Bowen Hills: Australian Academic Press.
- Stober, Dianna, and Anthony Grant (eds). 2006. *Evidence Based Coaching Handbook*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Stober, Dianna, and Anthony Grant. 2006. "Introduction." In *Evidence Based Coaching Handbook*, Dianna Stober and Anthony Grant (eds.), 1–14. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Streeck Ulrich. 2004. *Auf den ersten Blick. Psychotherapeutische Beziehungen unter dem Mikroskop*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Suchmann, A., K. Markakis, H. Beckman, and R. Frankel. 1997. "A Model of Empathic Communication in the Medical Interview." *The Journal of the American Medical Association* 277/8: 678–682. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1997.03540320082047>
- Swan, Elaine. 2008. "'You Make Me Feel like a Woman': Therapeutic Cultures and the Contagion of Femininity." *Gender, Work and Organization* 15: 88–107. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2007.00383.x>
- Tannen, Deborah (ed). 1993. *Framing in Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1993. "What's in a Frame? Surface Evidence for Underlying Expectations." In *Framing in Discourse*, Deborah Tannen (ed.), 14–45. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah, and Cynthia Waiet. 1993. "Interpretive Frames and Knowledge Schemas in Interaction." In *Framing in Discourse*, Deborah Tannen (ed.), 57–76. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, Carolyn, and Susan White. 2000. *Practising Reflexivity in Health and Welfare*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Theeboom, Tim., Beersma, Bianca, and Annelies van Vianen. 2014. "Does Coaching Work? A Meta-analysis on the Effects of Coaching on Individual Level Outcomes in an Organizational Context." *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 9/1: 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2013.837499>
- Tolan, Janet. 2003. *Skills in Person-centered Counseling & Psychotherapy*. London: Sage.
- Tracy, Karen. 2002. *Everyday Talk. Building and Reflecting Identities*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Tracy, Karen, and Jessica Robles. 2009. "Questions, Questioning, and Institutional Practices: an introduction." *Discourse Studies* 11/2: 131–152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445608100941>
- Thrift, Nigel. 1997. "The Rise of Soft Capitalism." *Journal of Cultural Research* 1: 29–57.
- Thrift, Nigel. 2005. *Knowing Capitalism*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, Teun. 2001. "Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (eds.), 95–120. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- van Dijk, Teun. 2008. *Discourse and Context. A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511481499>
- van Dijk, Teun. 2009. *Society and Discourse. How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511575273>
- Vehviläinen, Sanna. 1999. *Structures of Counselling Interaction. A Conversation Analytic Study of Counselling Encounters in Career Guidance Training*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

- Vehviläinen, Sanna. 2008. "Identifying and Managing Resistance in Psychoanalytic Interaction." In *Conversation Analysis of Psychotherapy*, Anssi Peräkylä, Charles Antaki, Sanna Vehviläinen and Ivan Leudar (eds.), 120–138. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511490002.008>
- Voutilainen, Liisa. 2010. "Emotional Experience in Psychotherapeutic Interaction. Conversation Analytic Study on Cognitive Psychotherapy." (PhD. Diss., University of Helsinki).
- Voutilainen, Liisa. 2012. "Responding to Emotion in Cognitive Psychotherapy." In *Emotion in Interaction*, Anssi Peräkylä and Marja-Leena Sorjonen (eds.), 235–255. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199730735.003.0011>
- Voutilainen, Liisa, and Anssi Peräkylä. 2016. "Interactional Practices of Psychotherapy." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Adult Mental Health*, Michelle O'Reilly and Jessica Lester (eds.), 540–557. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Voutilainen, Liisa, Anssi Peräkylä, and Johanna Ruusuvuori. 2010. "Recognition and Interpretation: Responding to Emotional Experience in Psychotherapy." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43/1: 85–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810903474799>
- Voutilainen, Liisa, Anssi Peräkylä, and Johanna Ruusuvuori. 2011. "Therapeutic Change in Interaction: Conversation Analysis of a Transforming Sequence." *Psychotherapy Research* 21(3): 348–365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2011.573509>
- Voutilainen, Liisa, Federico Rossano, and Anssi Peräkylä. 2018. "Conversation Analysis and Psychotherapeutic Change." In *Documenting Change Across Time: Longitudinal Studies on the Organization of Social Interaction*, S. Pekarek Doehler, J. Wagner and E. González-Martínez (eds.), 225–254. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-57007-9_8
- Washlyshyn, Karen. 2003. "Executive Coaching: An Outcome Study." *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research* 55/2: 94–106. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1061-4087.55.2.94>
- Watzlawick, Paul, Janet. H. Beavin, and Don D. Jackson. 1967. *Pragmatics of Human Communication: A Study of Interactional Patterns, Pathologies, and Paradoxes*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Watzlawick, Paul, John Weakland, and Richard Fisch. 1974. *Change. Principles in Problem Formation and Problem Resolution*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Wegener, Robert. 2017. "Bedeutsame Momente im Coaching. Plädoyer für eine prozessorientierte Forschungslandkarte sowie Entwicklung und Erprobung eines aufgaben- und kommunikationstheoretischen Verfahrens zur Identifikation und Analyse «bedeutsamer Momente im Coaching»." (PhD. Diss. University of Hamburg).
- Wegener, Robert, Michael Loebbert, Agnes Fritze, and Marianne Hänseler (eds.). 2018. *Coaching-Prozessforschung. Forschung und Praxis im Dialog*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- West, Candice. 2006. "Coordinating Closings in Primary Care Visits: Producing Continuity of Care." In *Communication in Medical Care: Interaction between Primary Care Physicians and Patients*, John Heritage and Douglas Maynard (eds.), 379–415. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607172.015>
- Wetherell, Margaret. 2012. *Affect and Emotion. A New Social Science Understanding*. London: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446250945>
- Wetherell, Margaret. 2013. "Affect and Discourse – What's the Problem? From Affect as Excess to Affective/Discursive Practice". *Subjectivity* 6/4: 349–368. <https://doi.org/10.1057/sub.2013.13>
- Williams, Patrick, and Deborah Davis. 2007. *Therapist as Life Coach. An Introduction for Counselors and Other Helping Professionals*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

- Winkler, Oliver. 2017. "Anwendung der Gesprächsanalyse als Feedback-Instrument im Chat-Coaching." *Coaching | Theorie & Praxis*. <https://doi.org/10.1365/s40896-017-0016-6>
- Witherspoon, Robert. 2000. *Coaching for Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Whitworth, Laura, Karen Kimsey-House, Henry Kimsey-House, and Philipp Sandahl. 1998. *Co-active Coaching. New Skills for Coaching People toward Success in Work and Life*. Palo Alto: Davis-Black Publishing.
- Whitworth, Laura, Karen Kimsey-House, Henry Kimsey-House, and Philipp Sandahl. 2007. *Co-Active Coaching. New Skills for Coaching People toward Success in Work and Life*. Mountain View, CA: Davis-Black Publishing.
- Wodak, Ruth. 1986. *Language Behavior in Therapy Groups*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2001. "The Discourse-historical Approach." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (eds.), 63–94. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2008. "Introduction: Discourse Studies – Important Concepts and Terms." In: *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*, Ruth Wodak and Michal Kryzanowski (eds.), 1–29. Houndmills: Palgrave. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-04798-4_1
- Wodak, Ruth, and Michael Meyer (eds). 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020>
- Wodak, Ruth, and Michael Meyer (eds.) 2016. *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Wooffitt, Robin. 2005. *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis. A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208765>
- Wynn, Rolf, and Michael Wynn. 2006. "Empathy as an Interactionally Achieved Phenomenon in Psychotherapy. Characteristics of Some Conversational Resources." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1385–1397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.09.008>
- Zimmerman, Don. 1998. "Identity, Context and Interaction." In *Identities at Talk*, Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds.), 87–106. London: Sage.

Index

A

- Activity Analysis 10, 60–61
- Activity type 9–10, 20, 49–53, 60, 70–71, 273–279, 279–280, 291
- Agenda
 - agenda setting 58
 - coaching agenda 24, 31, 35, 51, 56
 - professional agenda 9, 42, 47, 59, 61
- Asymmetry 9–10, 56–58, 60, 281–285

B

- Basic Activity Model 7–8, 10, 22, 49–71, 273
- Basic activities of coaching 10, 48, 69
- (Basic activity of) 'Defining the Situation' 51, 55, 60, 71, 75–125, 273, 274–279, 282, 288, 292, 289, 291
- Establishing the coaching realm 77, 78–84, 123
- Methodological and procedural framing of coaching 10, 77, 85, 107, 110, 114, 123, 171, 291
- Temporal framing of coaching 10, 77, 115, 122–123, 125, 282
- (Basic activity of) 'Building the Relationship' 51, 55, 60, 71, 75, 127–164, 274, 274–279, 282, 283, 288
- Establishing the roles and identities of 'coach' and 'client' 10, 129, 130–146, 163
- Negotiating hierarchy in an asymmetrical relationship 10, 129, 146–153, 163

- Topicalizing the coach-client dyad within the triadic coach–client–organization relationship 10, 129, 153–163
- (Basic activity of) 'Co-constructing Change' 51, 56, 60, 71, 165–227, 273, 275–279, 283, 288–289
- Diagnosing 69, 167, 168, 169–186, 226, 230, 236, 283, 288
- Intervening 69, 186–218, 226, 276–277, 283, 288–289
- Securing transfer 168–169, 219–226, 276, 289
- (Basic activity of) 'Evaluating the Coaching' 51, 56, 60, 229–272, 273, 274, 276–277, 279, 284, 290, 292
- Evaluating clients' change as regards their goal(s) 231–256, 270
- Evaluating the coaching interaction 231, 256–269, 270, 272, 284, 292

C

- Change 4, 17–18, 24–28, 35, 36, 40–42, 273, 274–279, 290
- Change scenario 24, 176
- Coach-client dyad 55, 56, 71, 76, 110, 115, 124, 128–129, 153, 162, 164, 274, 277–278, 293
- Coach-client interaction 4, 51, 249–250, 271, 273, 275
- Coach-client relationship (*see also* 'relationship between coach and client') 2, 127, 129, 164, 208, 230, 275
- (Executive) Coaching 1–8, 15–32, 49–53, 53–56, 57–60, 70–71, 274–279, 279–280, 281–285, 285–290, 290–293

- coaching discourse (*see also* discourse of coaching) 54, 62, 70, 78, 158, 176, 272, 291, 293
 - coaching process 7, 23–24, 31, 50, 51, 63, 66, 275, 282
 - Co-active 25–28, 130, 281
 - Communicative task 42, 50–52, 54, 58, 60, 70–72, 273
 - (Core) Component 50–51, 69, 71–72
 - (Primary) Concern 24, 27, 28, 35, 43, 47, 51, 55, 65, 67, 168–178, 178–183, 184, 185, 186, 190–195, 201, 206–213, 218, 219, 226–227, 230, 231, 235, 246, 270, 275, 276, 283–284, 288, 289
 - Conversation Analysis 1, 10, 60–62
 - Counseling 1, 2, 6, 15, 18, 19, 35, 52, 58, 165, 183, 272, 279
 - counseling talk 1, 51
 - Critical Discourse Studies 60–62
- ## D
- Discourse 2–7, 18, 22, 25, 31, 33–34, 37–38, 41, 44, 49, 51–54, 57, 60–64, 66–71, 274, 279–281, 283, 285–287, 289–293
 - managerial discourse 19, 34, 38, 227, 271, 274, 280, 285–290
 - meta-discourse 11, 19, 96, 125, 272, 274, 280, 290–293
 - professional and institutional discourse 1, 3, 5, 57–60, 279–280
 - (psycho-)therapeutic discourse 19, 37, 285–290
 - Discourse of coaching 1, 3, 52, 283, 285, 290, 291

Discourse type 3–5, 20, 49–53,
60, 61, 270, 274, 279–293
Doctor-patient interaction
1, 26, 43, 44, 70, 85, 128, 169,
186, 271, 291

E

Emotion(s) (*see also feelings, see
also feelings-talk*) 23, 33–48,
63, 84, 104, 165–166, 198, 202,
267, 287
communication of emotions
38, 41, 42, 45
discourse of emotions
33, 41, 287
emotional experiences
9, 11, 18, 25, 29, 41–48, 54,
56, 101, 102, 110, 115, 129,
195, 227, 230–231, 270,
276–279, 285–289
Emotional Intelligence 8, 23,
33–37, 288
Emotionally Intelligent Coaching
8, 33–37, 41, 47–48, 59, 65–66,
274–279, 279–285, 285–290
Equality 274, 280, 281–285
Executive client 11, 25, 31, 48,
76, 78, 107, 165, 229, 277
Expert-lay (person) 70, 164, 284
Extreme case formulation 94,
140, 141, 154, 156, 233

F

Feelings (*see also emotions, see
also feelings-talk*) 17–18, 27,
32, 33–48, 56, 59, 123–124, 193,
196, 213, 227, 283, 285, 287, 289
feelings-talk 33–48, 61, 77,
101, 104, 106, 124, 172, 179,
187, 191, 193, 195, 227, 230,
284, 287, 289
(Re-)Formulation 30, 36, 58,
104, 141, 155, 173, 283, 288, 291

H

Health care 51, 59, 165
Helping Profession 1, 72, 143,
165, 273, 284, 287, 289
Hierarchy 9, 115, 125, 164, 275,
284
Hybridity 19, 31, 52, 70, 274,
279, 280, 285, 293

I

Integrative Discourse Analysis
7
Integrative discourse analytic
framework 60, 66
Interaction field 9, 54–56, 100–
102, 124, 174, 186, 191, 210, 213,
227, 230, 235, 246, 270–271,
275–278, 284, 287, 289
Interaction frame 9, 43, 51,
53–56, 75–76, 110, 115, 123, 128,
274–275, 278, 284
Interaction type 65, 70, 164,
270, 291
Interactional Sociolinguistics
1, 10, 60–61, 63
Interdiscursivity 19, 274, 279,
280, 293
(Re-)Interpretation 30, 43, 45,
58, 93, 96, 104, 179, 181, 195,
199, 206, 247, 283, 288
Intervention 3, 4, 6, 7, 15, 19,
25, 30–32, 36, 38–39, 47, 57,
273–274, 277–279, 285, 286,
293

K

Knowledge 3, 21, 26, 27, 30, 36,
46, 49, 57–59, 75, 100, 103, 107,
124, 130–137, 146, 240, 281–283

L

Leadership 16, 67, 206, 212,
216–217, 229, 244
leadership skills 16, 25, 100,
110, 165

M

Management consulting 2, 19,
23, 26, 27, 55, 85, 97–98, 102,
213, 279
(Practicing) Mindfulness 35,
36, 61, 66, 79, 134–135, 166,
187–190, 218, 226

O

Organizational intervention
3, 4, 16, 25, 31, 39, 47, 57, 76,
273–274, 276–277, 285, 290

P

Person-centered 11, 17, 25–28,
146
Power 25, 50, 57–59, 62, 78, 125,
130, 146, 178, 207, 281–285
Problem 2, 17, 27, 28, 36, 37,
104, 115, 136, 166–168, 178–179,
219, 223, 226, 229, 232, 284,
288, 289, 291
problem-oriented (problem
orientation) 2, 24, 169
Process-oriented 4, 25–28, 273
Professional and institutional
interaction 10, 50, 57, 58,
146, 164

Q

Questions 26, 30, 36, 44, 81, 87,
104, 107, 108, 125, 147–148, 152,
169, 175, 225, 236, 243, 246,
255, 258, 283

R

Relationship between coach and
client 2, 24, 26, 36, 51, 122,
127, 146, 163, 230, 270, 273,
275, 278, 283, 289

S

Self-reflection 2, 4, 11, 18–19,
30, 36, 37, 39–41, 51, 61, 284–
286, 288
result-oriented self-reflection
19, 51, 285
Solution 24, 27–28, 30, 51, 166,
219, 226, 284
solution-oriented (solution-
focused) 2, 25–28, 178,
290
Supervision 50

T

Theme-Oriented Discourse
Analysis 10, 60–61
(Psycho-)Therapy 1, 2, 6, 17, 19,
23, 30, 32, 35, 38, 42, 44, 45, 47,
50, 52, 55, 86, 104–106, 128,
166, 226, 275, 279, 289
Therapeutic culture 3, 37–39,
63

The Pragmatics of Executive Coaching is the first linguistic monograph on executive coaching, a recent, not fully professionalized, yet booming helping professional format in the organizational realm. The book is positioned at the interface between applied linguistic analysis and the activity of coaching, coupled with its structuring professional theory. It presents the Basic Activity Model of coaching, a model for the qualitative analysis and description of the discursive co-construction of coaching by coach and client within and across individual coaching sessions and whole processes. The analysis is based on 150 hours of authentic data from the coaching approach *Emotionally Intelligent Coaching* and presents coaching as hybrid and interdiscursive helping professional format. The gained insights into the discursive layout of coaching interactions advance our linguistic understanding of helping professions as such, contribute to the theoretical and methodological underpinning of coaching and help promote the coaching practice.

ISBN 978 90 272 0245 1



John Benjamins Publishing Company