

# Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	11
<b>A word of thanks</b>	12
<b>Introduction</b>	15
An anthropological perspective	17
A closed community	17
Tension and contrast	18
A linguistic perspective	18
An interdisciplinary perspective	18
Notes	19
<b>Dramatis Personae</b>	21
<b>Chapter 1 Entering the field</b>	23
1.1 Introduction	24
1.2 From the perspective of the participants	26
1.2.1 Frame analysis: introduction	26
1.2.2 Frame analysis: the e-mail message	28
1.2.2.1 Mind your language	28
1.2.2.2 Native speaker	28
1.2.3 Frame analysis: an initial instance of interaction	33
1.2.3.1 Humor and incongruity	35
1.2.3.2 Pleased to meet you	36
1.2.3.3 Well, nothing really	37
1.2.4 Conclusion	39
1.3 From the perspective of the researcher	40
1.3.1 Introduction	40

1.3.2	Preconceptions about participation	40
1.3.3	Confronting context	42
1.3.4	The decisiveness of the field	43
1.3.5	Conclusion	48
	Notes	49
<b>Chapter 2 The ritual role of the meeting</b>		53
2.1	A two-dimensional perspective	54
2.2	Ritual regularity	55
2.3	Standards of seating	58
2.3.1	Introduction	59
2.3.2	Ritual initiation	60
2.3.3	Status contest	62
2.3.4	Cross-cultural perspective	66
2.3.5	Spatial arrangement of offices	67
2.3.6	The meeting table	69
2.3.7	Seating strategies	69
2.3.8	Areas of central importance	72
2.3.9	Semi-peripheral positions	73
2.3.10	Peripheral positions	75
2.4	Connectedness and cohesion	77
2.5	Conclusion	80
	Notes	81
<b>Chapter 3 Legitimizing power through ritual</b>		87
3.1	Introduction: controlling the social system through ritual	88
3.2	Enacting power: constructing and legitimizing a position of authority	89
3.2.1	Anthropology and Appraisal allied: a two-pronged approach to power and political performance	89
3.2.2	Tracing the anthropological roots of SFL	93
3.2.3	Appraisal: a brief outline	95
3.2.3.1	Introduction	95
3.2.3.2	Attitudinal positioning	95
3.2.3.3	Dialogical positioning	97
3.2.3.4	Graduation	100
3.2.4	Linguistic-descriptive analysis of the interview	101
3.2.4.1	Introduction	101
3.2.4.2	Analysis	103
3.2.5	Content analysis of the interview	108
3.2.6	Conclusion	111
3.3	Acting upon power: validating the norms	112
3.3.1	Introduction	113

3.3.2	Divergent evaluations	113
3.3.3	Echoes of the projected ideology	114
3.3.4	The truth of the performance	115
3.3.4.1	Cohesion versus competition	115
3.3.4.2	Opportunity versus obligation	116
3.3.4.3	Two monologues do not make a dialogue	118
3.3.4.4	Our meeting versus <i>his</i> meeting	119
3.3.5	Cover-up operation	119
3.3.6	Conclusion	122
	Notes	123
<b>Chapter 4 Staging a team performance</b>		127
4.1	Introduction	128
4.2	Goffman's dramaturgic metaphor	129
4.2.1	Introduction	129
4.2.2	Front	129
4.2.3	Idealization	131
4.2.4	Back region and front region	131
4.2.5	Team performance	131
4.3	Rule as role: the Ambassador's differentiated role playing	132
4.3.1	Director of the performance	132
4.3.1.1	Introduction	132
4.3.1.2	Announcing the team's line	133
4.3.1.3	Collective address	136
4.3.1.4	Sanctioning	137
4.3.1.5	Rewarding	139
4.3.2	Central player	141
4.3.2.1	An acclaimed soloist	141
4.3.2.2	Enacting a central position in a network of relations	141
4.3.2.3	An actor and comedian	142
4.3.2.4	Protagonist versus antagonist	145
4.3.3	Conclusion	146
4.4	Role allocation, role negotiation and status contest	147
4.4.1	Allocating the parts	148
4.4.2	Vying for status	153
4.4.3	Conclusion	155
	Notes	156
<b>Chapter 5 Conclusion</b>		159
	Ethnography: a method or a mode of knowing?	162
	Participant observer or observer as participant?	163

A text-oriented or a participant-oriented approach to discourse analysis?	163
An instrumental or a symbolic purpose of meetings?	164
A “solidarity-based system” or a “power-based system”?	165
Backstage or frontstage?	167
Notes	168
<b>Appendices</b>	171
<b>Appendix 1: Official request for permission</b>	172
<b>Appendix 2: Transcription glossary</b>	174
<b>Appendix 3: Organisation chart</b>	175
<b>Appendix 4: List of figures</b>	177
<b>References</b>	179