

THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION
OF LEADER IDENTITY:
Tim Cook in a broadcast interview

Master's Thesis
Pia Arvonen

University of Jyväskylä
Department of Languages
English
August 2016

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Pia Arvonen	
Työn nimi – Title The discursive construction of leader identity: Tim Cook in a broadcast interview	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Elokuu 2016	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 96 + liite
Tiivistelmä – Abstract <p>Tämän tutkimuksen aiheena on tutkia johtajaidentiteetin rakentumista diskursiivisesta näkökulmasta. Sosiolingvistisen tutkimussuuntauksen piirissä identiteetin rakentuminen nähdään kielellisenä prosessina: identiteetti rakentuu vuorovaikutuksessa diskursiivisten prosessien kautta. Tätä taustaa vasten tavoitteena on selvittää, kuinka Applen toimitusjohtaja Tim Cookin johtajaidentiteetti rakentuu haastattelutilanteessa erilaisten kielellisten keinojen kautta. Tutkimuksen keskiössä ovat erityisesti kielellisen asemoinnin keinot eli erilaisten lyhyt- ja pidempiaikaisten identiteettiasemien osoittaminen niin Cookin itsensä kuin haastattelijan toimesta.</p> <p>Teoreettinen viitekehys koostui Bucholtzin ja Hallin (2005) esittelemistä diskursiivisen identiteetin rakentumisen periaatteista sekä haastattelukontekstiin liittyvistä käsitteistä ja periaatteista, kuten Claymanin ja Heritagen (2002) uutishaastattelututkimuksen löydöksistä.</p> <p>Tutkimuksen aineisto koostui haastattelusta, jossa Tim Cook on journalisti Charlie Rosen vieraana. Analyysi tehtiin tarkastelemalla aineistossa esiintyviä kielellisen asemoinnin eri keinoja ottaen huomioon haastattelurakenteen erityispiirteet ja niiden vaikutuksen keskustelijoiden väliseen vuorovaikutukseen. Ennen laadullista aineiston analysoimista haastattelu litteroitiin noudatellen keskusteluanalyysin periaatteita.</p> <p>Analyysi osoitti Cookin johtajaidentiteetin rakentuvan neljän erotettavissa olevan ulottuvuuden kautta. Johtajaidentiteetin rakentuminen myös näytti heijastavan muutokseen, inspiroimiseen ja voimaannuttamiseen liittyviä diskursseja, jotka esiintyvät myös johtajuuden tutkimuksessa johtajuudesta esitetyissä määritelmissä. Tutkimus osoitti lisäksi johtajaidentiteetin voivan rakentua myös työpaikkakontekstin ulkopuolella.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords identity, socio-linguistics, conversation analysis, broadcast interview, leadership, Tim Cook, Apple	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository JYX	
Muita tietoja – Additional information Appendix 1	

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. LEADERSHIP STUDIES: TOWARDS A DISCURSIVE RESEARCH ORIENTATION 5	
3. DISCURSIVE IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION	8
3.1. The former and current understandings of identity as an academic concept.....	8
3.2. Identity as an intersubjective and discursive construct	9
3.2.1. Emergence in interaction	10
3.2.2. Positioning: assigning and adopting identity roles	11
3.2.3. Indexicality: identity construction mechanism	14
3.2.4. Identities as relational constructs	17
3.2.5. Partialness of identity construction	18
3.3. Previous studies	19
4. BROADCAST INTERVIEWS	24
4.1. Broadcast interview as institutional discourse.....	24
4.2. Interview genre	27
4.3. Interview conduct: question – answer sequences	28
4.3.1. Interviewer questions	29
4.3.2 Interviewee answers.....	34
4.3.3. Celebrity interview: co-operation and first-hand knowledge	35
5. THE PRESENT STUDY	37
5.1. Aims and research questions	38
5.2. Data.....	39
5.3. Analytic methods.....	41
6. THE EMERGING LEADER IDENTITY	42
6.1. Successor of Steve Jobs	43
6.2. Business leader	51
6.2.1. Leader by profession.....	52
6.2.2. CEO of Apple	61
6.3. Apple’s representative	71
6.3.1. Promoting and maintaining the values and image of Apple	71
6.3.2. Secretiveness.....	76
6.4. Tim Cook beyond Apple	80
7. CONCLUDING DISCUSSION.....	85
7.1. Summary of the main findings	86

7.2. Findings in relation to previous research.....	90
7.3. Limitations of study and suggestions for future research.....	92
BIBLIOGRAPHY	94
APPENDIX 1	97

1. INTRODUCTION

Who are the people leading the world's successful companies and how do they play their role as leaders? Some of the leaders heading highly successful enterprises, such as the late Steve Jobs, have reached a status of a celebrity or a hero of the time. The nearly idolized managers seem interesting not only due to their skills, insights and success within their field of business but also because of their personas. Media and nowadays especially the social media bring the otherwise unattainable executives closer to the public, which makes it easier to ponder how they verbally construct their identity as a leader.

The fundamental principle that this study is based on is that identity construction takes place in social interaction through varied discursive processes (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006; Bucholtz and Hall, 2005). More specifically, the discursive choices made by speakers are central in the identity positions that are assigned for or assumed by an individual. Especially the manners of dealing with the positions are at the core of analyzing identity construction. In the light of this theoretical background, the present study will examine the leader identity construction of Tim Cook, the current chief executive officer of Apple, who was appointed in the position after co-founder and former CEO Steve Jobs's resignation.

Contrary to what seems to be a prevailing contextual focus within this field of research, the present study considers the construction of leader identity outside the workplace context. Indeed, the data of this thesis consists of a broadcast interview where Tim Cook is interviewed by a journalist Charlie Rose about topics related to Apple and Cook leading the company. Therefore, the aim is to study how Tim Cook and Charlie Rose discursively formulate different identity positions and how these contribute to the emerging leader identity in the context of a broadcast interview. A relevant factor in terms of this study is that broadcast interview is a form of institutional discourse, which characterizes the interaction through institutionally based distribution of power, for example. Furthermore, the genre of the interview is determined as a celebrity interview, which is realized in the friendly relationship between Cook and Rose. The present study was especially guided by the framework for analyzing identity from a discursive point of view (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005) and Clayman and Heritage's (2002) research on news interviews.

At the time of writing this thesis Timothy Donald, “Tim”, Cook is the present CEO of Apple Inc., an electronics company within the field of information and communications technology (ICT). Cook has worked for Apple since 1998 and accepted the post of chief executive officer in August 2011, after Steve Jobs’s resignation due to health issues. Prior to being nominated as the CEO Cook was the chief operating officer at Apple (Apple Press Info, 2016). His professional experience before Apple includes positions at Compaq (the vice president of corporate materials), Intelligent Electronics (the chief operating officer of the Reseller Division) as well as IBM (director of North American Fulfillment) (ibid). By education he is a Master of Business Administration as well as a Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering. (Apple Press Info, 2016). Cook keeps his personal life mostly private but in an article that he wrote for Bloomberg Businessweek Cook came out publicly as gay. Cook (2014) states that “Being gay has given me a deeper understanding of what it means to be in the minority and provided a window into the challenges that people in other minority groups deal with every day.” In terms of the present study, his personal experience of belonging to a minority group seems to be a background factor in his leader identity construction.

The interview was aired in two parts in September 2014 when Cook had been the CEO of Apple for nearly three years. A few days prior to the interview Cook had published a new Apple product, the Apple watch, which was the first new product published and released in Cook’s lead. The release was definitely a milestone for Cook himself as well as for the whole company. Keeping this in mind, the topics covered during the interview were current and the interviewer is quite understandably interested in Cook’s position as the leader of Apple for example in relation to being the successor of Steve Jobs.

2. LEADERSHIP STUDIES: TOWARDS A DISCURSIVE RESEARCH ORIENTATION

The definition of leadership as a scholarly concept is elusive and there are probably as many definitions as there are scholars within the field. In this chapter I aim to present briefly some related understandings of leadership within leadership studies, which will help in grasping a general idea of leadership as an academic field of study. Going into the details of leadership research is not considered essential in the context of this study as the focus here is rather on

the discursive identity construction processes especially from a (socio)linguistic and discursive point of view. Therefore, this chapter does not by any means try to cover all research orientations or definitions of leadership within the field of leadership studies. For the purposes of this study a relevant aspect of leadership studies is that a branch within the field has turned towards a constructionist definition of leadership. However, I will first discuss the differences in the meaning of the words *management* and *leadership* and then move on to a brief discussion on the psychological and discursive approaches within leadership studies.

The terms *management* and *leadership* are often used as equivalents even though especially within leadership studies their meaning has been explicitly distinguished. To start with, according to Collins English Dictionary (2016), the word leader entails “a person who rules, guides, or inspires others; head” whereas the word manager is defined as “a person who directs or manages an organization, industry, shop, etc.” These definitions deliver a rough idea on the distinctive meanings of the words but still a clear-cut definition of the differences does not exist, even though – and probably because – within organizational studies “leadership is one of the most studied phenomena” (Cheney et al., 2004: 177). Yet, a broad shared understanding does exist on the core difference between leadership and management. Despite the fact that the concepts are sometimes used as synonyms, fundamentally, leadership is about leading people whereas management is about running things (Lämsä and Päivike, 2013: 207). The fundamental difference is realized in the product of the action, specifically “leadership produces change and management produces stability” (Cheney et al., 2004: 181). Furthermore, leadership is about promoting new ideas, trends and change whereas management consists of order, sustainability and stability (Lämsä and Päivike, 2013: 207). Indeed, the aspiration to influence one’s followers is a central feature of leadership and consequently influencing one’s subordinates by the means of language is associated as being something that a leader does (Cheney et al. 2004, 181). Altogether, it seems that leadership is associated with positive attributes such as generating change, inspiring of others and, recently, empowerment (Lämsä and Päivike, 2013: 232) whereas management is seen rather as an everyday practice (Cheney et al, 2004: 182) that creates stability.

As mentioned above, in a very pragmatic and probably the most basic sense, leadership can be understood as the leader’s pursuit of influencing his/her followers in a particular space and

time. Leadership can be described as a process that takes place on multiple levels and they are the individual, the group and the organization (Burns et al, 2004: 840). According to Burns et al (2004: 840), on the individual level, leadership is realized through the adoption of a leader role (and follower roles) and on the organizational or group level leadership is determined by the existence of organizational structures and processes. A context for interaction is vital for the existence of leadership (ibid). In essence, leadership can be understood as a social phenomenon. From a communicative perspective, Hackman and Johnson (2009: 11) define leadership as: “human (symbolic) communication, which modifies the attitudes and behaviors of others in order to meet shared group goals and needs.” This perspective reflects the idea that leadership is realized between the leader and his/her followers through communication that creates action.

A great deal of research within leadership studies has been conducted from a psychological perspective (leadership psychology), which as a research orientation constitutes an important foundation for leadership studies (Fairhurst, 2007: viii). The leadership psychology orientation is especially interested in managers’ cognitive processes, and how they translate into managerial behavior (Fairhurst, 2007: 2). For example, the trait theories, contingency theories and leader-member exchange theory represent the leadership psychology orientation (Fairhurst, 2007: viii). A research approach that Fairhurst (2007: 3) calls “discursive leadership” has emerged at the turn of the 20th and 21st century resulting from a number of leadership scholars’ work that were gravitating outside the psychological orientation. Discursive leadership abandons the conception of leadership as essential or inevitable in an individual, which is a typical standpoint within leadership psychology. Instead, leadership is seen from a discursively constructionist perspective (Fairhurst, 27: 4-5). In other words, from the discursive point of view, leadership becomes accomplished in interaction. However, discursive leadership is not to substitute the leadership psychology approach but rather to offer an alternative and possibly complementing perspective on leadership research (Fairhurst, 2007: 3-4).

The emergence of the discursive leadership approach as well as the trend towards studying the social construction of leadership (see e.g. Fairhurst and Grant, 2010) gives relevance to this study’s interest in analyzing the discursive identity construction processes of Tim Cook. Even

though this study does not investigate leadership per se, it aims to contribute to the social constructionist research orientation that has emerged also within leadership studies by means of a case study, which analyses a particular leader's identity construction processes from a discursive standpoint.

3. DISCURSIVE IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION

In this study the concept of identity is understood from the discursively constructionist perspective: identity is constructed in interaction through varying discursive means. In other words, rather than being an innate construct, identity is considered to emerge in interaction. Perhaps the broadest research orientation behind the understanding of identity adopted in this study is social constructionism. In brief, social constructionism entails the idea that the reality one creates for him-/herself is dependent on the time and space in which the person is located. Everything in our reality depends on the meanings around us, and how one makes use of those meanings in creating of his/her own reality. (see Lock and Strong, 2010).

The aim of this chapter is to deal with the concept of identity as it is understood from the intersubjective and discursive standpoint by introducing the concepts of emergence, positioning, indexicality, relationality and partialness. All of these relate to discursive identity construction and provide useful concepts and tools for analyzing the data of the study at hand. I will next summarize roughly the chronological development of the perception of identity starting from the sixteenth century. A brief history overview is helpful in order to understand in which ways the mundane understanding of identity differs from the current scientific understanding. After that I will move on to discussing identity as a discursive construct.

3.1. The former and current understandings of identity as an academic concept

According to Benwell and Stokoe (2006: 19), Descartes' (1596-1650) and Locke's (1632-1704) ideas were central in the conception of identity as a projection of the self. This way of understanding identity has prevailed since the Enlightenment (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006: 19).

Identity described as a “project of the self” carries with it an idea that identity is an internal construction of all the qualities that comprise a person that are then projected outside. This kind of perception of identity persevered through Romanticism, though the Enlightenment’s rationality-based way of understanding identity switched to a Romantic “expressive individualism” (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006: 19). Despite the currently prevailing “constituted in discourse” perspective on identity (which will be discussed in section 3.2.) Benwell and Stokoe (2006: 17-20) argue that the Enlightenment and Romantic understandings of identity persist even in current everyday life. After the “project of self” period and, not only before but also simultaneously with the “constituted in discourse” period there is, however, a period of “collective identities” that locates in the latter half of the 1900s (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006: 24-25). The theories that laid ground to this approach were Tajfel’s social identity theory and self-categorization theory (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006: 25). Within the aforementioned theories “social identity (as opposed to personal identity) is defined by individual identification with a group: a process constituted firstly by a reflexive knowledge of group membership, and secondly by an emotional attachment or specific disposition to this belonging” (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006: 25). In other words, one’s conceptions of group membership shape his/her social identity.

To move on to the twenty-first century, the prevailing trend within research orientations such as (interactional) sociolinguistics, Conversation Analysis and (Critical) Discourse Analysis among others has been towards the interactionally emergent understanding of identity. Despite the fact that the methodological take on identity varies within these research orientations, they all share the understanding of identity being a construct that emerges in interaction. For example, Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 587) argue that instead of being only a construct within the mind that is displayed by the means of language, identity is a “discursive construct that emerges in interaction”. In other words, in order to take place identity construction requires social interaction where language is the tool for constructing the identity. To put it shortly, identity is constructed intersubjectively rather than individually. This idea will be discussed in more detail in 3.2.

3.2. Identity as an intersubjective and discursive construct

Following the trend within the aforementioned research orientations, this study adopts the perspective that identity is an intersubjectively and discursively built construct. From this perspective, language use has a great impact on the interactionally emerging identity of a speaker. Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) framework for analyzing identity from the interactional point of view introduces five principles that condense together the essential work on identity within fields such as social psychology, linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics. The authors call this mixture "sociocultural linguistics" and by the term they refer to "the broad interdisciplinary field concerned with the intersection of language, culture, and society" (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 586). The framework's principles are the emergence principle, the positionality principle, the indexicality principle, the relationality principle and, finally, the partialness principle. The framework encompasses the different yet overlapping aspects of the interactionally emergent identity. Even though the authors describe the aspects in separate principles it is important to notice that they often function simultaneously. The principles along with other related theories will be discussed in the following sections.

3.2.1. Emergence in interaction

The first principle of Bucholtz and Hall's framework (2005: 588), the emergence principle, captures the prevailing analytic perspective on identity. The principle is outlined as follows: "Identity is best viewed as the emergent product rather than the pre-existing source of linguistic and other semiotic practices and therefore as fundamentally a social and cultural phenomenon" (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 588). Thus, Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 588) maintain that identity is constructed at the same time as an interaction takes place. Interaction is realized through the two levels of discourse, which Pietikäinen and Mäntynen (2009: 26-27) define as follows: discourse as social action (micro-level) and discourses (macro-level) as the surrounding socially recognizable, context dependent ways of meaning making. As for identities, Pietikäinen and Mäntynen (2009: 64) state that despite an individual's self-conception being a very subjective experience, identity is shaped through the discourses connected to the surrounding social contexts. For this reason, discourses related to broadcast interviews, in other words how interview participants ought to speak in order to comply with the requirements set by the surrounding context, will play a part in how the interaction

unfolds. The elements related to broadcast interview as institutional discourse will be discussed in more detail in 4.1.

Language in itself is shaped by social interaction but it is also “socially constitutive” (Fairclough, 1995: 55). The use of language is always a process where identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and belief are constituted all at the same time, though not always to the same degree (Fairclough, 1995:55). In addition, according to Fairclough (1995: 55), the constitutiveness of language use appears in both conventional and creative ways. He claims that the conventional ways contribute to the reproduction and maintenance of already existing social identities, relations and systems of knowledge and beliefs whereas the creative ways alter them. The social setting in which the discourse takes place accompanied by the way in which language is being used in it determine whether it is the conventional or the creative ways of using language that prevail in a certain case (Fairclough, 1995: 55). The data of this study demonstrates conventional ways of using language as the participants orient to the social setting by following the preconditions set by interview context.

3.2.2. Positioning: assigning and adopting identity roles

The kind of identity that emerges in interaction is greatly dependent on the identity positions assigned to or adopted by the speakers and therefore analyzing the identity positions is a key aspect of this study. In their article Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 586) define the concept of identity quite loosely – but deliberately so – as follows: “Identity is the social positioning of self and other.” According to Ribeiro (2006: 49), positioning is a notion that has been used in connection with analyzing the “contextualization processes in everyday talk (or texts)” for example in sociology and psychology. In the study of positioning one is interested in the “strategic interactional moves” that are made by the conversation participants (Ribeiro, 2006: 49-50). Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 592) expand on the idea of social positioning in the second principle of the framework, which they call the positionality principle. It is defined as follows:

“Identities encompass (a) macro-level demographic categories; (b) local, ethnographically specific cultural positions; and (c) temporary and interactionally specific stances and participant roles” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 592).

In relation to the positionality principle Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 591-592) argue that there are three levels of identity positions, which together contribute to the emerging identity. The levels include the socially large-scale identity categories (i.e. “macro-level demographic categories”) such as categories related to age, social class or gender. To the contrary, the more locally available identity categories, i.e. “local, ethnographically specific cultural positions” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 591-592) involve categories that are probably not available prior to analysis but instead can be detected only with the help of an ethnographic analysis. Category in a general sense, according to Silverman (2011: 258), can be understood as referring to a type of identity, such as ‘manager’, ‘employee’ or ‘philanthropist’. Categories can be organized into collections (e.g. ‘mother’, ‘baby’ and ‘father’ belong to ‘family’ collection of categories or ‘manager’, ‘employee’ and ‘trainee’ belonging to ‘work’ collection) and, therefore, the use of categories is defining because choosing one category from a collection of categories means that other categories in that collection cannot be used to identify a person (Silverman, 2011: 258). To continue with the ‘family’ category example, if one is to be categorized as ‘mother’ it results in other categories (such as ‘baby’, ‘father’) of ‘family’ collection becoming excluded. In other words, the defining nature of a category is actually twofold. First, the category used bears a specific type of meaning, the kind that dictionaries provide, such as the dictionary definitions for the categories ‘leader’ and ‘manager’ discussed in the section two. Second, a choice of using a certain category (such as ‘leader’) excludes the use of other categories (such as ‘employee’ or ‘trainee’) within a category collection (‘work’).

In comparison to the aforementioned groupings of identity categories, probably the most briefly occupied categories are the interactional positions, in specific the “temporary and interactionally specific stances and participant roles” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 591-592). The temporary roles (such as a critic or a listener) and orientations taken on during the unfolding of a discourse contribute to the emergence of identity at a very basic level (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 591). Similar to larger sociological and ethnographic identity categories, the temporary roles are instrumental in the development of “subjectivity and intersubjectivity in discourse” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 591). Regardless of their temporary nature, these roles are

participants' responses to the arbitrariness of the flow of discourse. The occupation of different temporary roles in conversation may contribute to the build-up of ideological associations with large-scale and local identity categories, and the ideological associations then may have an effect on the actions taken in a conversation (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 591). As a result, conversation participants can adopt different identity positions such as a temporary role of an evaluator or a more permanent role related to one's profession by employing different linguistic resources.

Also Zimmerman (2008) deals with the idea that speakers adopt roles of varying degrees of temporality within a talk-in-interaction. In a similar way that Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 591-592) understand the temporary roles and orientations as interactional positions adopted and abandoned by the participants during an interaction, Zimmerman (2008: 90, 92) explains that the sequentiality of interaction causes the interaction participants to adopt different types of discourse identities such as questioner – answerer or storyteller – story listener. In other words, the discourse identities (Zimmerman, 2008: 90) are a manifestation of the interaction participants' engagement in the discourse and their adherence to the progression of the discourse as well as to the actions accomplished during it. By initiating an action, such as asking a question, the initiating party simultaneously adopts the discourse identity of a questioner and assigns the reciprocal discourse identity of an answerer to the addressee (Zimmerman, 2008: 90). In order to avoid confusion, following Bucholtz and Hall's (2005: 591) positionality principle, the term temporary role will be used when referring to the roles that are adopted/assigned temporarily in reaction to the unfolding of the conversation.

Zimmerman (2008: 90, 94-95) also introduces the concept of situated identities, which arise from the speakers' orientation toward the interactive event and the activities and agendas relative to it. The situated identities differ from discourse identities in that the latter may change from turn to turn whereas the former tend to remain unchanged during a specific interactive event. However, these two operate together in interaction as the "oriented-to situated identities" provide the context, which guides the speakers in employing relevant discourse identities in order to accomplish a specific activity. (Zimmerman, 2008: 90-95). For example, in a broadcast interview the situated identities would be interviewer – interviewee

and/or host – guest and discourse identities could be for example questioner – answerer, story teller – story listener or introducer – introduced.

In terms of this study the aforementioned levels of identity categories and their relative (im)permanence is a relevant aspect to bear in mind. I assume that a leader identity can be manifested on any of the levels identified in the positionality principle. As the focus of this study is on an interview that takes place at a certain time and place I presume that the “temporary and interactionally specific stances and participant roles” will be most apparent in the data. Some of the “macro-level demographic categories” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 592) such as identity categories related to age, occupation or gender, are clearly visible and thus easier to detect than other less visible ones. The “local, ethnographically specific cultural positions” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 592) bear less relevance for my analysis. The data consists of a broadcast interview, which is a specific type of activity within the media genre. In more specific, broadcast interview is public discourse with its own particular cultural characteristics. However, the focus of the present study is on the public interaction instead of the cultural characteristics of the media genre and therefore the analysis of the discursively emerging identity positions is appropriate.

3.2.3. Indexicality: identity construction mechanism

Indexical processes are fundamental in the (dis)claiming or assigning of identity positions to or by the speakers. In the most general sense the indexing of an identity is accomplished in an interactive event through such language use and discursive choices that refer to some physical or abstract aspect in the environment. More specifically, indexicality is the linguistic mechanism based on language’s capability of pointing to the aspects of reality, such as time, space or objects. In interaction identities are (re-)negotiated and claimed by relying on a collection of linguistic resources available to an individual (Marra and Angouri, 2011: 1). The speaker’s use of his/her linguistic resources display the “different aspects of their identities in particular contexts at particular times” (Llamas and Watt, 2010: 1). The concepts indexicality and deixis refer basically to the same idea of context-dependent meanings of certain types of expressions but indexicality can be used in a broader sense. An index is a linguistic item that

is to be interpreted in relation to and with the help of the context in which it is uttered. In other words, indexicality means the possibility of an utterance to have different meanings depending on the context in which it is uttered (Bondi, 2013: 10). These are usually “expressions of personal, temporal and locational deixis (expressions such as *we, today, this report, here* and *you*)” (Bondi, 2013: 10). Furthermore, indexicality is at the core of the symbolic nature of language and it is “a layered, creative, interactive process” (De Fina et al., 2006: 4). Indexicality is not merely a way of referring to a facet in the physical and social surroundings but it is also a way of stirring up socially shared abstractions of, for example, “social representations about group membership, social roles and attributes” (De Fina, et al. 2006:4).

Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 594) remark that ideological structures are the base of indexicality in the identity construction process. In more detail, ideologies are the source from where the associations between particular kinds of language use and identity categories spring. Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 594) condense indexical processes into their indexicality principle:

“Identity relations emerge in interaction through several related indexical processes, including (a) overt mention of identity categories and labels; (b) implicatures and presuppositions regarding one’s own or other’s identity position; (c) displayed evaluative and epistemic orientations to ongoing talk, as well as interactional footings and participant roles; and (d) the use of linguistic structures and systems that are ideologically associated with specific personas and groups.” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 594).

By the mechanism of indexicality speakers can directly or indirectly exhibit that he/she identifies him/herself as belonging to a particular identity category (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 594-595). Probably the most easily identifiable way of claiming a membership of an identity category is “the overt introduction of referential identity categories into discourse”. Implicature and presupposition are indirect manners of adopting or assigning an identity position (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 594-595). In contrast to an overt reference to an identity category both implicature and presupposition cannot be interpreted straightforwardly but instead call for inference (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 595). Implicature means a choice of words that conveys embedded meaning for perceptive listeners whereas for others it carries no extra meaning. Presupposition then is a way of implicitly conveying in speech an idea that

is assumed to be true about the world. In the present study these indexical processes appear in both of the speakers' speech. The overt naming of an identity category takes place by the interviewer in the form of assigning the category on the interviewee and by the interviewee through self-categorization.

According to Ochs (1992: 336-337), the connection between a linguistic form and a social category cannot be straightforwardly determined. Instead, it is the language's relation to social constructs such as stances, social acts and social activities, which establishes the connection (Ochs, 1992: 336-337). Put otherwise, the communicative practices associated with a certain type of activity can index a certain social category. For instance, discursive practices that claim a directive right can be associated with a category of leaders. A speaker can adopt and display an authoritarian stance by discursive choices that convey forcefulness and consequently, the speaker can index to the identity category of leader. The fact that communicative practices generate associations suggests that the different ways of speaking are understood as evidence of a speaker's social identity (Holmes et al., 2011: 15). This sociocultural knowledge regarding the associations is brought along by speakers to each interactive occasion and it is central in order to interpret and evaluate the linguistic practices of the participants (Holmes et al. 2011: 15).

Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 595) gloss stance as "the display of evaluative, affective, and epistemic orientations in discourse". In relation to studying identity construction the benefit of analyzing the speakers' stancetaking is that it helps to detect how they position themselves as well as the other participants as certain kinds of people (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 595). In the literature that deals with stancetaking, according to Englebretson (2007: 15), the terms associated with stance are subjectivity, evaluation and interaction. These terms also represent the slightly different trends in the perspective adopted in the research on stance (for further details on the trends see Englebretson, 2007: 15-20). As a matter fact, each of the terms mentioned by Englebretson (2007: 15) seems to play a part in the stance triangle introduced by Du Bois (2007). Du Bois (2007: 163) suggests that the act of stancetaking encompasses a single stance act that consists of three subsidiary acts: the evaluation of an object, the positioning of a subject, the subject being self and/or others, and the alignment with other

subjects. Therefore, the act of evaluating an object both positions the speaker and aligns him/her with the other interaction participant(s) (Du Bois, 2007: 163).

According to Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 596-597), style marking is related to the interactional stances. Style marking takes place beneath the conversational acts as it is accomplished through the speaker's linguistic structures such as grammar, phonology and lexis (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 597). Therefore, style is determined as a set of linguistic forms that are associated with certain identity categories (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 596-598).

Stancetaking as well as style marking especially in the form of word choices are regarded to play a central role in Cook's identity construction. In the light of Bucholtz and Hall's (2005: 591) positionality principle, the discursive display of stance is taken to be realized through the speaker's occupation of the temporary roles. In other words, in the context of this study the occasions of stancetaking will reveal how the participants orient towards different issues during the interview and consequently what kinds of identity positions are created. Word choices are relevant from the point of view of their connotations and their consequent impact on identity construction.

3.2.4. Identities as relational constructs

Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 598) state that the emergence, positionality and indexicality principles emphasize the relational nature of identity. Furthermore, they argue that relationality in terms of identity consists of different dimensions, in other words identity relations. The relationality principle states that "Identities are intersubjectively constructed through several, often overlapping, complementary relations, including similarity/difference, genuineness/artifice, and authority/delegitimacy." (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 598). The central idea behind this principle is that identity is a relational phenomenon: identities do not exist in a vacuum but rather their social meanings arise from their social relations to other social actors and their identities in a certain social situation (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 598). Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 599-605) list identity relations as pairs: adequation and distinction, authentication and denaturalization, and authorization and illegitimation. In their previous

work Bucholtz and Hall (2004: 382-383) have called these relations as “tactics of intersubjectivity”. The authors remind that the identity relations are not considered to exclude one another (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 599). These intersubjective identity relation pairs show that there are multiple ways of constructing identity but it always happens in social interaction, in relation to the other participants.

The first pair, adequation and distinction, has to do with socially perceived similarities and differences between individuals and groups. Adequation stands for highlighting similarities and underplaying differences between individuals or groups as means for being seen as similar. However, since the level of identicalness is not necessary, and not even possible, sufficient similarity is enough. (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 599). In contrast, similarities between people or groups can be downplayed in order to be regarded as different. This is called distinction. (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 600). The second identity relations pair is authentication and denaturalization. The former is about the processes of validating an identity by discursive means. Specifically, the term authentication conveys that the construction of a genuine identity position is achieved by social processes in discourse, as opposed to the essentialist idea that authenticity is inherent in an individual. (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 601-602). The latter means challenging and/or disrupting conceptions of identities being inherently right or inevitable. This is accomplished by underlining “the ways in which identity is crafted, fragmented, problematic, or false” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 601-602). In other words, the process of denaturalization foregrounds “artificiality and non-essentialism of identity.” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004: 386). Authorization and illegitimation, the final pair, are realized through the expressions of structural and/or institutional power. Indeed, identities become declared or disregarded “through structures of institutionalized power and ideology” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 603). Power based on institutional structures can be discursively used to either assert or disallow an identity position (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 603).

3.2.5. Partialness of identity construction

Postmodernist spirit is captured in the fifth and last principle of Bucholtz and Hall’s (2005) framework, which is the partialness principle. The relationality of identity leads it to be

unavoidably partial. As the previous chapters suggest, identity is constructed in relation to other individuals in a given interactional context by different socially shaped processes. Therefore, the whole complexity of identity cannot be displayed within a string of interaction. Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 606) outline the partialness principle as follows:

“Any given construction of identity may be in part deliberate and intentional, in part habitual and hence often less than fully conscious, in part an outcome of interactional negotiation and contestation, in part an outcome of others’ perceptions and representations, and in part an effect of larger ideological processes and material structures that may become relevant to interaction. It is therefore constantly shifting both as interaction unfolds and across discourse contexts.” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 606).

According to Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 606) the concept of agency is connected to this principle. They point out that from the interactional perspective it is problematic to view agency as a state of conscious production of identity regardless of structural restrictions in a given situation. Consequently, identity should not be seen as produced by agency but instead the use of language is actually a way of doing agency (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 606). Without going into further detail on agency, the idea of identity construction being inherently partial is acknowledged in the present study. Put otherwise, the data of this study captures only one interactive event, which entails that the emerging leader identity is the product of the identity construction processes specific of that event.

3.3. Previous studies

The construction of leader identity from the discursive perspective is not a novel subject for research but the previous studies have focused mainly on workplace interaction. For example, Holmes et al. (2011: 3) have studied leadership communication in “ethnicized” workplaces. In more detail, they consider the effect of cultural elements in the discursive construction of leadership identity. In addition, Holmes (2006) has studied extensively the role of gender in relation to workplace communication. She deals with various aspects related to the topic, such as how masculinity has traditionally been affiliated with leadership, the way in which the use of humor works for gendered discourse, gendered conflict management strategies as well as the construction of gendered workplace identities through narratives. However, in the

following I will present in more detail two other previous studies conducted on discursive leader identity construction aiming to demonstrate that the examination of language use is a fruitful method for studying how leader identities are constructed. The studies that will be discussed below focus on leader – follower interaction at workplace and it is relevant to notice here that it is a different setting from that of my data. However, the researchers have adopted the discursive perspective on identity construction and consequently have made observations that seem to cohere with discursive identity construction theories. Thus, the studies provide a relevant background for understanding the results of the present study.

Schnurr and Zayts (2011) take a social constructionist point of view on leader identity construction in their case study, which focuses on a person, Cheryl, who has been promoted to be a leader of a team in which she used to work as an ordinary member. Similar to the present study, Schnurr and Zayts (2011) utilized the framework provided by Bucholtz and Hall (2005) as their theoretical background for describing the identity construction processes that emerge in their data. Their primary data consisted of video and audio recordings of administrative meetings and interviews, observation and consultation were conducted to complement and explain the primary data. To illustrate the co-operative identity construction Schnurr and Zayts (2011) analyzed five extracts from different meetings. The extracts show that leader identity co-construction does not always consist of harmonious negotiation but instead “sometimes antagonistic discursive practices are integral parts of the complexities of identity construction” (Schnurr and Zayts, 2011: 45).

Schnurr and Zayts (2011: 40) were especially interested in the interlocutors’ role in the identity construction process. As also Reid and Ng (2012: 3) point out, the relationship between leaders and their followers is co-dependent as one cannot exist without the other and language is the device that helps to separate these groups from one another. Indeed, a leader identity is always more or less defined by the interaction between the leader and the leader’s interlocutors, and this is what Schnurr and Zayts (2011) aim at showing with their data. Based on their analysis, Schnurr and Zayts (2011: 56-57) conclude that both the leader Cheryl and her subordinates conjointly construct the leader identity. They also claim that the actions that the interlocutors take, such as “supporting and reinforcing, as well as challenging and subverting discourse practices” are substantive in the processes of building a leader identity

(Schnurr and Zayts, 2011: 41). In more detail, Schnurr and Zayts (2011: 48) discuss for example a meeting where Cheryl made use of discursive practices that are associated with leadership, such as performing authoritatively in the form of opening and closing meetings, assigning tasks and appointing responsibilities. They point out that Cheryl was, however, challenged by her team members during the meeting, which could have been interpreted as collaboration, were the observations based on only video recording. Nevertheless, Schnurr and Zayts (2011: 48) report that the secondary data, i.e. the interviews with the participants, revealed that the cases of challenging the leader were meant to challenge the leader rather than to co-operate with her. Additionally, Schnurr and Zayts (2011: 55-56) detected a case of an explicit indexing to an identity category. They explain that when talking with one of Cheryl's subordinates, the most senior manager referred to Cheryl's leader identity by using the category "*your manager*". They concluded that the indexing resulted in positioning Cheryl as the subordinate's superior yet still inferior to the senior manager. In sum, in Schnurr and Zayts' (2011) research the meeting participants not only overtly labeled the leader as belonging to the leader category but also questioned her leadership by not supporting her decisions and by acting as if they had also the authority and power of a leader and this way challenging the actual team leader's identity.

Svennevig (2011) studies the identity construction of managers in a meeting setting. He adopts a conversation analytic standpoint to analyze three different cases where a senior manager is having a meeting with middle managers. The cases Svennevig (2011: 17) introduces deal with reporting sequences and, specifically, the responses the Managing Director (the senior director) gives to the reports presented by the middle managers. Based on his findings Svennevig (2011: 17) claims that there is a relationship between actions, style of communicating and identity. He aims at illustrating how the sequential actions and communication styles contribute to the leader identity construction (Svennevig, 2011: 21).

In the spirit of the discursive approach towards identity construction, Svennevig (2011: 18-19) argues that due to identity being a situated and relational construct in its nature the examination of the social relations that the senior managers create with the middle managers in the meetings is relevant. Svennevig (2011: 19) explains that there are three dimensions, namely the epistemic, the normative and the emotional dimension, that play a part in the

formation of social relations between speakers. First, the epistemic dimension is about how knowledge is expressed in interaction and how mutual knowledge is connected to establishing relations. He explains that if speakers share knowledge of encyclopedic information, a relation of common expertise is created whereas if the shared knowledge is about personal backgrounds it creates a relation of familiarity. Consequently, he states that expertise may be used as a device to associate oneself with a specific group and, similarly, shared personal knowledge may be used to create “in-group familiarity”. Second, Svennevig (2011: 19) maintains that the normative dimension includes the rights and responsibilities that people have to each other. He continues that these may be institutionally defined as for instance job descriptions but it is possible that they stretch beyond the institutional definitions of rights and responsibilities. In addition, he states that social relations between people are, along the normative dimension, created by patterns of interaction, of which the asymmetry/symmetry of the distribution of rights and responsibilities is one manifestation. He goes on to explain that a dominant relation is established when the distribution is systemically asymmetrical and, in contrast, when the distribution is symmetrical a relation of solidarity is created. Third, the emotional dimension is manifested “in displays of positive or negative affect towards an interlocutor” (Svennevig, 2011: 19). In fact, the dimensions of social relations discussed by Svennevig (2011: 19) coincide with Bucholtz and Hall’s (2005: 594) claim that by displaying different stances towards the ongoing interaction (among other means) speakers construct different kinds of identities and identity relations.

As mentioned above, Svennevig (2011: 20) sets “an inductive orientation, an emic perspective and a sequential approach” as his guiding principles for the analysis. In relation to his research following these principles means that the data is the starting point (inductiveness), the contextual features (or in other words, the social groups and situational roles of a participant) of the analysis are those of the participants (emic) and, in terms of analysis, the focus is on “the *participants*’ understanding of each other’s utterances as displayed in their reactions and responses” (sequentiality) (ibid). Svennevig (2011: 33) found out that the feedback responses given by the Managing Directors seem to contain some kind of evaluation of the middle managers’ reports. Also features such as “*clarification, diagnosis and directions for future action*” [italics in original] appear in the feedback responses (Svennevig, 2011: 33). In the conversation passages making a diagnosis of the reported situation, evaluating the efforts made by the subordinates and giving directions for future actions appeared to be

central in the leaders' feedback reports and, therefore, central to constructing a leader identity (Svennevig, 2011: 34). Based on this Svennevig (ibid) claims that the position as the senior manager is maintained and verified by accomplishing such actions that are associated with institutional authority and, consequently, the variable manners for performing institutional authority constitute different leadership styles (Svennevig, 2011: 35). The extracts demonstrate individual differences in how different leadership styles constitute different kinds of identities.

Svennevig (2011: 36) discusses the variations in leadership styles and how they are enacted relative to the three relation dimensions mentioned above, which help in understanding the connection between the ways of speaking and interacting and establishing leader identities. According to Svennevig (2011: 35), the extracts show that leaders can for example claim the position as the main epistemic authority by creating an asymmetry of knowledge in their favor. He notes that managers can do this by forming a diagnosis of a reported situation and giving orders for action based on the diagnosis. By contrast, a collaborative leadership style can be achieved by not claiming the solitary right to knowledge but, instead, signaling that the subordinates are equal to the manager in their right to access knowledge and competent in handling it (Svennevig, 2011: 36).

The aforementioned research illustrates how identity construction of leaders can be studied from the discursive point of view. The studies show, for example, that authoritative language use is a characteristic associated with the identity category of leaders/managers (Schnurr and Zayts, 2011; Svennevig, 2011). In addition, the previous studies show that the other discursive practices that are associated with leaders include the overt mention of an identity category, which was used to simultaneously construct and de-construct Cheryl's leader identity (Schnurr and Zayts, 2011: 56). Especially relevant seemed to be the observation that the interlocutors' role is not to be neglected as a factor in identity construction. In Schnurr and Zayts' (2011) case study the leader's subordinates did discursively challenge the leader's authoritative position. In addition, as Svennevig (2011) demonstrates in his study, the language use of a senior manager contributes to the establishment of a leadership style, which in its turn can be seen as a facet of the senior manager's professional leader identity.

However, context is one central difference between the previous studies discussed above and the present study. The data of the aforementioned studies was collected from work places. The conversations took place amongst a newly promoted team leader and her subordinates in Schnurr and Zayts's (2011) research and in Svennevig's (2011) study between a superior and a subordinate. In contrast, the data of the present study consists of a broadcast interview that is retrieved from the internet. Therefore, the context for the interaction between an interviewee (a CEO) and an interviewer is the studio where the interviews are recorded.

4. BROADCAST INTERVIEWS

As the data of the present study consists of a broadcast talk show interview I shall next consider broadcast interview as a form of interaction and discuss its interactional construction, which power-relations are involved and to what effect. Understanding the constructions of a broadcast interview is central in order to understand better the workings of the interview data of this research. The sequentiality of interaction is brought to the forefront in broadcast interview where the speakers are expected to follow restrictions set by the institutional nature of the context. In the data of my study the processes related to identity construction, such as discursively assigning or adopting an identity position or making presuppositions regarding them, appear in the question – answer sequences. For this reason, an understanding of interview structure supports the aims of this study.

4.1. Broadcast interview as institutional discourse

Interaction in a public forum – such as a broadcast interview – is always institutional interaction and the involvement of an audience differentiates it from everyday talk (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 13-14). Three central elements of institutional talk are the institutional roles to which the discourse participants discursively orient, the asymmetry in terms of rights, knowledge and routine and, an objective or agenda set by at least one of the participants (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 14-16). First, in institutional discourse there is always a participant who is in the possession of a role or mission provided by the institution s/he represents and, consequently, this representative is also in the possession of a set of certain

conventions which s/he is obliged to take into account as the discussions takes place (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 14). For example, the host of a broadcast interview is a representative of the organization offering the show, for example the broadcasting company. Because one of the main goals of a broadcast interview is to provide information to the third party - the audience - a relevant method to reach that goal during an interview is questioning. Consequently, the presence of a third party is also one key feature, which makes institutional talk different from everyday discourse. The discourse is constructed depending on the third party, which may be for example a television audience or a set of rules prepared by an official institution (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 14). In the framework of broadcast interviews, the third party can be referred to as the “overhearing audience” which may not actually be present in the physical set but is regardless considered as the primary audience (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 120). The achievement of the institutional tasks of providing information to the audience and “constructing the interview as an interactive event” requires that both the interviewer and interviewee adjust to these situation-specific membership categories and participate in the activities of questioning and answering (Koskela, 2011: 20). Similar to the concept of situated identities introduced by Zimmerman (2008: 90-95), the situation-specific membership categories are defined by the situation or the scene in which an interactive event takes place.

A second feature of institutional talk is asymmetry, which is rooted in the institutional roles present in institutional talk. There are three aspects identified as contributing to the emergence of asymmetry (Drew and Heritage, 1992, as cited in Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 15). Firstly, the participant in the role of the representative of the institution possesses certain rights, such as the right to ask questions. Therefore, the interviewer in the role of the representative of the host institution has a greater initiative right in discussion than the interviewee (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 15). Secondly, the expertise of the interviewer compared to the expertise of the interviewee may differ greatly (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 15). The interviewer as the institutional representative is an expert regarding the knowledge of the institution whereas the interviewee in the role of a guest is rather an expert of his own field of occupation and life experiences (Drew and Heritage, 1992, as cited in Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 15). By asking a question the interviewer displays a lack of knowledge and at the same time acknowledges the interviewee as having more information on the topic (Koskela, 2011: 19). Consequently, the interviewer may have more power in terms of being able to direct the

interview by questioning but simultaneously he/she consents to the possible epistemic superiority of the interviewee. Thirdly, institutional discourse such as a broadcast interview is most likely a routine task for the interviewer as the representative of the institution in question whereas for the interviewee it might be a first of its kind (Drew and Heritage, 1992, as cited in Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 15). There are, however, also people such as celebrities or politicians, who by their profession are probably as accustomed to being interviewed as interviewers are to interviewing (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 15).

Finally, in institutional talk an objective or an agenda set by at least one of the participants is always present, explicitly or implicitly (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula 2000: 16). In television interviews the objective is usually implicit and twofold depending on whether the perspective is that of the producers' or the guest's (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 16). For example, in a celebrity interview the interviewer may want to call attention to topics related to the interviewee's personal life whereas despite the concept of the show the interviewee would like to discuss his/her professional achievements. However, in terms of the unfolding of the interview it is relevant that the objective is realized in a manner appropriate to the institution (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 16). Another relevant factor is that the participants orient to the institutional setting, regardless of what the interviewer's and the interviewee's objectives are (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 16). The interviewee may, however, either sustain the agenda set by the interviewer or resist it (Koskela, 2011: 21).

The data of this study demonstrates the aforementioned aspects of institutional discourse. The interviewer Charlie Rose and the interviewee Tim Cook adjust their behavior to match their institutional roles as interview participants. Adhering to the institutional roles leads to an asymmetry in rights, knowledge and routine. In terms of asymmetrical discourse rights, Rose possesses the role of the representative of the broadcast organization and in that role he has the right to ask questions and, therefore, he can control the course of the discussion. Tim Cook as the guest conforms to the interviewee role by refraining from asking question and obeying the responsibility of answering. Even though the right to ask questions provides Rose with control over the course of the interview, asking questions can also be considered to indicate that he has less knowledge of the topics that are discussed about. As a result, there is an asymmetry in the epistemic positions of Cook and Rose. More precisely, Cook can be

regarded as having a more powerful epistemic position in terms of the epistemic domain of being the leader of a prosperous consumer electronics company. In other words, Cook's knowledge of being a leader grants him the access to that specific epistemic domain whereas for Rose the access is restricted due to his lack of experience within that specific field. In addition, both of the interview participants are experienced public figures and therefore are likely to have good knowledge of the routine of a broadcast interview. All of these aspects of institutional discourse play a part in the unfolding of the interview and contribute to Cook's identity construction.

4.2. Interview genre

Not all broadcast interviews are similar in the way they are organized even though they all typically follow the principles of institutional talk. In fact, it is the societal position of the interviewee that conventionally determines the interview genre (Koskela, 2011: 26) and, therefore, the interview genre may be for example a celebrity interview, a political interview or a news interview. In other words, the unfolding of an interview is contingent on the interview genre and for this reason it is relevant to take into account the genre of the interview data examined in this study. Analyzing the interview genre will help in understanding the interview structure and, consequently, in apprehending how Tim Cook as an interviewee is positioned and how his identity is constructed by himself as well as for him by the interviewer Charlie Rose.

In order to determine the genre of the interview data studied in this research one should first consider the social status of the interviewee. Tim Cook's public persona is, in fact, a mixture of different social roles. Firstly, Cook is the chief executive officer of Apple. Secondly, due to his professional status as the head of a technology company, that is both financially very successful and an alluring brand Cook is a public figure that has gained a celebrity-kind of social status. As will be demonstrated in section 6.1., being the successor of the late Steve Jobs has without a doubt also contributed to the public's interest in Cook's endeavors as the CEO of Apple. For these reasons, in this study the interview genre of the data is considered to be a celebrity interview.

4.3. Interview conduct: question – answer sequences

Next I will deal with the question and answer sequences. The broadcast journalists' professional tasks of providing information for the audience and simultaneously pursuing to maintain an impartial stance towards the interviewee are central factors in the question-answer sequence formation of the news broadcast interviews (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 119). During a news interview the orientation towards the overhearing audience is achieved for example by both the interviewer and the interviewee avoiding any vocal actions of acknowledgement (such as 'oh', "mm hmm" and "really") which in contrast are very common in everyday conversation (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 120). In other words, by refraining from vocally acknowledging the interviewee's talk the interviewer is both avoiding "an interactional alignment as the primary recipient of the interviewee's talk" and also ensuring that the interviewer him-/herself follows the impartialness guideline (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 124). In fact, as the data of this study consists of a celebrity interview the interview conduct followed by the interviewer is slightly different from that of the news interviews. As the celebrity interview genre is less strictly tied to a question – answer structure and is more co-operative in general, the interviewer can chip in in the interviewee's talk by making brief acknowledgements as well as even occasionally interrupt the interviewee to comment or to make a complementing note. However, the interview conduct is for the most part very similar to the news interview conduct described by Clayman and Heritage (2002).

In linguistic terms the question-answer sequence is an adjacency pair, which means, according to Downes (1998: 281), "a set of two adjacently positioned utterances, by different speakers, closely related to each other in a specific way". Furthermore, Downes (1998: 281) notes that central in adjacency pairs is that the type of the first turn sets expectations of relevance on the next turn and, for this reason, the second turn will be interpreted "as an act of the kind required by the first part". In terms of the question-answer adjacency pair, Koskela (2011: 21) explains that a question as a first part makes relevant an answer as a second part of the adjacency pair. The relevant type of an answer then is determined by the formulation of the question (Koskela, 2011: 21). The question may be for example a polar question, which means that a relevant answer includes either a yes or a no. Furthermore, the design of the question is an indicator of what type of an answer is preferred, as some answer types are more

preferred than others are (Koskela, 2011: 21). For example, in question-answer sequences agreement with the interviewer's claim is preferred over disagreement (Koskela, 2011: 21).

An outline of different possible question types will be provided in section 4.3.1. Interviewee answers will be discussed in section 4.3.2. In these chapters especially Clayman and Heritage's (2002) research on the structure of news interviews will be used as a central reference and background for understanding the data of this study. Despite the fact that the structure of news interviews follows probably more strictly the question-answer sequence than the celebrity interview, which is the data of this study, the analysis of the interviewer questions and interviewee answers conducted by Clayman and Heritage (2002) sheds light on the interview structure of a celebrity interview as well. Furthermore, the effect of the celebrity interview genre on the question and answer turns will be considered in 4.3.3..

4.3.1. Interviewer questions

Clayman and Heritage (2002: 99-100) state that in order to elicit information from the interviewee the interviewer can resort to actions that are achieved by producing what in linguistics are called an interrogative utterance and a declarative utterance. They explain that, on one hand, grammatically an interrogative utterance accomplishes the action of a question, whereas a declarative utterance functions as a statement. On the other hand, a declarative utterance can be used in the function of a question and an interrogative utterance can be used as an assertion, agreement or an accusation (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 99-100). In their research on news interviews Clayman and Heritage (2002: 100-101) found several different question types including the main interrogatives: "wh" questions, "Yes/No" questions, and polar alternatives. In addition, questions can also be formed with a declarative plus a tag question or a declarative plus a question intonated word as a tag (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 100-101). Instead of an interrogatively formulated question, the interviewer may use a declarative such as a "B-event" which is a term for an event of which the interviewee has "unique or privileged knowledge" (Labov and Fansel, 1977 as cited in Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 102). These B-events may be used to refer to the interviewee's field of expertise or to his/her personal frame of mind such as feelings, attitudes or intentions (Clayman and

Heritage, 2002: 102). Despite their declarative form, they are used for example to seek confirmation, clarify future actions or make a summary of the core of the interviewee's previous turn (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 102-103). Furthermore, a declarative can function as a question if it is uttered with a rising intonation and this type of a question is called a declarative question (Quirk et al, 1972, as cited in Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 104).

In contrast to the aforementioned types of questions that are quite simple in their structure, prefaced questions are more complex. A prefaced question consists of additional statements that precede the actual question (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 104). As pointed out above, a central goal of a broadcast interview is to provide information to the audience (Koskela, 2011: 19-20; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 119-120) and the use of prefaced questions serves this purpose well as they provide the audience with additional or background information on the topic of the question. In addition, the prefaced questions can be used to introduce new topics for discussion (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 201) and therefore they can be used to manage the flow and course of discussion. In terms of this study, however, the most relevant function of the prefaces is that they can assign various identity positions to the interviewee. In the data of this study the interviewer uses prefaced questions frequently and in many cases identity positions are assigned to Cook in this manner as will be shown in the analysis.

The professional journalists' pursuit of adhering to the professional standards of interviewer conduct has a great influence in how the interviewer questions are formed. Likely the most important element is objectivity towards the interviewee. However, in relation to maintaining the impartial stance Clayman and Heritage (2002: 119-120) point out that it is impossible to maintain an absolutely neutral stance and, therefore, they rather call the interviewer stance "neutralistic". The organization of the dialogue between the interviewer and the interviewee into question – answer sequences is a central factor that contributes to the pursuit of avoiding biasedness. By restricting to asking questions the interviewer avoids expressing agreement or disagreement with the interviewee or from articulating personal opinions openly (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 126). Nevertheless, questions or statements of the interviewer may still often contain either intentional or unintentional assumptions that reflect the interviewer's attitude towards the interviewee (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 119-120). This transpires also in the data of this study as the analyses of the interviewer's questions demonstrate.

Clayman and Heritage (2002: 152) declare that in terms of maintaining the neutralistic stance while asking questions the interviewer may resort to including a third party into the question, which conveys a shift in the interviewer's footing. More precisely, an interviewer can discursively indicate that a point of view regarding the topic of the question voiced by him/her is actually expressed by someone other than the interviewer (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 152-153). The third party can be a specific person, a certain group or category of people or even a "generic and anonymous collectivity such as "people"" (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 152-153). Moreover, regardless of the fact that the statements attributed to the third party are not questions in the grammatical sense they do function as such (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 154). In addition to the interviewer's aspiration to maintain neutralism by the third party attributed statements, also the interviewee tends to contribute to neutralism by dealing with the statements without contesting the interviewer's objectivity (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 162).

Furthermore, despite the fact that the broadcasting journalists value maintaining impartialness during an interview the interviewer may use the question for purposes such as agenda setting (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 196). Because of the pursuit of maintaining a neutralistic stance during an interview the interviewer's own agenda must be camouflaged as questions in order to avoid being accused of departing from the institutional role of an interviewer (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 188). For this reason, question design plays a central role (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 189). The interviewers' question design has at least three dimensions, which include setting an agenda, asserting propositions and/or claiming presuppositions, and preferring one response to another (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 192-209). To accentuate the effect of the question design the interviewer can make use of prefaced questions (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 192).

According to Clayman and Heritage (2002: 196-198), setting an agenda for the interviewee can be achieved by involving three features in the design of the question. First, the question in itself can be formulated so that it restricts the range of relevant response to a specific topical domain. Should the interviewee fail to provide an answer relevant to the set agenda, the interviewer has the right to ask the question again or try other resources to receive an answer (Heritage, 1984, as cited in Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 196). Second, questions also

determine actions that the interviewee should accomplish whilst responding within the relevant topical domain. Lastly, the formulation of questions that set an agenda determines also the expected scope of the answer, meaning how narrow or broad the answer should be. From the point of view of the agenda setting dimension of questioning, for example a yes/no question sets the interviewee an agenda of responding within the relevant topical sphere while completing also the adequate action of providing a yes or no answer for the question. A yes/no question typically defines the scope of the answer rather narrowly (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 196-198). Furthermore, Clayman and Heritage (2002: 201) remark that in addition to using prefaced questions in order to provide background information to the audience, the interviewer can use them to modify the agenda. They state that the additional questions preceding the actual question can function to restrict the range of available answers or to make the agenda more complex or problematic to the interviewee. With regard to the different question types Clayman and Heritage (2002: 200) point out that the wh-questions do not confine the interviewee to an agenda as strictly as the yes/no questions do. As will be demonstrated for example in section 6.1. the interviewer Charlie Rose prefers questions that provide Tim Cook with a rather broad agenda, which is likely due to the celebrity genre of the interview where the interviewer typically puts effort in maintaining a co-operative and friendly atmosphere. In fact, regardless of the fact that Cook occasionally evades the agenda set by the question he is not sanctioned with a repeated question but, instead, Rose lets Cook go on with his response and moves on after Cook's turn ends.

Asserting propositions and/or claiming presuppositions is another dimension of question design available for the interviewer. Clayman and Heritage (2002: 203) explain that an interviewer may incorporate presuppositions in both simple and prefaced questions. They also remark that the degree of explicitness of the presupposition may differ. In terms of prefaced questions, however, they point out that the presuppositions are typically explicit as they appear within the prefatory statements on which the final question is grounded. Moreover, the question in itself may incorporate embedded presuppositions (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 203). Concerning the embedded presuppositions that the questions may contain, Clayman and Heritage (2002: 203) state that the depth of embeddedness may vary. The depth in which the presupposition is embedded can be determined by examining whether the interviewee is able to provide a response that addresses the question's presupposition while still answering according to the agenda of the question (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 204). If the interviewee

manages to cover both, the presupposition is not very deeply embedded. Conversely, a presupposition is deeply embedded if the interviewee has to depart from providing an answer that is in line with the agenda in order to resist the question's presupposition(s). (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 204).

Yet another dimension of question design arises in questions that convey a preference of one answer over other possible answer options. Clayman and Heritage (2002: 209) explain that the preference of a particular answer can be facilitated by three alternative ways of constructing the question: by an interrogative grammatical structure, by the use of prefatory statements or by the combination of these two. Negatively formulated interrogatives tend to invite a "yes" and statements with tag questions prefer an answer that confirms the statement made by the interviewer (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 209-212). When comparing the assertiveness and conduciveness of the negative interrogative structure with the statement plus tag question structure, in news interviews the interviewees handled the former as more assertive and conducive than the latter (Heritage 2002: 1440). Furthermore, even the use of certain words such as the negative polarity terms, for example 'any', communicates a preference of a certain answer (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 209-212). In addition to conveying preference through the use of interrogative structures the interviewer may also employ prefatory statements prior to the subsequent question that facilitate a preferred answer. For example, by mentioning a group of people with a specific perspective on the topic of the question the interviewer can invite a particular answer. (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 213-214).

Clayman and Heritage (2002: 188-237) have grouped the dimensions of question design described above under the title of "adversarial questioning" and indeed their data of broadcast news interviews demonstrate how the aforementioned question designs put pressure on the interviewee. However, even though the aforementioned dimensions of question design appear in the interviewer's questions also in my data, the atmosphere of the interview examined in this study is better described as co-operative and friendly rather than hostile or adversarial.

4.3.2 Interviewee answers

As discussed above, it is impossible for the interviewer to avoid incorporating at least some of the three dimensions of question design (setting agendas, making presuppositions, and indicating preference for certain kinds of answers). However, Clayman and Heritage (2002: 192) point out that the interviewer may select from the different ways of implementing the dimensions and this way influence for example which action(s) the question accomplishes or the nature of the interview. The interviewee then produces a response to the question addressed to him/her and forms the answer so that it accepts, resists or rejects the dimensions of the question.

Clayman and Heritage (2002: 243) show that the interviewee's answer turn may take different trajectories to arrive at the action of responding. They claim that a reply can be considered to be a roundabout answer when the initial part of the reply does not answer the question itself but however belongs to a wider stretch of talk that addresses the topical agenda and is therefore considered to answer the question. However, roundabout answers are not always a safe manner for replying as the interviewer may regard the interviewee as trying to evade the question by shifting its agenda (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 244). Due to the celebrity interview genre of the data analyzed in this study the roundabout answers are generally not sanctioned by the interviewer and thus the interviewee is allowed rather freely to arrive at an answer through longish trajectories.

In the data at hand the answer trajectory more commonly followed by the interviewee is a minimal answer plus elaboration (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 245). Unlike the roundabout answer, a minimal answer plus elaboration consists of a stretch of talk at the beginning of the answer turn, which provides a minimal amount of information to address the topical agenda of the question, which is then followed by clarification and/or elaboration (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 245). For example, an answer to a yes/no question can be structured so that it starts with either a confirmation or a rejection and then unfolds into a deeper elaboration on the topic of the question. See for example data sample 12 in section 6.3. for a demonstration of this kind of answer trajectory. Additionally, Clayman and Heritage (2002: 246-249)

identify different “surface features” in the design of the initial remark that the interviewee can make use of in order to mark the answer’s relevance to the question. They mention repeating a word or a longer string of talk of the question or incorporating back-referencing expressions (such as the pronoun ‘that’ and the past tense ‘was’ of the verb ‘be’) in the answer turn as ways to mark the relevance.

Instead of answering, the interviewee may also choose to resist a question. According to Clayman and Heritage (2002: 250) resisting to answer a question has two dimensions, namely the negative and the positive dimension. The negative dimension of resistance is displayed when the interviewee evades producing an adequate answer to the interviewer’s question. In contrast, when the interviewee provides an answer that goes “beyond the parameters of the question” or, instead, stays within the topical agenda but performs a task that was not invited by the question, the positive dimension is displayed (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 253-254). In other words, in the context of this study, the cases where the interviewee avoids providing a sufficient answer he displays the negative dimension of resistance. The interviewee’s departure from the question’s topical agenda into the direction of providing more information than what was asked for manifests the positive dimension of resistance. The data samples chosen for analysis in this study exhibit few cases of downright resistance.

4.3.3. Celebrity interview: co-operation and first-hand knowledge

Koskela (2011: 37) points out that celebrity interviews tend to be more co-operative than for example political interviews, which better enables the interviewer to ask the interviewee even personal questions. The co-operative and less formal celebrity interview genre allows the interviewer and the interviewee occasional departures from the question – answer sequence structure that, at least in the data of this study, results in a somewhat casual, everyday-like discussion. For example, an anticipatory completion turn (Lerner, 1996) is here considered as an indicator of rather a relaxed than a strictly formal interview structure. In short, should the previous speaker’s turn be constructed in such a way that it projects a possible completion point, the next speaker can react to it by producing an anticipatory completion before the previous speaker’s turn is actually finished (Lerner, 1996: 240-242). Additionally, the

anticipatory completion can launch a “collaborative turn sequence”, which consists of the acceptance or rejection of the anticipated completion (Lerner, 1996: 241). Data sample 15 in section 6.3.2. illustrates a case of anticipatory completion.

In celebrity interviews, the interviewer is especially focused on introducing the celebrity or to disclosing some personal aspects of the celebrity such as opinions, personal experiences or narratives and for this reason a high level of intimacy is required (Koskela, 2011: 38). In addition, Koskela (2011: 21) found that the interview genre has an effect on the formulation of questions. To be precise, she states that depending on the genre some question types are used more often than others are in order to meet the goals substantive of a particular interview genre. Furthermore, Koskela (2005: 98) reports that in the celebrity interviews the interviewer formulated the questions so that they would invoke first-hand knowledge. She also argues that the interviewers make use of these kinds of questions in order to control the interview’s level of intimacy.

Koskela (2005: 100) suggests that there are two practices that the interviewers can make use of in question turns in order to invoke first-hand knowledge. First, similar to the question type “B-event” (Labov and Fansel, 1977 as cited in Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 102), the interviewer can introduce topics that the interviewee has personally experienced or has otherwise, for example due to the interviewee’s membership of a particular category, first-hand access to. Second, first-hand knowledge can be invoked by “explicitly voicing the ‘personal’ viewpoint” (Koskela, 2005: 100). The personal viewpoint can be brought up by addressing the interviewee’s epistemic authority regarding his/her personal experiences in the past and/or addressing the interviewee’s opinions or thoughts. Koskela (2005: 105) points out that these kinds of questions are typical not only in cases where the interviewer shifts the topic but especially in cases where the interviewer wants to remain within the same subject topic but at the same time wishes to invite the interviewee’s personal point of view.

Koskela (2005: 107) recognized that the interviewee can resist the interviewer’s agenda to invoke first-hand knowledge by designing the answer in a way that does not fit the agenda. She maintains that these ways include treating the question or some aspect of it as

problematic and/or displaying general knowledge instead of first-hand knowledge. Koskela (2005: 108-109) carries on to explain that if the question contains an aspect that is for example incorrect, loaded or too personal, the interviewee can resist the question's agenda by marking a contrast in the knowledge types (for example general versus first-hand knowledge) in questions and answers. She remarks that the contrast can be marked by the choice of contrastive word choices (such as *but*) or by stating the contrast explicitly. According to Koskela (2005: 109), displaying general knowledge instead of first-hand knowledge can be done after pointing out an aspect of the question as problematic or straightforwardly without doing so first. She explicates that it can be accomplished through the interviewee's lexical choices that mobilize different kind of knowledge, such as generalized expert knowledge. Moreover, Koskela (2005: 112-113) states that the use of present tense is also a way for the interviewee to indicate a more general perspective on the topic and thus to resist the question's agenda of invoking first-hand knowledge. She clarifies that the present tense relocates the focus of talk from the personal to general knowledge. Koskela (2005: 114-115) identifies two functions of the interviewee's display of general knowledge instead of the first-hand knowledge. First, to avoid providing an answer to a question that the interviewee finds somehow problematic yet still responding to the question and taking into account the topical agenda. Second, to foreground expert knowledge and consequently to present oneself as an expert.

Presenting oneself as an expert of a particular field is an indexical process where one makes salient his/her expertise and points to it through discursive means. In relation to this study this is particularly relevant to bear in mind as the person in focus, Tim Cook, is the CEO of a very successful company and is therefore presumably an expert within his field of business. Therefore, in this study it is hypothesized that processes of indexing to Cook's identity role as a CEO will be accomplished especially through invoking his first-hand knowledge of the profession, Apple and the ICT field.

5. THE PRESENT STUDY

In this chapter I will first discuss the aim of this study and introduce the research questions. Second, I will describe the data, from where it was collected and the principles followed in

the transcription process. As the data consists of a broadcast interview I will also briefly determine the interview genre and what kind of an effect the genre has on the unfolding of the interview. Lastly, I will discuss the methods applied in the analysis.

5.1. Aims and research questions

As discussed in section three, the understanding of identity construction adopted in this research is based on the idea that identity is constructed through the speaker's discursive choices. Language use, then, is the tool of identity construction. Against this background, the present study will concentrate on examining the leader identity construction by employing the framework for analyzing identity as a socially emergent construct (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005) as well as research done on broadcast interviews (Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Koskela, 2011). The aim of this study is to investigate the interactional construction of leader identity in a broadcast interview of Tim Cook, the CEO of Apple. To meet this analytical goal, the analysis will focus on Rose and Cook's language use. More specifically, The focus of the present study is primarily on the discursively crafted identity positions assigned for Tim Cook by Charlie Rose as well as by Cook himself. In order to understand the workings of the interview, particular attention will be paid to the question and answer turns and the actions achieved by them.

The research questions are:

How do Tim Cook (interviewee) and Charlie Rose (interviewer) use language to construct, maintain and reinforce Tim Cook's leader identity in the broadcast interview?

- How do the interviewer's questions position Tim Cook?
- How does Tim Cook deal with the positions in his answer turns?
- What kinds of categories are used in reference to Tim Cook and which (if any) categories appear repeatedly and to what effect?

5.2. Data

The data that I will focus on comprises of a broadcast talk show interview where Charlie Rose, an American journalist, interviews Tim Cook, the present CEO of Apple. The show is titled according to its host as Charlie Rose and it is broadcast on PBS (Public Broadcasting Company) and Bloomberg Television (About – Charlie Rose, n.d.a). The interview was aired in two parts in 2014, the first part on 12th of September and the second part on 15th of September. Both of the interview parts are available on www.charlierose.com. Because the interview was divided into two parts and aired in separate episodes, the data consists of two interviews of which the first is 52:15 minutes and the second is 21:31 minutes long. The total duration of the interview is 1h 13 min 46 seconds.

The interview was transcribed following the conventions of conversation analysis. However, in terms of the level of detail represented by the transcription, in most cases the transcription of the interview represents mainly the turn sequences. This level of transcription detail is considered as sufficient for the purposes of this study because especially the actions of assigning an identity position and the acceptance or rejection of an identity position achieved by the interviewer question and interviewee answer turns are considered as the key elements of the data. Of course an attempt was made to reach also an accurate representation of the speech on a word level to avoid misinterpretation in the analysis. Even though transcribing was carried out by paying close attention to the audio data with the pursuit of avoiding any lapse in precision, mishearing and consequent mistakes in the transcription cannot be ruled out. Nevertheless, because the transcriptions of the interviews are available also online (at www.charlierose.com) it was possible to refer to them in order to check any unclear parts in the interview. The analysis is based on the transcribed interview data and on the presumption that the data is as accurate as possible.

In the discussion show Charlie Rose hosts people from different fields of the American society such as business leaders and engages them in one-on-one interviews (About – Charlie Rose, n.d.a). The configuration of the interviews is much the same in most of the episodes and the interview with Tim Cook is set up in a similar manner. Regarding the physical setting

of the interview, the only people visible in the picture are the interviewer (Charlie Rose) and the interviewee (Tim Cook) and the viewer gets the impression that there is no audience in the studio. The frame is quite simple; the background is black and Cook and Rose are sitting at a round table that has a few Apple products on it.



Image 1: Charlie Rose (right hand side) interviewing Tim Cook (left hand side) at the round table (screenshot from <https://charlierose.com/videos/18663>).

Based on Cook's social status as CEO of Apple and as a sort of celebrity due to his profession, the genre of the interview is determined as a celebrity interview genre with features of news interview genre as well, especially in regard to the formulation of the interviewer questions. In the data of this study, the features related to celebrity interview genre are realized especially in the questions by which Rose tries to get Tim Cook to talk about himself and reveal pieces of information. Additionally, as is typical of celebrity interviews, the interviewer style adopted by Rose can be described as co-operative and friendly yet still "neutralistic" (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 119-120), which contributes to Rose's pursuit of extracting information from Cook.

In the institutional role of the representative of the broadcasting company and as the interviewer Rose possesses the right to lead the conversation and to ask questions, which

evidently has a great effect on the structure of the interview. For the most part the structure of the interview in question consists of question – answer sequences but it is worth pointing out that there are a few cases where both Rose and Cook deviate from it. Consequently, occasionally the dialogue resembles rather an everyday conversation instead of a strict question – answer sequenced interview. This can be considered as a relevant feature of this particular interview as for Rose’s purpose of retrieving also personal information from Cook it is likely better that Cook is not restricted to purely providing an answer that is strictly related to the topical domain of the question. Instead, for Rose’s purposes it is beneficial that Cook feels free to provide even a lengthy answer that may address other topics than the original topic of the question. In fact, some of the data samples had to be condensed by omitting parts of Cook’s answer turn in order to keep the analytical focus clear.

The general themes of the interview entail Tim Cook as the present CEO of Apple and the direction, values and products of the company. The topics addressed during the interview that are especially paid attention to in order to reach the aims of this study include Tim Cook as the present CEO of Apple, the values that he follows as a CEO and as a private person and the values followed at Apple.

5.3. Analytic methods

Since the purpose of this study is to gain more insight of the discursive leader identity construction of Tim Cook, the analytical methods applied in the study are qualitative. The focus of the analysis is in interaction and in specific in the discursive choices that contribute to identity construction. The analysis of the interactionally constructed leader identity is carried out by applying key concepts, conventions and principles from three different analytic methods that complement each other and seem fit for the purposes of this study. First, the principles and conventions of Conversation Analysis are followed in the transcribing of the data as explained above. The research conducted on celebrity interviews (Koskela, 2011) and on the conventions and practices of broadcast news interviews (Clayman and Heritage, 2002) are applied to analyze the interview structure and especially the question – answer sequences of the data at hand. Second, the framework for analyzing identity in interaction introduced by

Bucholtz and Hall (2005) and especially the positionality, indexicality and relationality principles provide central points for reference. Specifically, detecting the indexical processes is central in identifying the identity positions that arise in the interaction. In terms of analyzing the identity positions, the first step is to identify them in the data. The second, and likely the more enlightening step in terms of meeting the aims set for this study is to examine how Cook deals with the identity positions. Furthermore, identity relations emerge because of the relationality of discourse and provide yet another aspect in the leader identity construction of Tim Cook. Even though the principles are introduced as separate aspects of the framework they do function simultaneously and they overlap one another. Therefore, at times some principle(s) may be dominant and more readily detectable whereas at other times the principles intertwine.

6. THE EMERGING LEADER IDENTITY

Similar to Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) perspective on identity, this study considers identity to be constructed through and emergent in interaction. In order to carry out the analysis attention will be paid to the identity positions that Rose discursively assigns for Cook. However, the ways in which Cook deals with these identity positions, i.e. whether he accepts, rejects or possibly modifies them, is of special interest and enlightening with regard to the aim of this study. Furthermore, also the identity position that Cook assigns for himself are central. In the analysis I will apply the positionality, indexicality and relationality principles introduced in Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) framework. Specifically, the analytical interest lies in both Cook and Rose's discursive choices as they contribute to the realization of the identity positions through indexical processes. In specific, the speakers' use of identity categories, stancetaking, implicatures, presuppositions, and word choices as well as the identity relations forged through these are key elements in the discursive construction of Cook's leader identity. Furthermore, the interview structure and, in specific, the question and answer turns will be analyzed with the help of the concepts of broadcast interviews discussed by Clayman and Heritage (2002). Koskela's (2005) findings regarding the celebrity interview genre's influence on the question and answer turn types will shed light on the data as well. The analysis of the question – answer sequences provide further insight on how the structures of institutional discourse influence the speakers' interactional acts and consequently, how they either enable or disable identity construction processes.

Four different yet overlapping dimensions that contribute to the discursive construction, maintenance and reinforcement of Cook's leader identity arise from the data and the analysis is divided into subsections according to them. The dimensions encompass Cook's position as the successor of Steve Jobs, which is discussed in section 6.1. Section 6.2. examines the positions of a leader by profession (section 6.2.1.) and CEO of Apple (section 6.2.2.), which are grouped under the title business leader since they are considered as two separable but complementary aspects of Cook's leadership practice. Section 6.3. focuses on Cook's identity position as Apple's representative, and it is also divided into subsections: 6.3.1. promoting and maintaining the values and image of Apple and 6.3.2. secretiveness. Section 6.4. then deals with the personal rather than the professional dimension of Cook's identity, simultaneously demonstrating that even the personal aspects of his identity seem to reflect the professional. In order to maintain the analytical concentration in each of the subsections I will focus the most attention on one aspect per data sample, even though none of the data samples demonstrates purely one identity aspect. However, for the same reason some of the samples are analyzed more than once with a different dimension of the emerging leader identity in the spotlight. Before carrying on to the actual analysis it is worth pointing out here that the emerging leader identity is naturally dependent on the topics, which seem to be mostly decided by Rose, presumably due to his institutional right to lead the conversation. However, it is possible that the topics for discussion and even specific questions have been agreed on before the actual interview.

6.1. Successor of Steve Jobs

The identity role of successor of Steve Jobs can be justly assigned to Cook as it is a fact that Cook is Apple's current CEO, adopting the position after the late Steve Jobs. Succeeding the position of a successful as well as a controversial CEO brings with it expectations from the interested parties such as investors and consumers. In the following data sample (1) Rose asks Cook if he considers himself to be able to reach the same goals as Steve Jobs did as the CEO of Apple. Rose's final question is preceded by a preface in which he assigns Cook the role of a successor and in connection with that role he brings up the expectations held by the stakeholders. The final question then revolves around whether Cook himself felt the need to prove that he was competent to lead Apple after Jobs.

Data sample 1:

1 Rose: was this a question for you
 2 among some investors among some consumers among some people who write about technology
 3 there was the question
 4 uh Steve was a visionary
 5 can Tim continue the Apple tradition of creating new products every four years or less
 6 can he reach into the future
 7 does he have that kind of make-up
 8 did that concern you
 9 did you think about that
 10 were you committed to prove that Apple had a future
 11 beyond the groundwork that Steve Jobs had laid
 12 Cook: - - he knew when he chose me
 13 uh that I wasn't like him
 14 that I'm not a carbon copy of him
 15 uh he and so he obviously thought through that deeply
 16 about uh who he wanted to lead Apple
 17 and so that I have always felt the responsibility of
 18 and I've uh wanted desperately to continue his legacy
 19 and uh the Apple I deeply love
 20 and so I I from the onset
 21 I wanted to pour every ounce that I had in myself into the company
 22 and uh but in terms of of being everything he was
 23 I've never had that objective
 24 I've never had the objective of being like him
 25 because I knew
 26 uh the only person I can be
 27 is the person I am

Rose begins his turn with a grammatically formulated question *was this a question for you* (line 1) but instead of yielding the turn to Cook, he continues to report the investors', consumers' and technology journalists' questions that were related to Cook taking over Jobs's position as the CEO (lines 2-7). As a matter of fact, the question is formulated so that it would have been impossible for Cook to provide a congruent answer without hearing the rest of Rose's turn first. In his concluding set of three grammatically formulated questions (lines 8-10) Rose then goes on to ask if Cook felt that he had to prove his competence as Apple's leader. Taking into account the prefacing part of this question where Rose brought up Jobs's credits as the CEO, the concluding question slightly challenges Cook.

The prefacing on lines 2-7 is done with the audience in mind in order to give information on the expectations and questions that were raised upon Cook's appointment as the CEO. The bringing up of the stakeholders by mentioning the investors, the consumers and the people who write about technology in the question preface indicates a shift in Rose's footing. It is the

interviewer's way of highlighting that someone other than Rose himself originally raised the questions and that he is just reporting what the stakeholders are thinking. The fact that Rose is only reporting the stakeholders' concerns is accentuated further as Rose refers to Cook by his first name *Tim* and by the third person singular *he* in his reported speech questions *can Tim continue the Apple tradition of creating new products* (line 5), *can he reach into the future* (line 6) and *does he have that kind of make-up* (line 7). This way Rose distances himself from the stakeholders' doubts and constructs a configuration where the stakeholders with their doubts are set against Cook. One reason for distancing himself this way from the confrontational questions raised by the stakeholders is that Rose is making an effort to maintain a co-operative interview atmosphere, which is typical of the celebrity interview genre. The celebrity interviewers aspire to get the interviewee to talk about personal opinions and sustaining a non-threatening interview situation by making the interviewee feel comfortable and getting the interviewee also to trust the interviewer helps to reach that objective. Another reason for presenting the questions as the stakeholders' questions is likely the fact that in the role of a professional journalist Rose is obliged to maintain an impartial stance towards the interviewee and therefore he does not want to express overtly his opinions or attitudes but rather reports on the questions raised by someone else.

In the prefacing part of his question Rose refers to Jobs by name two times (lines 4 and 11) and both of these cases convey an idea that taking over the position of the CEO of Apple after Steve Jobs is a demanding task. In the first case (line 4), Rose refers to Jobs as a visionary and in the second case (line 11) Rose identifies Jobs as the person who laid Apple's groundwork. Furthermore, Rose mentions that Apple has traditionally launched new products at more or less regular intervals (line 5). These references to Jobs provide information for the audience by identifying Jobs's merits as the CEO of Apple and simultaneously portray Jobs as a highly successful CEO. The references also set Jobs up as the example of a successful CEO that Cook is expected to follow. Moreover, as Rose reports, the stakeholders expect Cook to be able to lead Apple as successfully as Jobs did. By making these references to Jobs and to his accomplishments, Rose positions Cook as the new CEO of Apple. By the references Rose also underlines the fact that Cook indeed succeeds Steve Jobs who has been involved in the company from the beginning and who had the kind of character that enabled the success that Apple has had. In addition, the demands that result from this position and the challenges that the successor might encounter are highlighted.

The identity relation of distinction discussed by Bucholtz and Hall (2005) can be detected in the way that Rose covertly differentiates Jobs and Cook. The distinction between the two is not pointed to by an overt comparison. Instead, it is created by mentioning Jobs's positive characteristic of being a visionary (line 4) and achievements of creating new products within regular time periods (line 5) and laying the groundwork for Apple (line 11) in connection with questioning Cook's ability to perform as successfully as Jobs. The distinction is underscored also by the rhetorical questions *can Tim continue the Apple tradition of creating new products every four years or less* (line 5), *can he reach into the future* (line 6) and *does he have that kind of make-up* (line 7). The questions not only challenge Cook's ability to complete an action but they also imply that the actions of creating new products, reaching into future and having a specific kind of make-up are attributes related to Jobs and that they were key elements in Jobs's performance.

In his answer (lines 12-27), Cook talks about being selected to the position by Jobs and deals with the juxtaposition of his identity and the identity of Steve Jobs. The answer is quite lengthy and its scope extends further than the actual topic of the question, even though the question in itself also allows Cook a somewhat broad answering sphere. Cook clarifies that it was Jobs's decision to name him as the next CEO and the decision was not based on an assumption that Cook would have been similar to Jobs. These are important points made by Cook for they discursively legitimize his position as the leader of Apple and thus display the identity relation of authorization (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 603-604). Indeed, it can be argued that Cook implies to Jobs's position as the ultimate authority at Apple and his consecutive right to name him as the next CEO of Apple. This implication functions as what perhaps could be called as second-hand authorization as Cook legitimizes his position through Jobs's institutionally based authority instead of his own. Furthermore, the process of authentication (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 601) is displayed in Cook's final statements (lines 22-27) where he claims that he does not attempt to be like Jobs regardless of even the stakeholders' questions suggesting that the identity of an Apple CEO is by default a Jobs kind of identity. Cook uses reason to his advantage in authenticating his identity by stating that he knows that he cannot be anyone else than the person he is.

Cook highlights the differences between himself and Jobs by first stating that *I wasn't like him* (line 13) and then emphasizes the message by rephrasing the same idea in the statement *I'm not a carbon copy of him* (line 14). By doing this Cook accepts the successor of Steve Jobs position assigned to him but at the same time discursively distances himself from Jobs by pointing out that he has his own identity that is different from Jobs's identity. In addition, by pointing out that Jobs knew that Cook was different from him but still wanted him to lead Apple Cook rejects the question's presupposition that Jobs himself or the stakeholders would have expected Cook to be just like him. Moreover, regardless of Rose bringing the stakeholders' doubts into discussion, Cook does not comment on being responsible for proving his competence to them. In fact, Cook does not mention the investors, the consumers or the technology journalists in this answer turn at all. Cook states that he does, however, recognize the responsibility of being chosen as the next CEO by Jobs, which Cook regards as the reason to continue the work that Jobs started (lines 17-21).

When Cook is talking about his work as the CEO of Apple, he uses emotional verbs such as *want* (lines 18 and 21) and *love* (line 19). In connection with the company they suggest a personal viewpoint to the company as well as personal commitment. Furthermore, Cook expresses strong commitment and dedication to the company by stating that *I wanted to pour every ounce that I had in myself into the company* (line 21). Using such emotional expressions in connection with the company Cook discursively constructs himself as an emotionally invested CEO. Raising emotions as part of his leadership also convey a relatable image of him instead of a probably quite typical association of leaders being cold, calculative and number-oriented.

The extract below is continuation to the discussion Rose and Cook had on Cook being the successor of Steve Jobs (see data sample 1). The discussion on professional identity and confidence was initiated by Rose's turn where he asks Cook if he felt the need to show that he could live up to the expectations that people such as investors or customers have regarding Cook's performance as a CEO. The following data extract is from Cook's turn whereby he addresses this topic and makes a claim for his personal identity as the CEO. In the data sample Cook uses the first person singular *I* five times (repetition at the beginning of line 4 is considered as one case), which signals a personal point of view. Therefore, the data sample

illustrates Cook's claim for a personal identity position as the CEO of Apple. Cook reflects on his leader identity by the means of referring to the skills that he does not have and by assigning himself the identity role that he considers to be more accurate.

Data sample 2:

1 Cook: right and uh I'm not an actor
 2 I'd be terrible at Hollywood
 3 and umm and so that's what I've done
 4 I've I've tried to be the best uh Tim Cook I can be

It is relevant to analyze this data sample in the light of the identity role of the successor of Steve Jobs, which was assigned for Cook by Rose's question (see data sample 1, lines 1-11). As was discussed above, when dealing with the proposed identity role Cook justifies his position as the CEO with the fact that Jobs himself had wanted Cook to be the next CEO. During the same answer turn Cook also makes a strong claim for his personal identity. In this context, data sample 2 illustrates that Cook is still focused on addressing the question's agenda that was to offer Cook a certain identity role and to elicit a reaction from him. By stating that he is not an actor (line 1) Cook denies having the quality of being able to act as someone else – such as Steve Jobs. He even accentuates the statement by adding that he would be terrible at Hollywood (line 2), which is especially in the western cultures identified as the home of the film industry and actors. Indeed, the 'actor' category carries with it the idea of consciously acting in a way that differs from an individual's typical behavior. Furthermore, by categorizing himself as *not an actor* (line 1) and stating that he has tried to be the best version of himself suggests that Cook does not value imitation. Consequently, Cook makes a claim for a genuine identity.

The statements where Cook identifies himself as not an actor lay ground to the subsequent statements (lines 3-4) where he moves on to declaring a personal identity (line 4). Cook refers to himself in third person singular, using the proper noun Tim Cook (line 4), which suggests that Cook perceives being Tim Cook, CEO as a role separate from his other identity roles. In other words, in the context of the data of this study it seems that by referring to himself in the third person Cook refers to his identity role as a professional leader. By declaring that he is not trying to be anything else than what he is and that he is trying his best as himself Cook

discursively accepts the successor role. At the same time, he also renounces the possible presuppositions of him trying to imitate someone, such as Jobs. In sum, taking into account the identity role of being the successor of Steve Jobs, which was assigned to Cook by Rose in his question turn, Cook's statements seem to reinforce the distinctness of his identity from that of Jobs and highlight that in the leader role Cook tries his best by being himself.

The data sample (3) below illustrates another case where Rose points to Cook's position as the successor of Steve Jobs, though not as explicitly as in data sample 1, where Cook was explicitly compared to Jobs and therefore his answer seemed to be defensive of his right to the position. Yet, Cook's answer encompassed also elements that can be seen as constructing a leader identity that is clearly different from Jobs's identity. Data sample 3 illustrates a case where Rose later during the interview reiterates this topic. However, in this case his focus is slightly different for he does not straightforwardly compare Cook with Jobs. The question does indirectly allude to the prevailing questions regarding Cook's suitability to lead Apple, even though the only doubt explicitly voiced is *questions...about the future of Apple* (lines 6-7). Succeeding a distinguished leader such as Jobs would probably be a daunting task for a great number of people and, furthermore, the stakeholders had already questioned Cook as Jobs's successor. For the interviewer the possibility that the new head of Apple would have doubted his executive skills is an interesting topic.

The first part of Cook's answer as well as Rose's brief comments have been omitted from the data sample in order to maintain a clear focus on only one dimension of Cook's leader identity at this point. This data sample with the omitted parts is however analyzed also in section 6.2.1. from the perspective of being a leader by profession.

Data sample 3:

1	Rose:	did the team
2		you leading the team
3		have any question
4		that you could accomplish
5		what you did
6		knowing those questions were out there
7		about the future of Apple
8	Cook:	- - so the question I think is
9		did I have doubts

10 the answer is no
 11 and did the executive team have doubts
 12 I think you can see it in our products
 13 that we were all betting on each other in a big way

The question (lines 1-7) is grammatically a yes/no question, which limits Cook's answering options considerably. This type of question anticipates an answer that either confirms or rejects the question. The topical agenda of the question concerns the external doubts regarding the company's future and whether they had an effect on Cook's and the executive team's confidence in being able to run Apple successfully.

Rose indexes discursively Cook's position as the leader of the executive team by the reference *you leading the team* (line 2). In addition to this, by explicitly addressing Cook by the personal pronoun *you* (lines 2, 4 and 5) and using the past tense Rose invokes Cook's first-hand knowledge of his past experience of having to deal with concerns regarding the future of Apple which he was freshly appointed to lead. Thus, with his question Rose aims to solicit personal information about Cook's thoughts upon his succession of Jobs as the CEO. The question invites an account of thoughts and/or feelings that are very personal and therefore it is possibly a question that the addressee would want to avoid. At the same time, as part of the question, Rose briefly mentions that even though Apple's future was questioned Cook has since proved to be able to run Apple successfully (line 5). Consequently, Rose describes Cook as having been in a situation where he could possibly have felt uncertain as the successor of Jobs, but simultaneously positions him as an accomplished leader of Apple.

The answer Cook provides (lines 8-13) corresponds to the topical agenda of the question but it is worth noticing that Cook first rephrases the original question as he states *so the question I think is* (line 8). In addition, here *I think* marks Cook's evaluative stance towards the issue of having doubts. He divides the reformulated question into two separate questions according to whose doubts are in question since the answers he provides for himself and on behalf of the executive team are different in their level of certainty and what they are grounded on. For his own part Cook provides the most minimal possible answer *no* (line 10) to effectively deny having had any hesitation on whether he could lead Apple. By this short yet concise answer Cook makes a claim for a strong self-confidence as the CEO of Apple.

For the executive team's part Cook does not give a clear yes/no answer. Instead, by *I think* in *I think you can see it in our products that we were all betting on each other in a big way* (lines 12-13) Cook displays again an evaluative stance this time towards the issue whether the executive team doubted their ability to perform successfully. He discursively indexes the Apple products as a concrete proof of the group members relying on one another rather than doubting each other. By pointing to the Apple products as material evidence for his and the executive team's trust in one another, Cook avoids reporting the executive team members' personal thoughts of which he could not have reliable knowledge.

6.2. Business leader

Two complementary identity positions related to the role of a business leader were detected to arise from the data. These are a leader by profession and the CEO of Apple. The first-mentioned identity position emerges from the personal experience on practicing the profession of a leader. The latter is based on the idea that companies as organizations with sets of values, visions, strategies and organizational cultures have an effect on how their representatives such as leaders or employees behave and express themselves. Consequently, the nature and culture of the company is likely to affect the formation of the leader's identity as the leader of that specific company.

In this data the instances where Cook talks from his personal point of view, usually using the personal pronoun *I*, are regarded as references to his personal experiences and viewpoints from the standpoint of being a CEO in a more general sense instead of being a CEO of a particular company. Consequently, these instances contribute to the emergence of the identity position of leader by profession. In a similar manner but to a different outcome, the cases where Cook uses the personal pronoun *we* are taken to refer to the corporate body of Apple which is embodied by all the employees of Apple, including Cook in the role of the CEO, thus resulting in the emergence of the CEO of Apple identity position.

6.2.1. Leader by profession

The next example is a demonstration of a case where by turning the conversation into another direction Cook avoids answering Rose's direct question on whether he has a trusted person in the same vein as he presumably was to Jobs. The interaction here also illustrates how Cook discursively constructs his professional identity as a CEO by referring to a value that he considers important.

Data sample 4:

1 Rose: you have a picture in your office of Martin Luther King
 2 and a picture of Robert F Kennedy
 3 Robert F Kennedy after his brother's assassination
 4 someone said umm the difficulty for him well
 5 he'll have no RFK as he was to his brother Jack
 6 so I might ask the question
 7 do you have a Tim
 8 as you were Tim to Steve
 9 Cook: I think each person
 10 if you're a CEO
 11 the most important thing is
 12 to ha- to me
 13 is to pick people around
 14 that aren't like you
 15 that complement you
 16 because you want to build a puzzle
 17 you don't wanna stack chicklets up
 18 and have everyone be the same
 19 and so I believe in diversity with a capital d
 20 and that's diversity in thought
 21 and uh diversity in any way that you wanna measure it

Rose's question addresses Cook's professional relationships. The actual question (lines 7-8) is grammatically a yes/no question that requires a yes or no answer and it is preceded by a preface (lines 1-6). In the preface (lines 1-6) Rose parallels the relationship between Robert F. Kennedy and his brother, the former president of the USA, John F. Kennedy with the relationship between Cook and Jobs. In more detail, by bringing up the category of *brother* (lines 3 and 5), which belongs to the category collection of 'family', in conjunction with RFK and JFK, Rose draws a parallel between family like close relationships and professional relationships. Rose mentions that according to an unknown source, after John F. Kennedy's assassination Robert F. Kennedy did not have a trusted person in a similar way as he had been to his brother. Furthermore, Rose points out that, according to the same source, not having

such a close relationship was possibly a difficulty for RFK (lines 3-5). Therefore, in both cases, one party (JFK/Jobs) of the relationship is deceased, leaving supposedly the other (RFK/Cook) without a trusted person. Against this background, Rose continues to ask Cook *do you have a Tim as you were Tim to Steve* (lines 7-8). The indefinite article *a* before Cook's first name makes it a general noun instead of a proper noun. Used along with the reference to the JFK - RFK kind of close relationship, the noun *a Tim* points to a role of a trusted person. By the question's latter part, *as you were Tim to Steve*, Rose discursively refers to a presupposition that there indeed was a close confidential professional relationship between Tim Cook and Steve Jobs and thus indexically positions Cook as having had a close relationship with Jobs. Furthermore, even though Rose does not explicitly suggest that not having a trusted person would be a hindrance for Cook, Rose can be seen to imply it by his reference to Robert F. Kennedy's difficulty of not having a trusted person on his side (lines 4-5).

On one hand, in his answer Cook turns the conversation away from the question whether he has *a Tim*, and by doing so, he evades addressing the question's topical content. Furthermore, Cook does not directly address Rose's presupposition of Cook having been Jobs's trusted person. On the other hand, Cook's answer turn could be regarded as a roundabout answer (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 243), that contributes to the question's topic in a wider sense. Cook talks about the importance of having people around that *complement you* (lines 13-15) and thus answers the question in a general sense, instead of directly commenting on whether he has one particular trusted person.

Cook's answer deals with his definition of the category 'CEO'. Cook starts his answer by displaying first-hand knowledge of being a CEO by stating that *I think each person if you're a CEO the most important thing is --* (lines 9-11). By *I think* he marks a personal viewpoint on the issue and then moves on to talking about what he considers as the most important thing in being a CEO. The personal viewpoint is further emphasized by a self-repair *the most important thing is to ha- to me is to pick people around - -* (line 12). In other words, the answer adopts a personal point of view, as the question requires, but instead of answering to a very specific question *do you have a Tim* (line 7) the answer remains on a more general level. Especially in the latter part of his answer Cook names diversity as the most important value

for him personally to follow as a CEO. Cook makes use of the rhetorical device of repetition and figures of speech in order to clarify his point regarding diversity and its importance to him in professional sense. He explains that as a CEO he prefers having a diversified group of people around him. To illustrate this idea he uses the metaphor of building a puzzle instead of stacking up chicklets (lines 16-17). Cook goes on to define that to him diversity is essentially *diversity in thought* and, maybe a bit vaguely, *diversity with a capital d* and *diversity in any way you wanna measure it* (lines 17-19). The word diversity is repeated three times and along each case, Cook provides a specifying definition for what the concept represents for him. As a result, for Cook diversity seems to be an all-encompassing way of thinking and carrying out leadership.

Similar to Cook's way of resisting the question's agenda in data sample 4, data sample 5 below illustrates how Cook turn-initially moves beyond the topical sphere of the question by talking about a skill that he finds helpful in being a good CEO. As a side note, Cook does in fact provide a direct answer to Rose's question at the end of this answer turn. This part of Cook's answer and how it contributes to the construction of Cook's identity are discussed in section 6.1. (data sample 3). In fact, data sample 5 is extracted from the same point in the interview as data sample 3. However, since in this section the analytical focus is on Cook's professional identity as a representative of the leader category, data sample 5 includes the beginning of Cook's answer along with a few comments by Rose that were omitted from data sample 3.

Data sample 5:

1 Rose: did the team
 2 you leading the team
 3 have any question
 4 that you could accomplish
 5 what you did
 6 knowing those questions were out there
 7 about the future of Apple
 8 Cook: I think for me
 9 I can't talk about what everybody else thinks
 10 but for me one great skill I have is blocking noise
 11 and so I typically read and listen to things
 12 that are deep and challenging uh and intellectual in nature
 13 not the just the noise
 14 I think if you get caught up in the noise as a CEO
 15 you're gonna be a terrible CEO
 16 because there's so much noise out there in the world

17 that everybody is on the sidelines
 18 saying what you should do shouldn't do
 19 uh it's sad
 20 it's sort of like the old uh Roosevelt uh quote
 21 in the arena
 22 Rose: right Teddy Roosevelt
 23 Cook: yes
 24 Rose: credit belongs to the man in the arena
 25 who gets dirty
 26 and all of those things
 27 Cook: yes well I'm the dirty one
 28 and you have to block the noise

As was discussed in connection with data sample 3, Rose's question turn (lines 1-7) discursively indexes Cook's position as the leader of Apple's executive team and consequently positions Cook as the leader of Apple. The question's topic then broaches the concerns related to the future of Apple and especially whether Cook or the executive team were affected by those concerns. Furthermore, the question raises Cook's first-hand knowledge of his experience of the situation of that time. Specifically, by the question Rose constructs a setting where Cook and the executive team were put against the stakeholders and their thoughts of uncertainty regarding Apple's future.

Cook's answer turn (lines 8-21) exhibits how Cook broadens the question's original topical domain by incorporating *noise* as a more general topic. Thus, he also avoids answering directly the actual question. The concept of *noise* fits in the question's broadened topical sphere for Cook seems to use it as a cover term for external criticism, rumors, et cetera. According to this line of thought, the *questions* referred to by Rose can be categorized as *noise*. In this connection it is relevant to notice that even though in the question Rose requested also for second-hand information of the team's possible doubts, the answer covers only Cook's personal opinions. He marks his personal perspective on the issue turn-initially clearly by *I think* and *for me* (line 8). By *I can't talk about what everybody else thinks* (line 9) Cook voices also that he does not have the right to talk about the executive team members' thoughts. This statement justifies why Cook does not comment for the team's part.

Cook claims that *for me one great skill I have is blocking noise* (line 10) and thereby discursively positions himself as a person not concerned with the noise. He goes on to claim that instead of focusing his attention to the noise he rather concentrates on *things that are*

deep and challenging uh and intellectual in nature (lines 11-13). These statements regarding his intellectual preference over the noise contain an indirect definition of noise as being the opposite of the type of material he typically prefers. By disregarding the noise Cook separates himself from what he considers as shallow, simple and unintellectual, that is, the noise. Furthermore, similar to data sample 4, the lines 14-15 in data sample 5 display how Cook again defines the category ‘CEO’ from his personal point of view. He regards noise as negative for a CEO by explicitly stating that getting *caught up in the noise* will result in being a *terrible CEO* (lines 14-15). In his response Cook also refers to a passage from one of president Roosevelt’s speeches¹. In the spirit of the passage, Cook categorizes himself as *the dirty one* (line 27), which is a reference to the man in the arena who gets dirty because of facing failures and victories. He continues *and you have to block the noise* (line 28). These utterances suggest that Cook considers being a CEO to involve constant judgement and evaluation coming from outside of the company. For that reason, ignoring the noise is important for him as a CEO. In short, Cook discursively refers to noise as a negative aspect of being a CEO by displaying a negative stance towards the noise. Furthermore, by stating that he prefers sources that are more intellectual creates a positive image of Cook as a sophisticated and intellectual person, which also positively contributes to the construction of his CEO identity.

Rose’s turn (lines 1-13) in the following extract results in a discussion regarding the factors that influenced Cook’s decision to work at Apple. Some parts of the discussion that take place in between the question and answer turns illustrated here have been omitted from the data sample. In addition to Rose’s turn the sample’s most relevant part in relation to the topic of this chapter appear nearer to the end in Cook’s answer turn (lines 14-22). In brief, the omitted parts of the discussion revolve around Cook’s first meeting with Jobs, which was set up to recruit Cook to Apple. Cook agreed to meet Jobs even though he was not initially thinking of leaving his previous work at Compaq. In the meeting Jobs explained to Cook his business strategy that was different from the strategies of most of the other businesses in the technology field.

¹ The passage is called The Man in the Arena and it is from a speech called Citizenship in a Republic given by Theodore Roosevelt in 1910.

Data sample 6:

1 Rose: I mentioned that
 2 at the beginning of the interview
 3 the fact that
 4 when you made the decision in 1998 about Apple
 5 you had some reservations
 6 but at the same time
 7 during your interview with Steve
 8 you said something like this
 9 I was prepared within five minutes
 10 to throw caution to the wind
 11 what did he say
 12 that made you believe
 13 this company is the place for Tim Cook
 14 Cook: - - what he was doing
 15 was going uhh hundred percent into consumer
 16 when everybody else in the industry had decided
 17 you couldn't make any money in consumers
 18 so they were headed to servers and storage in the enterprise
 19 I thought
 20 I'd always thought
 21 that following the herd was a not a good thing
 22 it was a terrible thing right

Rose begins his turn with prefatory statements (lines 1-10) that provide background information for the overhearing audience and lay ground to the subsequent question on lines 11-13. More precisely, in the prefatory part of the question Rose introduces into the discussion the interview that Cook had with Jobs (line 7) and the reservations that Cook had towards joining Apple (lines 4-5). He also reports the statement that Cook made during the interview with Jobs (lines 7-10). During the course of his turn Rose contrasts Cook's reservations with his quick change in opinion, which suggests that it was Jobs who managed to turn Cook's head. Then on lines 11-13, Rose invites Cook to explain what Jobs actually said to Cook that was so influential that despite his hesitation Jobs managed to convince him to join Apple. By the prefatory statements Rose depicts a situation where Cook had to make a decision about his career which would then later on turn out to be a significant point in Cook's career.

In addition, in his question Rose refers to Cook by employing two different means. First he addresses Cook with the personal pronoun *you* several times and then at the end of the question he refers to Cook by using his full name, *Tim Cook* (line 13), instead of *you* which would have been grammatically a possible option as well. Similar to data samples 1 and 4 discussed above (for data sample 1 see section 6.1. and for data sample 4 see section 6.2.1.),

by using the proper noun Tim Cook instead of a personal pronoun Rose puts space in between himself and Cook. Furthermore, in the data sample here the change of a pronoun in Rose's question is significant as by doing so Rose indexically points to Cook's two different identity roles. The pronoun *you* as a deictic expression here refers to Tim Cook, who is sitting at the roundtable with Rose in the setting of the interview show being interviewed. Likely due to the physical proximity between the two, Rose addresses the question to Cook using the personal pronoun *you* and then the proper noun *Tim Cook* helps Rose to identify and address the professional dimension of Cook's identity.

In his answer Cook draws a connection between Jobs's strategy thinking (lines 14-15) and his own thinking (lines 19-22), and as a result Cook and Jobs are portrayed as similar with regard to their business strategy thinking. Highlighting the similarity between Jobs and Cook is a demonstration of the relationality of identity construction (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005). The process of adequation (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005) occurs in Cook's turn, where he first talks about Jobs's business strategy which was completely opposite to the strategy thinking within the field of information and communications technology of that time (lines 14-18). He then points out that he has always thought that copying what others are doing is not a good idea (lines 21-22). As a result, Cook aligns himself with Jobs in terms of strategical thinking. Furthermore, this gives reason to assume that as a CEO Cook still considers *following the herd* as not a good strategy.

Dealing with responsibility is part of being a leader and the following data sample 7 is a case in point where the CEO is held accountable for the company's failure. The topic of the question is likely somewhat problematic for Cook as it deals with the negative side of (working) life. Cook's answer turn illustrates how he moves beyond the specific topical agenda of the question by discussing failure on a general level. Data sample 7 is the same as data sample 10 (see section 6.2.2.) with slight alterations. Rose's question turn is the same in both of the data samples but the beginning of Cook's answer, which will be analyzed in section 6.2.2., has been omitted here. The theme of this extract, failure, is discussed in this section from Cook's perspective as a CEO in a more general sense than in section 6.2.2., where the focus in analyzing Cook's identity construction is on the identity position of the CEO of Apple.

Data sample 7:

1 Rose: so all the successes you have pointed to
 2 when you do something that's not as much of a success
 3 and I'm obviously thinking of maps
 4 Cook mm-hmm
 5 Rose: and you look at it
 6 what did you do wrong
 7 Cook: -- and uh you know sometimes
 8 when you're uh running fast
 9 you slip and you fall
 10 and I think the best thing you can do
 11 is get back up
 12 and say I'm sorry
 13 and you try to remedy the situation
 14 and you work like hell
 15 to make the product right
 16 uh if you're probably never making a mistake
 17 you're probably not doing enough

In this example Rose brings up the failure which took place upon the release of Apple maps and asks Cook to explain what went wrong. Rose's turn is a prefaced question that he starts by notifying that the discussion has been revolving around Cook's accomplishments. After that, Cook moves on to a contradictory topic of making mistakes and then narrows it to Apple maps (lines 1-3). After introducing the topic, Rose asks Cook to reflect in retrospective what went wrong with the maps (line 5-6). The question contains a presupposition that the failure was a result of a mistake made at Apple instead of it being a cause of some external factor.

Rose refers to making a mistake with a circumlocutive expression doing *something that's not as much of a success* (line 2). This lexical choice diminishes the severity of the failure since it conveys the idea that instead being a complete failure the release was just not quite successfully completed. The expression also lessens the adversialness of the question, and thus serves the purpose of maintaining a co-operative atmosphere during the interview. Specifically, Rose's stance of de-emphasizing the severity of the failure is displayed by this discursive choice.

In order to get a truthful conception of Cook's answer turn, it is relevant to note here that the first part of Cook's answer, which is omitted here but dealt with in detail in section 6.2.2., consists of admitting and taking responsibility of the failure on behalf of the whole company rather than assuming full personal responsibility. In contrast to the collective point of view,

the part of Cook's answer analyzed here includes a transition from first person plural *we* to first person singular *I*.

The shift to first personal singular occurs on line 10 where Cook introduces the topic of how to deal with failure into the discussion. Changing the person pronoun in speech is a clear point of transitioning from one perspective to another and therefore worth paying attention to. By *I think* (line 10) Cook signals an epistemic stance towards the failure and conveys that what he is about to say next is his personal opinion on how to survive a failure. He then goes on to list the things that he considers to be the actions to take after making mistake (lines 10-15). In this connection, Cook uses the generic *you*, which is in fact a way of discussing failure in a more theoretical and impersonal sense and consequently it moves the discussion away from the question's actual topic. In addition, the generic *you* distances Cook from the particular failure. Furthermore, discussing the topic from the perspective of how to deal with it can also be seen as a strategy for shifting from the negative side of failure to a more positive one and this way contribute to portraying a positive image of him as a CEO.

Cook's lexical choices in this answer turn depict failure as having stages similar to the stages of falling down. He uses three metaphors *running fast* (line 8), *slip and fall* (line 9) and *get back up* (line 11) to describe the stages of failing, where the first two stand for the actual failing and getting back up is considered as the best resolution (line 10). In this connection, the use of terminology that is related to an ordinary physical action gives the impression that failing is an ordinary thing and can be overcome just like falling down. This way Cook also diminishes failure's nature as a scandalous topic. Another case of informal speech appears in Cook's statement regarding how to continue after a failure: *and say I'm sorry and you try to remedy the situation and you **work like hell** to make the product right* (lines 12-15). Even though in this part of Cook's answer turn he talks about failure using the generic *you*, his utterances on lines 12-15 give reason to assume that they represent his personal work morale. This assumption is supported by the preceding *I think* (line 10), which indicates a personal perspective. Hence, these lexical choices contribute to the portrayal of Cook as humble (*I'm sorry*), and hardworking (*work like hell*).

In the last two lines (16-17), Cook makes a point that never making a mistake may suggest a lack of effort. This statement conveys the idea that it is probably impossible to avoid making any mistakes while working and therefore this statement functions both as a disclaimer and as an explanation for the failure with the Apple maps. As a result, the statement is an effective way of diminishing the gravity of making mistakes in general. It also sums up the answer turn.

6.2.2. CEO of Apple

The next extract is the introduction of Tim Cook made by Rose at the very beginning of the interview. The introduction follows a convention typical of broadcast interviews where the interviewer's opening turn consists of introducing and welcoming the guest. Introducing the guest is primarily audience-oriented and it serves the purpose of providing background information on the interviewee to the audience. The welcoming part is addressed chiefly to the guest. In contrast to the majority of data examples analyzed in this study data sample 3 illustrates principally positioning done by Rose. Since this extract is from the beginning of the interview, the positions assigned for Cook are especially relevant in that they indicate in which capacity he is invited to the show. In addition, the convention of introducing the guest before moving into the actual interview establishes the participant roles of interviewer and interviewee in a top-down manner as the roles, or situated identities (Zimmerman, 2008), along with the related role expectations and requirements are based on the institutionalism of broadcast interviews (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000).

Data sample 8:

1	Rose:	Tim Cook is here
2		he is the CEO of Apple
3		he succeeded Steve Jobs in August of 2011
4		had joined Apple in 1998
5		against the advice of his friends
6		and his own better judgment - -
7		he has also said
8		working at Apple was never in any plan
9		that I had outlined for myself
10		but was without a doubt
11		the best decision that I ever made - -
12		I am pleased to have Tim Cook at this table
13		for the first time
14		welcome

15 Cook: Charlie it's great to be here
 16 thank you for inviting me

In the part that provides background information to the audience (lines 1-9), Rose indexically brings up several Cook's identity positions. Rose starts with the name of the guest and then refers to his position as the *CEO of Apple* (line 2) and points out that Cook *succeeded Steve Jobs in August of 2011* and *had joined Apple in 1998* (line 4). By these statements Rose explicitly positions Cook as the current CEO of Apple, who succeeded Steve Jobs. By mentioning the year when Cook started working at Apple Rose provides factual evidence of Cook's experience of working at the company. Cook's role as Steve Jobs's successor is discussed in the section 6.1. For this reason it will not be considered here in further detail.

Following the fact-based identity positions Rose positions Cook as the CEO of Apple by referring to Cook's decision to work at Apple. Rose reports that Cook joined Apple *against the advice of his friends and his own better judgment* (lines 5-6), which gives the impression that joining Apple was an irrational choice and therefore probably made based on intuition rather than reason. He also reports Cook own words regarding that working at Apple was not a goal that Cook had intentionally set for himself yet he considers it to be the best decision he has ever made (lines 7-11). In contrast to the purely fact-based identity positions, these characterizations create a colorful and human image of Cook and his decision-making patterns.

Instead of ending his turn with a question, Rose indicates the end of his turn by producing the first part of an adjacency pair of greeting by welcoming Tim Cook as the guest to the show. Cook is required to complete the adjacency pair by providing the appropriate second turn, which is recognized by Cook, and accomplished appropriately by thanking for the invitation. Cook's answer is restricted to answering only to the welcoming part because the introduction provided by Rose is addressed to the audience rather than to Cook. Consequently, the identity positions indexed to in Rose's introduction are not in fact discursively offered for Cook for commentary and therefore, based on his knowledge of the broadcast interview conventions, Cook refrains from reacting to introductory part.

In the following example Cook is requested by Rose to discuss his personal values. The first lines of Cook's answer have been omitted here with the aim of focusing only on the identity role of the CEO of Apple. However, it is relevant to note in this connection that in it Cook answers from a personal point of view, which complies with the perspective Rose requested Cook to take. The same extract with the first part of Cook's answer will be analyzed in the section 6.4. (see data sample 17) to illustrate a more personal aspect of Cook's emerging leader identity.

Data sample 9:

1 Rose: I mentioned Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King in your office
 2 tell me the values that you consider most important
 3 beyond the culture and the values of Apple
 4 Tim Cook the man
 5 Cook: - - I also see as a as a businessman in Apple
 6 I can see the value in diversity
 7 I see a tremendous company
 8 that because we don't judge each other
 9 because we don't have different rights and so forth
 10 because we allow anyone in the front door
 11 uh I see a company that uh we're that that
 12 this inclusion really inspires innovation
 13 and an so I see the value of it
 14 from that point of view as well

Rose begins his question turn with a preface before he moves on to ask Cook to talk about the values that are important to him personally. In the preface Rose refers to the pictures of Robert F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King that Cook has in his office, which invokes the ideologies related to great men, the values associated with these men and the theme of values in general. In addition, the fact that the pictures are said to be in Cook's office creates a presupposition that the ideas and values that these men represent are also important to Cook. The approach Rose invites Cook to take is a personal one as, first, the question is addressed to Cook using the second person singular *you*. Second, to emphasize that the request addresses Cook's opinions and values especially as a private person Rose adds a qualifier *beyond the culture and values of Apple* (line 3) to determine the word *values* (line 2). Rose ends his turn with *Tim Cook the man* (line 4) where the use of the category 'man' can be seen to accentuate the personal rather than the professional viewpoint. This way Rose invokes Cook's first-hand knowledge of the values that are important to him as a private person.

The extract in focus here illustrates a shift in Cook's point of view from personal to professional. As mentioned above, in the first part of Cook's answer, which has been omitted from the data sample, Cook lists the values that are important to him personally. In spite of the fact that Rose addresses Cook personally, he goes beyond the scope of the question with the account on the values that he considers important from the professional perspective. He is likely aware of surpassing the question's agenda as he linguistically marks (*also* on line 5) that he is providing additional information. Rose allows the answer's topical shift by letting Cook to carry on without disrupting him.

Two features in Cook's answer mark the shift from personal to professional. First, the self-categorization as a *businessman in Apple* (line 5) and second, the use of first person plural *we* (lines 8-10). Regarding the latter, as already discussed above, in the context of this data the first person plural *we* used by Cook often refers to Apple as a community that includes the Apple employees as well as Cook himself. The former is a case of Cook discursively adopting an identity role of a *businessman in Apple* (line 5), which actually contains two categories: 'businessman' and 'businessman in Apple'. Both of these are rather general identity category to use of Cook. The impact of referring to himself as a *businessman* can be demonstrated by comparing the self-assigned category of *businessman* with for example the category of *leader of Apple*, that would also have been an available option for Cook to choose. However, by categorizing himself in the more general sense Cook underplays his position as the chief executive officer. Instead, he foregrounds the company and thus also suggests that in the role of a businessman in Apple he perceives values from the perspective of the company. The fact that Cook claims an identity category by using the grammatical structure first person singular *I* + preposition *as* + noun *businessman in Apple* also guides the listener to regard the subsequent *I* pronouns used by Cook as referring to him from the professional rather than personal standpoint. Using a category that seems to equalize Cook and the Apple employees manifests the relationality principle by Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 598). More precisely, by categorizing himself as *businessman in Apple* Cook downplays his position as the CEO and thus represents himself as any Apple employee. As a result, this self-categorization demonstrates the identity relation of adequation (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005).

Taking on the identity position of a *businessman in Apple* is also a way for Cook to justify his right as an insider to evaluate the significance of diversity for Apple. In this role Cook appears to be talking as any businessman in Apple, which possibly implies that diversity is not significant only from the leader's perspective but it also positively affects Apple employees at other levels. Indeed, Cook describes Apple with the adjective *tremendous* in *I see a tremendous company* (line 7). According to the Collins English dictionary (2016), *tremendous* is defined as 'vast; huge,' and in a more informal sense 'very exciting or unusual'. This adjective is preceded by *I see* which marks Cook's evaluative stance towards the company. He continues to list the reasons for this definition on lines 8-10 where he uses repetition of the conjunction *because* to emphasize one by one the aspects of pro-diversity at Apple. In each case he also takes on the collective perspective, *we* as a company (lines 8-10) which highlights that the principles of supporting diversity are included in the organization's culture. Furthermore, the use of *we* suggests that Cook identifies himself as part of the company instead of being separate from or superior to the other Apple employees.

Lines 8-14 also illustrate how Cook takes on the temporary role of an analyst. He lists the factors that make Apple a company that supports diversity and on line 12 comes to the conclusion that diversity positively contributes to innovation. This analysis not only reflects Cook's thinking but also gives a positive impression of Apple's ethics and therefore it also contributes to the positive image of Cook as the CEO of the company.

In the following the theme of failure is reiterated to analyze how Cook as the CEO of Apple deals with the topic. The pronoun that Rose uses in his final question *what did you do wrong* (line 6) can be interpreted to mean either the second person singular, which in this case would be Cook or the second person plural, which would stand for a larger group at Apple, for example the executive team or even Apple as a whole company. Throughout his answer turn Cook uses *we* instead of *I* and as a result conceals personal responsibility. He implies that the responsibility of Apple maps is shared collectively by Apple as a corporate body. In other words, Cook in the role of the leader of Apple admits the failure but avoids putting full responsibility on himself or a specific person or group at Apple.

Data sample 10:

1 Rose: so all the successes you have pointed to
 2 when you do something that's not as much of a success
 3 and I'm obviously thinking of maps
 4 Cook: mm-hmm
 5 Rose: and you look at it
 6 what did you do wrong
 7 Cook: oh we screwed up to put it bluntly
 8 uh we there were many screw-ups in that one
 9 not just one
 10 uh there's many
 11 and we've learned and corrected
 12 and are continuing to invest in maps
 13 because our our our fundamental premise
 14 that maps were really key to Apple
 15 is the same as when uh when we made that call many years ago
 16 uh but we did screw up on the on the release
 17 uh it should not have happened like it did
 18 it shouldn't have come out uh - -

Since Rose's turn in this data sample has been analyzed in more detail in section 6.2.1. in connection with data sample 7 it will be discussed here only to the extent that is relevant in order to understand Cook's answer. In his question turn Rose points to the unsuccessful release of the Apple maps. Rose asks Cook to provide an account on the actions that lead to the failure and thus positions Cook in the temporary role of an evaluator (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 591).

By the question Rose assigns Cook the temporary role (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 591) of an evaluator. Based on Cook's answer turn he seems to accept the temporary role of an evaluator and fulfils the role expectation by providing an evaluation on the mistake with Apple maps. The use of *we* suggests that Cook accepts the question's presupposition that the mistakes were Apple-internal. In his reply Cook admits right away that they indeed *screwed up* (line 7) and goes on to add that there was actually more than one mistake made with the maps. Similar to Rose, Cook avoids using the words failure or mistake. Instead, he uses a colloquial expression, *screw up* (lines 7, 8 and 16), to refer to the mismanagement with the maps. Despite admitting the failure, Cook does not provide an answer for Rose's question on what exactly went wrong as he moves straight ahead to pointing out to the aspects that can be considered as the positive outcomes of the failure, saying that they have learned from the mistakes and will continue to invest in maps (lines 11-12). By doing so Cook avoids going into detail about the mistakes and consequently avoids putting emphasis on them. This way he

is being truthful yet simultaneously he maintains the positive image of the company. Yet again, after taking the conversation briefly away from the mistakes Cook brings them up again providing more information regarding the shortcomings by mentioning that release of the maps was the part where the error occurred. According to Cook, the release did not happen in a desirable manner.

It is important to remember here that Cook's point of view on the matter is subjective and he deals with the topic from the position of the CEO of Apple. On one hand, in the role of the CEO of the company one can presume Cook to know the details of what happened with the Apple maps. He also states at the end of his turn that the release should have been carried out differently, which displays a stance of being unhappy with it. On the other hand, in the position of the head of the company Cook has the role of a representative of Apple and hence has to be careful about which pieces of information he discloses to the public in a television broadcast. Dealing with the question by admitting the mistake but keeping the details related to it as minimal as possible are relevant in terms of Cook's public persona. Cook is expected to follow the same morals as any other person and therefore he is obliged to providing a truthful answer yet at the same time, he has to take the interest of the company into consideration. Therefore, he must avoid revealing any information that might be unfavorable for the company.

It is probably safe to assume that it is not uncommon that the characteristics and values of the company have an influence on the formation and construction of the leader identity of the company's head. This is illustrated in the following data sample where Rose describes Apple as being *at the junction of tech and humanities* (line 3). Cook accepts this description and carries on to explain that Apple as a company is motivated by the attempt in contributing to the consumers' lives in a positive way and towards the end of his turn states that he personally is also motivated by making a difference instead of *making products to sell* (line 12).

Data sample 11:

1 Rose: and the Apple of your future uh stands
2 as Steve once said

3 at the junction of tech and humanities
 4 Cook: yes it does
 5 and you can see it in these products
 6 in this in this incredible watch
 7 uh you can feel it
 8 you can uh see the in everything that we do we have this focus on
 9 how am I changing the world
 10 how am I enriching somebody's life
 11 how am I making things easier for people
 12 and we're just not making products to sell
 13 you know
 14 that that's a very uh that doesn't get me up in the morning
 15 uh I get up in the morning
 16 and many other people get up in the morning
 17 to change things

Rose's turn (lines 1-3) here is not grammatically a question but rather a statement. He not only describes directly the field of business (combination of technology and humanities) that Apple is in but also indirectly positions Cook as the CEO of a specific kind of Apple, namely the Apple that is attributed to being in the junction of tech and humanities. In addition, it is also worth noticing that Rose refers to Apple lead by Cook as *the Apple of your future* (line 1), which implies a belief in the permanence of Cook's position as Apple's CEO.

Regardless of the grammatical structure of Rose's utterance Cook provides an answer that confirms the statement. The fact that Cook as the CEO of Apple accepts the description of Apple suggests that Cook does not see a conflict in the position that Rose claims Apple to occupy and the position where Apple is considered to be by Cook himself. In other words, Cook and Rose are in agreement regarding the standing of Apple. Furthermore, Cook points to Apple products, especially to the Apple watch, to support the statement. Cook also elaborates on the idea of Apple being the interface of technology and humanities by explaining the Apple ideology of trying to contribute in changing the world, enriching and making people's lives easier and that it is not just selling products that is their main goal.

In his answer Cook clarifies that for him the combination of improving the quality of life and technology and being able to make a change is more motivating than selling products. Furthermore, Cook does not consider selling in its own right as a goal worth pursuing but mentions the changing of things as the key motivator for him. By stating that *we're just not making products to sell* (line 12) Cook also discursively indexes an ideological association

between large companies and a purely profit-driven mentality. By stating that Apple is not focused only on selling products and consequently makes an ideological distinction between Apple as a technology company with humanistic values and the other large companies that prioritize profit. Cook adds also a personal dimension to his statement by claiming that instead of producing goods for sale he is motivated by the opportunity to make a change (lines 12-17). This also conveys that Cook as the CEO of Apple follows values that meet with the values followed generally at Apple.

From the point of view of constructing and maintaining a positive image of the company it would not be beneficial for a company to admit that its only objective is to make profit. Instead, as Cook does, it is advantageous to underscore the company's values and principles that create a positive image of the company and help differentiate it from its rivals. For these reasons, creating and maintaining a positive image by underscoring the positive values of the company is expectable of the CEO.

In the same vein as data sample 11, the next extract touches on the aspects that comprise the motivational background of Apple. However, here the focus turns to the financial success of the company, which leads Cook to take a defensive approach.

Data sample 12:

1 Cook: -- what drives us are
 2 making great products and enrich people's lives
 3 it's the same thing that has driven Apple forever
 4 Rose: but it's been a good business
 5 aren't you now the largest company in the world
 6 in terms of market cap
 7 Cook: we are
 8 but but we don't fixate on it Charlie
 9 we don't I don't get up in the morning
 10 thinking wow we're the largest
 11 and we act arrogant and

Data sample 12 begins with Cook talking about the social driver behind Apple's operations, which, according to him, is to *enrich people's lives by making great products* (lines 1-3). Rose probably sees this as an opportunity to make a point beside the human pursuits of Apple by remarking *but it's been a good business* (line 4). He then asks a question that addresses the

success of Apple from the financial perspective and seeks for a confirmation of the initial statement on line 4. By pointing out that Apple has gained also remarkable financial success, Rose shows an evaluative stance towards Cook's claim of being driven by social pursuits. This way he also indirectly questions Apple's motivations and possibly also implies that the financial aspects too could have had a motivational role at Apple. In essence, Rose's question turn challenges Cook, which then causes Cook to provide further support for his claim.

At the same time, in the question Rose indexes to Apple's standing of that time on lines 5-6 as the *largest company in the world in terms of market cap* (i.e. market capitalization, meaning the added monetary value of all Apple's outstanding shares). Thus, Cook's leader identity as the CEO of Apple gets another dimension as the leader of the company that has the largest market capital in the world. Adding to this dimension Rose's possible implication to the relevance of financial matters, the position of being the CEO of the largest company in the world could be interpreted as an identity position that bears negative associations such as greed with it.

Cook is under pressure to agree with Rose's question due to the question's grammatical structure (a negative interrogative) which strongly prefers agreement with the argument as an answer (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 209-212). Cook's answer is formed as a minimal answer plus elaboration (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 245). He begins with a brief answer *we are* turn-initially (line 7). Right after this Cook however returns to his original argument of Apple being motivated by social factors instead of financial ones by disclaiming any fixation on being the largest (line 8). Consequently, Cook discursively accepts the role in which he is positioned by Rose's question. Cook carries on to point out that at Apple they are not fixated on being the largest or that Apple being the largest company is not an absolute value that drives Cook. Furthermore, he remarks that despite Apple being a very large company they do not act arrogantly (lines 8-11). One can detect an underlying ideological association between big companies and a fixation on being the biggest in these statements. Cook seems to consider these qualities as negative since he denies that Apple as a company would be obsessed in being the largest. Disclaiming the negative qualities Cook ideologically associates with other large companies is an illustration of the identity relation of distinction, that is an identity construction structure related to the relationality principle (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 598-

599). By addressing and denying the aforementioned qualities, Cook differentiates Apple from other large companies in the sense of Apple being positively different.

When talking about getting up in the morning Cook makes a self-repair from *we* to *I* in the sentence *we don't I don't get up in the morning thinking wow we're the largest* (lines 6-7), which directs the attention to Cook and to the values he personally considers important. This statement conveys that as the CEO of Apple Cook's main goal is not to achieve the title of the largest company in the world. Furthermore, another motivation for Cook's self-repair might be the fact that when attitudes are being discussed the person himself of herself has the primary right or responsibility to talk about them. Cook would have violated other Apple workers' right of talking about their attitudes if he would have completed his turn without changing the personal pronoun from *we* to *I*.

6.3. Apple's representative

The interview analyzed in this study is focused on Tim Cook rather as a professional instead of as a private person due to Rose's questions that to a great extent revolve around Apple and Tim Cook as the CEO of Apple. In this role Cook is also a representative of the company and therefore it is not surprising that the in multiple cases Apple is promoted by Cook. In the following I aim to demonstrate cases where especially Cook's role as a representative of Apple surfaces. Two different aspects to being the representative of Apple emerge from the cases to follow and, based on them, this chapter is divided into the following subchapters: promoting and maintaining the values and image of Apple and secretiveness.

6.3.1. Promoting and maintaining the values and image of Apple

According to the Apple webpages (2016), the values of Apple include environment, supplier responsibility, accessibility, privacy, inclusion and diversity as well as education. Especially environment together with inclusion and diversity appear repeatedly in the data of this study. Concerning how promoting Apple affects the emerging leader identity of Cook it is relevant

to notice that the head represents the whole company. Therefore, the CEO can be considered as the embodiment of the company including both its positive and negative features. For this reason it is logical that Cook puts effort in highlighting the positive values and principles of Apple since it can have an effect on how he as well as Apple are perceived.

In the following data sample Rose invites Cook to discuss the possibilities that Apple's financial resources enable for the company in terms of technology, humanity and good citizenship (lines 1-9). In effect, especially by mentioning the concepts of *humanity* and *being a good citizen* (lines 8-9), Rose brings up especially the ethical and philanthropic aspects of corporate social responsibility².

Data sample 13:

1 Rose: I know well no you don't think it of that way
 2 you think of it
 3 and so you also have over a hundred million dollars in the bank
 4 based on whatever your stock buyback has done
 5 which are the numbers
 6 do you think of that
 7 in terms of the opportunities it provides you to do
 8 all the things that I've just we've been talking about
 9 whether it's technology
 10 whether it's humanity
 11 whether it is being a good citizen
 12 Cook: I do
 13 and I I see it as a responsibility
 14 uh I don't see it as a burden
 15 I see it as a responsibility
 16 I feel that this gives us even a greater ability to contribute more
 17 not not just in a monetary sense
 18 we'll always contribute the most to humanity through our products
 19 because these products will change people's lives
 20 and enable them to do things they couldn't do before
 21 we can reach more people doing that
 22 but I'm proud to be working on uh on product red with Bono
 23 and uh eliminating AIDS in Africa
 24 I'm proud that we're out in the front on environment
 25 I'm proud that we're we're pushing like crazy in human rights
 26 I'm proud that we're working on education
 27 trying to change the way teachers teach and students learn

² Carroll (1991) defines corporate social responsibility (CSR) as a pyramid of responsibilities. Starting from the bottom, the social responsibilities of a corporation include first and foremost the economic responsibilities, secondly the legal responsibilities, thirdly the ethical responsibilities and at the top of the pyramid, philanthropic responsibilities.

In his turn Rose asks Cook a prefaced question. Typically, in prefaced questions the actual question ends the turn but in this case Rose adds a few statements right after it. These additional statements (lines 8-11) after the question (lines 6-7) seem to provide a framework for understanding what Rose means by the word *opportunities* (line 7). This way Rose both outlines what is the relevant topical field for Cook's answer and also helps him in orienting to the topic. In addition, the question itself is formulated as a yes/no question, which by default allows Cook rather a narrow selection of answer options. The additional statements after the question widen the selection, so in other words they allow Cook a wider range of answer possibilities that all fit the agenda of the question.

By first pointing to Apple's monetary assets (line 3) and even mentioning the amount of money, *a hundred million dollars* (line 3), Rose portrays Apple as a financially very affluent company. As Rose then in the subsequent question brings up the opportunities which Apple's financial standing makes possible in terms of technology, humanity and good citizenship, he points to the idea that financial resources enable companies to contribute to the society's wellbeing and that this is a topic for the head of Apple to consider. Moreover, Rose's self-repair from *I* to *we* on line 8 emphasizes that Rose and Cook together have already been discussing topics related to the technology, humanity and citizenship possibilities and this way remarks that the topic is already familiar to Cook. To summarize the gist of Rose's turn, he raises the question of whether Cook recognizes the social responsibility (or as Rose puts it, *possibilities*, which has a more positive sound to it) that results from Apple's financial standing.

Cook's answer is structured as a minimal answer plus elaboration (Clayman and Heritage, 2002). Cook's first stretch of talk, *I do* (line 12), is the minimal answer and indicates that Cook is paying attention to the agenda set by the question. He then moves on to the elaboration where he reflects on the issue in more detail. The first part of his answer turn is from the point of view of the CEO of Apple as he makes the statements on lines 12-16 using the personal pronoun *I*. By contrasting the words *burden* and *responsibility* Cook implies that corporate social responsibility may be considered as a burden but for him as the CEO of Apple it is rather a responsibility (lines 13-15). This statement in addition to the affirmative *I do* convey that Cook does recognize Apple's social responsibility. Consequently, Cook gives

the impression that both Apple and Cook as its CEO are responsible and do not see responsibilities as a burden.

Next Cook moves on to discuss responsibility and contribution in relation to Apple. At the same time Cook changes the perspective from individual to collective based on the pronoun change on line 18 from first person singular *I* to first person plural *we*. Cook seems to make a distinction between two types of contribution: the *monetary sense* (line 17) of contributing and contributing through their products. He talks about the latter type of contributing by stating that *we'll always contribute the most to humanity through our products* (line 18). He goes on to motivate the statement by claiming that the Apple products are life changing in that with the help of the products people are able to such things that were not possible before (lines 19-20). He thus creates a very positive and even virtuous image of Apple and its products.

Then on the final lines of the data sample (lines 22-27) Cook yet again changes perspective and at the same time assumes the temporary role of an evaluator. He lists four things that Apple is engaged in: Product red, sustaining environment, promoting human rights and developing education and in connection with each of the points he states that he is proud of Apple as an organization taking part in the aforementioned actions. In other words, Cook expresses personal pride in the actions undertaken by Apple, which suggests that as a leader Cook stands behind Apple's values and as a result portrays himself as a leader who is concerned about the societal and environmental issues.

In addition to talking about Apple's social responsibility and how it is carried out, Cook brings up the importance of education in order to promote equality between people. Data sample 14 shows a point in the interview where first Cook explains that Apple is providing education for their employees in order to promote equality, especially in China. He then moves on to pointing out that promoting equality is an area where he wishes to see more co-operation. This data sample is a case in point of how the endorsing of the company values in the role of the company's representative can simultaneously contribute to the construction of Cook's leader identity.

Data sample 14:

1 Cook: so we're trying to provide education
 2 which to me is the great equalizer on people
 3 to people on the factory floor
 4 who want and aspire to do more
 5 so we worked with local Chinese universities
 6 to employ uh classes right on campus
 7 to make it super convenient for people
 8 I really feel
 9 that we've done a tremendous amount in this this uh in this area
 10 and plus we've been incredibly transparent
 11 because this is an area
 12 unlike me being secretive about the future
 13 I want everybody to copy
 14 and I would love
 15 that everybody takes exactly what we're doing
 16 and do it
 17 and if they got any better ideas
 18 I want them
 19 cause I think we all ought to be
 20 you know
 21 just like with the environment and human rights
 22 this is an area
 23 we ought to all share
 24 we could all improve the world on
 25 it's not building a new product
 26 where we want to keep it secretive

The first part of the data sample above consist of Cook's report on what Apple as a company is doing for promoting education and equality (lines 1-7) which is a strategy for creating and maintaining a positive image of the company. At the same time, it also influences the public image of Cook as its leader and, indeed, Cook seems to align himself with Apple and its values. He first reports that *we're trying to provide education* (line 1) where he is talking as the representative of Apple, as the choice of personal pronoun *we* suggests. Next, he evaluates education from his own perspective by stating *which to me is the great equalizer on people* (line 2). This utterance displays Cook's supportive stance towards education and equality, and therefore he positions himself as valuing the same things as Apple as a company does. Even though the identity relations are typically established in the relations between people or groups (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005), in this case it can be argued that the identity relation of adequation is created through Cook's alignment with Apple. In other words, Cook as an individual discursively adequates himself with the Apple community in terms of sharing corresponding values.

On lines 8-10 Cook moves on to reflect on Apple's actions. The utterance *I really feel* (line 8) conveys rather a strong belief than knowledge. He states that Apple has contributed a great deal and adds that they have been *incredibly transparent* (line 10) about it. By this statement, he goes on to argue that the promotion of education and equality is a field where openness and co-operation is needed instead of secretiveness (lines 11-26). Cook's statements here such as *I want everybody to copy* (line 13), *this is an area we ought all to share* (lines 22-23) and *we could all improve the world on* (line 24) portray Cook as dedicated to creating and encouraging co-operation for the betterment of the society. Furthermore, his use of emotional words *want* and *love* (lines 13-14) display an affective stance towards the issue and therefore position Cook as emotionally invested in promoting education and equality in the society.

6.3.2. Secretiveness

The extract below exhibits Rose and Cook's dialogue regarding secretiveness that they both consider a characteristic shared by both Cook and Jobs. Maintaining the business secrets is vital for companies in order to achieve or retain a desired market position. Revealing the business secrets can be harmful for a company as it would provide the rivalling companies an opportunity for example for copying. In this respect, Tim Cook is like any other business leader and, as will be shown in the following data sample, Cook positions himself as a person who is reluctant to even answer questions regarding unpublished Apple projects. In addition, the following extract exemplifies how both Rose and Cook occasionally depart from the question – answer sequence structure that is typical of broadcast interviews. In the cases where Rose and Cook do so the dialogue tends to resemble the structure of an everyday conversation.

In the discussion preceding data sample 15, Rose has stated that Apple spends a great amount of money on research. Cook confirms the statement with a minimal answer plus elaboration, where he reports that the sum has increased significantly. He mentions the Apple watch as an example of a project where research and development was started years before its actual launch and continues that Apple is continuously working like that.

Data sample 15:

- 1 Rose: here's what's interesting about you and about Steve Jobs uh [**
 2 Cook: [we're a bit secretive @@@
 3 Rose: yeah exactly @@@ exactly it's hard to get something

Rose's turn on line 1 is grammatically not an interrogative utterance but rather a declarative one, to which Cook reacts (line 2) by providing the next turn that he considers to be fit in the light of Rose's foregoing turn. In other words, even though Rose's utterance is not structured as a question, which would clearly mark it as an item that requires Cook's response, Cook does treat it as an utterance to which he can respond on the grounds of his epistemic position as the current CEO of Apple and as the successor of Apple's previous CEO Steve Jobs. Based on these positions Cook has the first-hand knowledge regarding his and possibly Apple's preference for secretiveness and, based on his experience in working with Steve Jobs he is likely familiar with Jobs's preference for secretiveness as well. Therefore, Cook's statement on line 2 regarding the shared characteristic has legitimacy.

Rose's agreement with Cook's statement departs from the conventions of broadcast interviews. Maintaining an impartial stance towards the interviewee is one of the key standards related to professional journalism (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 119) and for this reason acknowledging the interviewee's statements is considered as compromising of the interviewer's objectivity. However, the genre of celebrity interview likely diminishes the severity of breaking the interview conventions.

Being secretive about Apple's future operations in a similar way as Steve Jobs was is an identity position that is assigned to Cook in the co-operation between Cook and Rose. Rose's first statement (line 1) refers to Cook's previous turn where he explains how the money spent on research and development is distributed among different Apple products and that the research and development expenses are not always apparent immediately as the development of a product may begin several years prior to the actual launch. Likely inspired by this, Rose introduces a new topic into discussion by remarking that he has noticed an interesting point regarding both Cook and Jobs (line 1). His turn projects a characterization that fits the two. Before Rose manages to complete his turn Cook interrupts him by providing an anticipatory

completion (Lerner, 1996) (line 2). By doing this Cook indicates that he recognizes what Rose's turn forecasts. Thus, instead of waiting for Rose's characterization he is able to use his own word, *secretive* (line 2). This word is quite negative and therefore a somewhat unlikely choice of words for Cook. The characterization is immediately accompanied with laughter (line 2) which suggests that Cook recognizes the conflict in his word choice.

In addition, the fact that both Cook and Rose laugh due to Cook's turn on line 2 suggests that Cook has adopted the temporary role (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005) of a joke teller. Even though his utterance is not a joke with a narrative structure the word choice conveys a humorous take on describing a quality that is typically regarded as negative. Rose agrees with Cook's statement (line 3), which indicates that Cook's presupposition regarding Rose's consideration on the aspect of similarity is correct. Also Rose's turn includes laughter that signals that he also recognizes the humor in Cook's characterization.

It is important to notice that in data sample 15 the identity position of a secretive leader is not explicitly assigned on Cook by Rose one-sidedly. On the contrary, Rose implies to it discreetly, yet clearly enough, so that Cook is able to conclude to which shared characteristic Rose refers, and goes on to interrupt Rose (line 2). However, since the statement made by Rose is not an interrogative, instead of chipping in, Cook could have remained silent and waited until Rose would have yielded the turn to Cook. As mentioned above, by interrupting Rose, Cook briefly takes over the control of the course of conversation and this way gets to decide which characterization is used.

The turn sequence of the dialogue illustrates how also presupposition and grammatical indexicality contribute to the unfolding of the dialogue at hand and consequently on the construction of Cook's leader identity. Both Rose and Cook seem to hold the presupposition that Cook and Jobs share a characteristic of being secretive. This is supported by Cook's complementing of Rose's statement as well as by Cook's use of the first person plural *we* on line 2. Cook's own presupposition regarding the identity roles that other people may assign to him can be detected in that he is able to without hesitation provide a reply that is in line with

Rose's implicature. However, Rose's back referring utterance *here's what's interesting* (line 1) probably guided Cook to voice the presupposition in the first place.

Highlighting a similarity or similarities is a mechanism of adequation (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 599) and it is used to accentuate the likeness of people or groups of people. In the light of the previous analyses, especially in section 6.1., data sample 15 is an exception in the sense that Cook typically rejects the identity position of being like Steve Jobs and underscores the authenticity of his personal identity. Here, however, Cook adopts the position of being similar to Jobs with regard to secretiveness and hence displaying the identity relation of adequation.

In the dialogue in data sample 16 Cook not only bolsters his identity position as a secretive leader but he also provides a logical reason for it. At the beginning of the data sample Cook identifies being *fixated on one thing* within the ICT field as a hindrance for discovering what *the next next next thing* is (lines 1-4). Cook then admit that he does not know what the answer is but hints anyway that Apple may have some ideas (lines 6-8).

Data sample 16:

- 1 Cook: -- sometimes in the valley you can
 2 all everybody can get so fixated on one thing
 3 and lots of companies pop up and and and do those things
 4 and you're not thinking enough about the next next next thing
 5 uh and so it's it's something that that we think about
 6 and uh I don't know what the answer is
 7 I don't know what the answer is
 8 we you know we always have some ideas here and there
 9 Rose: well give me one
 10 Cook: well I don't wanna give you one
 11 I don't want anybody else to copy it
 12 we have people who do the copying
 13 so I don't wanna help them do that

In his turn Cook discursively highlights the distinction between Apple and other companies within the field. He first explicitly claims that there is a prevailing tendency of focusing only on one thing at the cost of losing insight into the future (lines 1-4) and second, he points out that *it's something that we think about* (line 5), where the use of *we* likely refers to Apple.

These statements not only differentiate Apple from the other companies but they also describe Apple as a future-oriented company.

Cook then moves on to talking from his perspective by claiming that he does not know what the *next thing* could be. In fact, he makes exactly the same claim *I don't know what the answer is* twice (lines 6-7), likely for emphasis. Being the CEO of Apple and by admitting that he does not have an idea of what the next big trend is, Cook in a sense implies that it is difficult for even experienced professionals to forecast the future trends. However, he also states that *we always have some ideas here and there* (lines 6-8), which is in line with his previous statement on line 5 and suggests that even though he himself would not know the answer, Apple is working towards resolving it (line 8). This also contributes to depicting Apple as a forward-looking company.

Rose addresses Cook's claim regarding Apple's ideas by requesting him to provide an example of them (line 9). Cook overtly refuses to provide an answer by stating *well I don't wanna give you one* (line 10), which reinforces Cook's identity position as a secretive leader. The wording of this utterance is almost identical to Rose's original request *well give me one* (line 9) which marks it as a direct answer to the request. After refusing to answer Cook moves on to motivate his refusal. This softens the originally somewhat sharp refusal and justifies the refusal by wanting to maintain originality and avoid copying. Put otherwise, Cook discursively portrays himself as secretive for a justified reason instead of purely for the sake of being reticent.

6.4. Tim Cook beyond Apple

Despite the fact that the process of identity construction can be examined from various perspectives, such as from the point of view of the construction of a professional identity, it does not mean that the different identity dimensions would be separate and isolated from one another. It would also be artificial to assume that the different dimensions of one's identity would not overlap or that one dimension would not have an effect on the construction of another. For this reason it is appropriate to include analysis of the instances where Cook's

personal identity is the topic of the discussed. The personal dimensions of one's identity are in interplay with the professional dimensions and, consequently, who Tim Cook as a private person is has an effect on the kind of person he is as a leader (and vice versa). As will be demonstrated by the following data extracts, in the cases where the personal dimensions of Cook's identity are addressed he deals with them through his values. As the most important values for him personally Cook mentions equality. Another issue that appears to be personally important to Cook is the protection of the environment. However, it is relevant to point out here that the cases where Cook discusses any topic from a perspective outside his professional role are rare in the data of this study.

In the next data sample (17) Cook answers Rose's question regarding the values Cook considers to be the most important ones for him personally instead of as the CEO of Apple. The following extract has been analyzed in section 6.2.2. (see data sample 9) with the focus on the identity position of being the CEO of Apple. Rose's question turn remains the same in both samples whereas Cook's answer encompasses different parts of one longish answer turn.

Data sample 17:

- | | | |
|----|-------|--|
| 1 | Rose: | I mentioned Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King in your office |
| 2 | | tell me the values that you consider most important |
| 3 | | beyond the culture and the values of Apple |
| 4 | | Tim Cook the man |
| 5 | Cook: | treating people uh with dignity |
| 6 | | uh treating people the same |
| 7 | | uh that everyone deserves a basic level of human rights |
| 8 | | regardless of their color |
| 9 | | regardless of their religion |
| 10 | | regardless of their sexual orientation |
| 11 | | regardless of their gender |
| 12 | | uh that everyone deserves uh respect |
| 13 | | and and you know I'll I'll fight for it until my toes point out |

In his turn Rose invites Cook to switch his perspective to a more personal one instead of talking from a professional point of view. Rose begins his turn with a prefatory statement (line 1) by naming two well-known historical persons Robert F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King likely in order to mark the topic shift. The statement also places Cook among the aforementioned men with power and influence and invokes the kinds of values that these men represent, which guides Cook into the direction of the question's agenda.

Rose goes on to request Cook to talk about his personal values that are the main topic of question. Rose addresses Cook as *you* (line 2) and highlights that he wishes Cook to address the topic of important values especially from the point of view of *beyond the culture and the values of Apple* (lines 3). In addition, the use of the category *the man* (line 4) indexically points to Cook's identity position as a private person and rules out from the discussion the other categories such as 'CEO', 'leader' or 'employee', which, if used, would have led the discussion into a different direction.

Cook does provide an answer that is in line with the question's agenda as he lists the values that he considers important (lines 5-13). On one hand, the values listed by Cook (the equal and dignified manner of treating people despite their backgrounds), seem quite similar to the values of Apple and therefore it could seem debatable whether Cook's reply is really in accordance with the question's agenda. On the other hand, as the CEO of Apple it is very logical that Cook's personal values mirror the values followed at Apple and based on this idea there is no reason to doubt that Cook would not have talked about his personal values. From this perspective, Cook followed the agenda set by the question.

In the data sample Cook portrays an image of himself as an advocate of diversity and human rights, similar to the men referred to by Rose in the question. Cook uses repetition (lines 5-6 and 8-11) to highlight that he supports human rights and that everyone despite their background has the right to be treated equally. Repetition is an effective rhetoric device to emphasize the message and, by naming color, religion, sexual orientation, gender (lines 8-11) separately as qualities that do not justify unequal treatment of employees, Cook portrays himself as a liberal person in support of equal rights regardless of a person's qualities or ideologies. Moreover, Cook shows a strong personal commitment to promoting diversity by stating that *I'll fight for it until my toes point out* (line 13), in which especially the use of the word *fight* and the more colloquial expression *toes point out* (that presumably stands for dying) suggest dedication to the issue.

Discussing the values that Cook considers important to him personally in a broadcast interview is a way of implementing the authority that his position as the CEO of Apple grants him. Even though the question is about Cook's personal values and not the values he adheres to as a representative of Apple the interview is an opportunity to promote the values that Cook considers as important.

In addition to naming diversity and equality as important personal values in data sample 17, Cook also mentions nature and its preservation as an important issue for him, as the next data sample shows. It also illustrates again that the personal values of Cook and the values of Apple are corresponding. The following data sample 18 is a take from Cook's rather lengthy turn where he discusses how sustainability is implemented in Apple's business activities.

Data sample 18:

1 Cook: -- I don't know about you
 2 but when I when I spend my spare time
 3 when I have any
 4 I like to be out in the national park
 5 and reminding myself of the land
 6 and the beauty of it
 7 and you can go to different places
 8 and see that slipping away
 9 and uh it's not right
 10 and we owe it to the generation
 11 to the younger generation
 12 to solve this
 13 and not to keep turning
 14 and looking the other way

At the first part of the data sample (lines 1-6) Cook talks from a personal perspective, which is marked by the first person singular *I*. The statement on line 1, *I don't know about you*, projects that what he is about to say is possibly not generalizable to other people, thus shows his personal stance towards the issue to which he is about to move on. On the lines 2-3 he distinctly shows that he is talking from a perspective beyond Apple by discursively pointing to a specific temporal (outside of working hours), spatial (outside of working environment) and perhaps mental (outside of working mentality) occasion or state, namely to *spare time* in *when I spend my spare time* (line 2). The connotations related to spending free time are brought up by this utterance. Out of the possible connotations, the most relevant one in this case is possibly the idea that during one's spare time s/he is free to attend to issues that are

personally, rather than professionally, important. By subsequently adding *when I have any* (line 3), he highlights that he has very little free time and also implies that he dedicates a great deal of this time to his work. Furthermore, the temporal adverb *when* (lines 2 and 3) in the initial position in this data sample projects more to come.

As the unfolding speech turns shows, from line 4 onwards, nature is the turn's central theme. On line 4 Cook states *I like to be out in the national park*, which a statement of personal preference, that characterizes him as an outdoorsy and active person. Considering the statement in the light of the precedent ones (lines 2-3), Cook seems to imply that he considers spending time in nature worth of his little free time. He continues to explain that it helps him to remember the beauty of the land (lines 5-6), which indicates that he values nature. These statements (lines 1-6) reflect Cook's stance of respect towards the environment, which positions him as pro-nature and thus aligns him with the likeminded.

After discursively positioning himself, Cook voices his criticism based on his experience on lines 7-9. He first states that *you can go to different places and see that [the land and the beauty of it] slipping away* and then makes a clear statement of evaluation by *it's not right*. In addition, on lines 7-8 Cook shifts perspective from the personal *I* to generic *you*, which marks a shift from the description of a subjective preference (lines 2-6), to the description of an objectively observable phenomenon. The following statements on lines 10-14 include the collective *we*, which suggests that Cook considers the responsibility as a collective one.

The statements on lines 10-14 also include Cook's specification of to whom the responsibility is – *the younger generation* – and that ignoring the nature issues should end. In relation to the responsibility to the subsequent generations Cook uses the word *owe* (line 10) which in this context contains the idea that the current generation has taken a loan from the future generations. The word choice conveys a sense of responsibility towards them as the definition of owing someone includes the obligation of repaying it. Therefore, Cook positions himself along with perhaps the entire current generation as liable for the state of the environment and as obliged to resolve environmental problems.

In sum, both data sample 17 and 18 demonstrate cases where Cook deals with values important to him personally. In data sample 17 Rose explicitly asks Cook for his personal views whereas in data sample 18 Cook assumes the personal perspective without being requested to do so. In terms of Cook's emerging leader identity these cases are also relevant since the values Cook mentions as important to him as a private person are consistent with the values of Apple. As a result, Cook's personal values align him with Apple and position him in terms of values a matching leader for Apple.

7. CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

The present study investigated the leader identity construction of Tim Cook, the CEO of Apple, from an interactional and discursive perspective. The aim was to analyze Tim Cook and Charlie Rose's discursive choices that contributed to the construction of leader identity of Tim Cook. Specifically, the present study paid attention to the discursive positioning of Cook and especially to Cook's strategies of dealing with the identity positions assigned to him. Furthermore, the use of different categories in reference to Cook was considered relevant in terms of identity construction. The interview of Tim Cook provided a fruitful data for analyzing identity construction from the discursive standing point. The principles Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) framework helped to analyze the indexical processes that contributed to the discursive positioning of Cook. Furthermore, the central idea of the emergence principle condenses the fundamental basis on which the present study relies on. Especially the positionality, indexicality and relationality principles of the framework accompanied by the theories on the broadcast interview conventions (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000; Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Koskela, 2011) guided the practical analysis.

In the following I will summarize the main observations of the present study, discuss them in relation to the previous studies and finally conclude with limitations of the study and suggestions for future research.

7.1. Summary of the main findings

Cook's identity construction was examined in the context of a broadcast celebrity interview, which had great influence on the organizational structure of the interaction and therefore also on Rose's and Cook's discursive responsibilities and rights. The institutional nature of the interview determined the participants' situated identities (Zimmerman, 2008) as interviewer (Rose) and interviewee (Cook). Especially the beginning of the interview shows the participants' orientation also to the situated identities of host (Rose) and guest (Cook). The fact that the participants orient towards these institutionally established identities results in the interview's organization into question – answer sequences. The interview atmosphere seemed to be rather friendly and co-operative, which according to Koskela (2011: 37-38) is typical of celebrity interviews, as it provides the interviewer with the possibility of asking personal questions. On one hand, Rose adhered mostly to a “neutralistic” (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 119-120) interviewer stance, which entails that the interviewer refrains from displaying agreement or disagreement with the interviewer's statements and is typical of news interviews. This is supported for example by Rose's question formulation: questions that challenged Cook and his position as a leader were formulated so that they reported some other group's or person's thoughts and opinions instead of Rose's own. On the other hand, the fact that the occasional departures from the question – answer sequence structure seem to be acceptable contribute to the co-operative spirit of the interview. Furthermore, the results of this study support Koskela's (2005: 98) observation that in order to address the interviewee's personal point of view the interviewer may ask questions that invoke first-hand knowledge. For instance, Rose's questions that dealt with Cook's position as the successor of Steve Jobs seemed to address Cook's personal reflections in that they raised the doubts and the prejudice that prevailed amongst the stakeholders during the time when Cook was appointed as the CEO.

Cook's answers were often formulated as minimal answer plus elaboration or as roundabout answers (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 243, 245). These answer types appeared to be a way for Cook to broaden the topical sphere of the original question, thus being able to not only answer the question but also provide extra information related to the topic. More specifically, it allowed him to not only answer the question but also to deal with the identity positions that

were assigned to him in the question turns. Likely due to the celebrity interview genre and its co-operative characteristic, Rose allows Cook's occasionally rather lengthy answers instead of interrupting him.

Following Fairclough's (1995) idea of the constitutiveness of language, the language use of Rose and Cook is seen to be conventional rather than creative, as their discussion follows the interview conventions rather than departs from them. Furthermore, the interaction reproduces the elements of institutional discourse, these being the institutionally set roles of interviewer and interviewee, the power asymmetry in terms of the right of leading the conversation and the agendas of the participants (Nuolijärvi and Tiittula, 2000: 14-16). More precisely, Rose and Cook orient to their roles as interviewer and interviewee, with occasional cases of every day type of conversation. Rose as the representative of the broadcasting company and the host has the right to direct the conversation with his questions and Cook is required to follow the lead and answer the questions. As for the agendas, some of them may be more clearly visible whereas some are hidden. Since the interview was determined as a celebrity interview, it is probably safe to say that Rose's agenda is to get Cook to talk even about sensitive issues, such as the failure with the Apple maps, or personal matters such as his personal values outside the role of the leader of Apple. Based on Cook's answers it can be assumed that one of Cook's agendas was possibly to reinforce his position as the CEO in the eyes of the public and to promote Apple.

The discursive choices of both Rose and Cook contributed to Cook's emerging leader identity. Following the positionality, indexicality and relationality principles of Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) framework, several indexical processes were detected in the speech turns. It was possible to determine emerging identity positions and identity relations by leaning on the occasions of discursive indexing in the data. Guided by the Bucholtz and Hall's (2005: 594) indexicality principle, the present study benefitted especially from identifying the following indexical processes: the speakers' use of particular identity categories in reference to Cook, the implicatures and presuppositions below the literal message of the speech turns and the displays of different stances towards the issues covered in the interview. The analysis of the interview resulted in the appearance of four dimensions that together contribute to the emergence of Cook's leader identity. The dimensions intertwine and compose a multifaceted

depiction of Cook's leader identity. Despite being inherently connected to one another, the dimensions were determined separately as successor of Steve Jobs, business leader, Apple's representative and Tim Cook beyond Apple.

The interview can be described as friendly and even peaceful. Consequently, the authenticity of Cook's position as the leader of Apple or his actions within that capacity are not severely challenged. Therefore, the identity construction in this case seems to be realized through cooperation between Rose and Cook rather than through confrontation. Identity positions were indexically assigned for Cook in Rose's question turns and Cook dealt with them in his answer turns by either accepting or rejecting the positioning. Cook did not resist such identity positions that were based on facts, such as being the successor of Steve Jobs. Furthermore, Cook highlighted the positive aspects related to Apple and leading the company, which resulted in the emerging identity position of the representative of Apple. In contrast, Cook dealt with negative themes by putting distance between himself and the unfavorable topic. For instance, Rose's question that addressed the failed release of Apple maps led Cook to avoid claiming any personal responsibility. Instead, he discussed the topic from the point of view of the whole company. This topic also got Cook to describe with metaphorical expressions what happens when one fails. Here the lexical choices as well as the discursively claimed distance from the actual failure contributed to the construction of business leader. In specific, the two aspects of it, namely being a leader by profession and being the CEO of Apple, were both emergent in the discussion regarding failure. Another illustration of rejecting negative positioning is the case where Cook names making good products and enriching people's lives (data sample 12) as the motivators for Apple. Rose reacts to this statement by point out that Apple has been financially very successful, thus contrasting Cook's claims by implying to the profit-oriented mentality often associated with large companies. Cook's answer turn consists of denying that it would be Apple's sole motivator. The answer turns evidence that Cook also issued identity positions for himself, which in many cases can be seen to broaden or define the positioning done by Rose. For example, the use self-categorization as *businessman in Apple* concealed his authoritative position.

The categories that were used in reference to Cook seemed to have an influence on how Cook was positioned and therefore the contributed to the construction of leader identity. The

category that appeared most often was ‘CEO’ and both Rose and Cook used it. When used by Rose the category referred to Cook’s professional position in order to provide information for the audience. The cases where the category appeared in Cook’s talk were related to his perceptions of the category. He seemed to consider promoting diversity as a central principle in acting as a CEO in addition to avoiding the irrelevant *noise* coming from the outside. Reinforcing Cook’s personal leader identity was also one central theme in the data and his use of the ‘actor’ category was regarded as contributing to the construction of a genuine personal identity. Cook’s self-categorization as *businessman in Apple* seems to contain in fact two categories: ‘businessman’ and ‘businessman in Apple’, which are both fairly general identity categories. As a result, the use of *businessman in Apple* downplayed Cook’s executive position and brought forth a more general position as a representative of the company. As for the categories used by Rose, the category ‘brother’ was seen to invoke the ‘family’ category collection and the ideological association of family members having close mutual relationships. As the discussion in which the category was used concerned Cook’s professional relationships, Rose’s reference to the brotherly as well as professional relationship between Robert F. Kennedy and John F. Kennedy can be perceived to imply that there possibly was a similar close relationship between Cook and Jobs. In addition to this, Rose used the category ‘man’ in the question where he addressed Cook’s personal views, thus aiming to eliminate answers that would adopt a different perspective.

The conception of leadership being a function that generates change (Cheney et al. 2004: 181) as well as being a source for inspiration and empowerment (Lämsä and Päivike, 2013: 232) is reproduced in the discursive choices made by both Rose and Cook. First, the discourses of change surfaced on many occasions. For example, by referring to the time when Cook was nominated as the CEO of Apple, Rose refers to a situation where change was possible and even unavoidable. On one hand, in this case Cook was not in fact the initiator of change, but rather encountered it himself in the form of the professional position. On the other hand, the reference to the doubts that the stakeholders had during the change of the CEO positions Cook indeed as the embodiment of possible change for Apple. Besides this example, Cook makes a claim for change driven leadership, as he explicitly claims *I get up in the morning... to change things* (data sample 11, lines 15-17). Second, also the inspirational and empowering aspects related to leadership appear in Cook’s talk, though mutually intertwined. Cook’s use of rhetoric devices such as repetition and metaphors in connection with diversity can be seen

as inspirational speech, even though it would not have been specifically intended for that purpose. However, the rhetoric devices do contribute to the portrayal of Apple as an inspirational company with pursuits beyond making monetary profit, such as promoting environmental sustainability, human rights as well as education. These, along with the repeatedly appearing diversity as an important personal and professional value, also reflect empowerment in the sense that Cook discursively recognizes minorities and supports them.

7.2. Findings in relation to previous research

The results of this study present both similar and differing discursive processes in comparison to those detected by Schnurr and Zayts (2011) as well as Svennevig (2011), despite the fact that the contexts of the data were fundamentally different. In the same vein as Schnurr and Zayts (2011) observed that in a work place context both the leader and her subordinates contribute to the construction of the leader identity, the present study illustrates how Rose and Cook jointly raise and negotiate different identity positions. Schnurr and Zayts (2011) found that the leader who was in the focus of their case study used authoritative discursive practices, such as managing the openings and closings of the meeting and assigning tasks, that are associated with leadership and thus construct a leader identity. In contrast, the present study illustrates that a leader identity can be constructed also outside the work place and discourses related to that context. Indeed, in the case of the present study, Cook does not have institutional authority over Rose and thus his identity construction could not be established through authoritative language use in relation to the immediate interlocutor. Instead, the identity construction was grounded on discursive means such as the processes of distinction as well as adequation (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 599-601) that in this case were not so much based on an institutionally based right of giving directions but rather on the construction of a positive image of Cook himself and Apple.

With regard to the challenging of the leader, Schnurr and Zayts' (2011) study displayed more such cases than the present study, which is likely due to the context of the interaction. As pointed out above, the celebrity interviews (Koskela 2011; Koskela 2005) tend to be cooperative and thus conflicts or challenging were not very likely to occur. However, the data of

the present study did display two rather clear cases of Rose challenging Cook. The first case (see data sample 1) deals with Cook's position as the successor of Jobs and thus addresses Cook's professional validity as the CEO of Apple. In the second case (see data sample 12) Rose pointed out a contradiction in Cook's claims in relation to the financial status of Apple. Based on the findings of the present study and Schnurr and Zayts' (2011) study, on one hand, it seems likely that the challenging the leader and thus questioning his/her leader identity is more prone to take place in the work environment rather than in a broadcast celebrity interview. On the other hand, an interview of another genre, such as a news interview, could present more cases of identity challenging.

Furthermore, similar to the findings of the present study, an overt indexing of an identity category was used to discursively position the leader in Schnurr and Zayts' (2011) study. However, in their research the indexing to the leader's identity position was done without the leader being present in the interaction and thus she was unable to deal with it. By contrast, in the present study Cook was able to respond to the indexing of his identity positions and to either accept or reject them.

Analogous to Svennevig's (2011) research, the present study took a conversation analytic approach towards the data. Through the analysis of the relationship between the sequential actions, communication style and identity, Svennevig (2011) concluded that the managers constructed and confirmed their manager identities through the use of discursive practices of institutional authority. He also found out that there are variations in the managers' ways of realizing the authoritative discursive actions, which then lead to the appearance of differences in leadership styles (Svennevig, 2011: 34-35). The leadership styles are realized in the social relations between the interaction participants through the epistemic, normative and emotional dimensions (Svennevig, 2011: 19). In other words, the discursive realization of these dimensions contributes to the establishment of the social relations between the speakers. Even though the present study did not exhibit instances of direct discursive acts of institutional authority due to the context of the interaction, the establishment of other, non-authoritatively based social relations between Cook and Rose was certainly detectable in the data. Similar to Svennevig's (2011) research, the present study demonstrates cases of discursive constitution of the social relation based on the epistemic and normative dimensions. Specifically, Rose's

questions that invoked first-hand knowledge and/or addressed topics that dealt with Cook's expert knowledge created an asymmetrical relationship between Rose and Cook in the sense that Cook was positioned as having an epistemic superiority. Furthermore, I wish to claim that not only were the social relations established between Cook and Rose, but also between Cook and the audience, including the interested parties, such as customers and shareholders. Despite the speculative nature of the following, I argue that regardless of the audience being an indirect interaction participant without the possibility of contributing, its presence undoubtedly influenced the discursive choices that both Cook and Rose made.

Bearing in mind the observations of the previous research and the present study, it is noteworthy that the discursive identity construction seems to take similar forms regardless of the physical and/or situational context, as explained above. Furthermore, based on the findings of the present study, I wish to claim that despite the environment in which the interaction takes place, leader identity construction arises especially through the discursively established social relations between the speakers. This claim supports also the findings of Schnurr and Zayts (2011) and Svennevig (2011) as well as Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) relationality principle.

7.3. Limitations of study and suggestions for future research

I acknowledge that there were factors related to the data and the analysis that limited the study and the findings it produced. First, a more detailed transcription would doubtlessly have provided a deeper insight into the ongoing interaction. The inclusion of paralinguistic features such as intonation, laughter or the tone of the voice in the transcription would likely have enabled a more versatile analysis. Second, since the data of the present study consisted of only one particular interview there was no variation in the data in terms of interview genre or participants. Indeed, the findings present only the identity positions of Tim Cook that emerged in that specific interview. Therefore, the results cannot be generalized to apply to any other leader nor can it be assumed that exactly similar identity positions would arise in other discussions that Cook participates in. With hindsight, including more interviews that represented different interview genres, such as a news interview, would have offered a more varied data with regard to the topics as well as the question and answer turns. Moreover, as

the focus was on the discursive processes of identity construction, the interview structure and related phenomena received less attention. Therefore, some aspects of the interview structure may have been neglected in the analysis. I also wish to mention that in the mentality of social constructionism, the present study is also a product that reflects its writer's perceptions of the world. In other words, it is inescapable that the analysis and the consequent implications and conclusions have been influenced by my prior knowledge and impressions of Tim Cook and Apple as well as Steve Jobs.

In contrast to the present study that investigated identity construction by looking at several different dimensions of Cook's leader identity that arose from the data, future research at the intersection of identity construction and leadership could benefit of focusing on only one dimension of leader identity. Such dimension could be for example ethical leadership in terms of how an ethical leader identity is discursively constructed. In addition, a more business oriented perspective could be possible as it was observed in this study that representing Apple played a part in Cook's leader identity construction. Continuing this line of thought, leader identity construction could be examined in relation to marketing and especially how identity construction is or could be used for promoting a company.

Regardless of its limitations, the present study was able to identify and discuss different discursive means that contributed to the construction of Tim Cook's leader identity. At the same time the study took into account the influence of broadcast interview as institutional and public discourse and the structural features typical of it. The findings show that discursive positioning and the indexical devices as the mechanism of creating identity positions were an appropriate analytical focus for exploring identity construction. The study therefore adds to the discursively oriented research on identity construction and especially to research on the construction of leader identity. Furthermore, the present study showed that the construction of a leader identity takes place also outside the workplace, thus expanding the sphere of contexts in which identity construction can be studied.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources:

Charlie Rose LLC. (2014). *Tim Cook* [broadcast interview].

<https://charlierose.com/videos/18663>

Charlie Rose LLC. (2014). *Tim Cook, pt.2* [broadcast interview].

<https://charlierose.com/videos/23415>

Secondary sources:

Apple Inc. (2016). www.apple.com (Accessed 23 March 2016).

Apple Inc. (2016). Press Info. <http://www.apple.com/pr/bios/tim-cook.html> (Accessed 23 July 2016).

Benwell, B. and Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bondi, M. (2013). Introduction. In J. Bowker and R. Salvi (eds.). *Space, Time and the Construction of Identity: Discursive Indexicality in Cultural, Institutional and Professional Fields*. Bern: Peter Lang AG, 9-21.

Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2005). Identity and Interaction: A Sociocultural Linguistic Approach. *Discourse Studies* [online] 7 (4-5), 585-614.
DOI: 10.1177/1461445605054407

Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2004). Language and Identity. In A. Duranti (ed). *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 369-394.

Burns, J.M., Sorenson, G.J. and Goethals, G.R. (eds.) (2004). *Encyclopedia of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Carroll, A.B. (1991). The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organizational Stakeholders. *Business Horizons* [online] 34 (4), 39-48. <http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=66bb9efa-6945-4b3f-bc07-23160a0d832e%40sessionmgr103&vid=5&hid=124>

Charlie Rose LLC. About. (n.d.a.). <https://charlierose.com/about> (Accessed 4 August 2016).

Cheney, G., Christensen L.T., Zorn, T.E. Jr., and Ganesh, S. (2004). *Organizational Communication in an Age of Globalization*. Long Grove: Waveland Press.

Clayman, S.E. & J. Heritage. (2002). *The news interview. Journalists and public figures on the air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Collins English Dictionary. (2016). www.collinsdictionary.com (Accessed 18 August 2016).
- Cook, T. (2014). Tim Cook Speaks Up. *Bloomberg Businessweek*. (Accessed 4 August 2016). <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-10-30/tim-cook-speaks-up>
- De Fina, A., Schiffrin D., and Bamberg, M., (2006). Introduction. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin, and M. Bamberg (eds). *Discourse and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-23.
- Downes, W. (1998). *Language and society*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Du Bois, J. (2007). The Stance Triangle. In R. Englebretson (ed). *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 139 – 182.
- Englebretson, R. (Ed.) (2007). *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Hodder Education.
- Fairhurst, G. (2007). *Discursive Leadership: In Conversation with Leadership Psychology*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Fairhurst, G. and Grant, D. (2010). The Social Construction of Leadership: A sailing Guide. *Management Communication Quarterly* [online] 24(2), 171-210.
Doi: 10.1177/0893318909359697
- Hackman, M. and Johnson, C. (2009). *Leadership: a communicative perspective* (5th edition). Long Grove: Waveland Press.
- Heritage, J. (2002). The limits of questioning: negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of Pragmatics* [online]. 34 (10), 1427-1446.
doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00072-3
- Holmes, J., Marra, M. and Vine, B. (2011). *Leadership, Discourse, and Ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Holmes, J. (2006). *Gendered talk at work: Constructing social identity through workplace interaction*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Koskela, H. (2005). Invoking different types of knowledge in celebrity interviews. In Koskela (2011). *Constructing knowledge: epistemic practices in three television interview genres*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 163. University of Jyväskylä.
- Koskela, H. (2011). *Constructing knowledge: epistemic practices in three television interview genres*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 163. University of Jyväskylä.
- Llamas, C. and Watt, D. (eds.) (2010). *Language and identities*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Lock, A. and Strong, T. (2010). *Social Constructionism: Sources and Stirrings in Theory and Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, G. (1996). On the “Semi-permeable” character of grammatical units in conversation: conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E.A. Schegloff and S.A. Thompson (eds.). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 238-276.
- Lämsä, A-M. and Päivike, T. (2013). *Organisaatiokäyttämisen perusteet*. Helsinki: Edita.
- Marra, M and Angouri, J. (2011). Investigating the negotiation of identity: a view from the field of workplace discourse. In J. Angouri and M. Marra (eds.), *Constructing Identities at Work*. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-17.
- Northouse, P.G. (2007). *Leadership: theory and practice*. (4th edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Nuolijärvi, P. and Tiittula, L. (2000). *Televisiokeskustelun näyttämöllä. Televisiointitutionaalisuus suomalaisessa ja saksalaisessa keskustelukulttuurissa*. Vaasa: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Ochs, E. Indexing Gender. (1992). In Duranti, A. and Goodwin, C. (Eds). *Rethinking context. Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 335-339.
- Pietikäinen, S. and Mäntynen, A. (2009). *Kurssi kohti diskurssia*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Reid, S. and Ng, S. (2003). Identity, Power, and Strategic Social Categorizations: Theorizing the Language of Leadership. In D. van Knippenberg and M. Hogg (eds). *Leadership and Power: Identity Processes in Groups and Organizations*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 210-224.
- Ribeiro, B.T., (2006). Footing, positioning, voice. Are we talking about the same things? In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin, and M. Bamberg (eds). *Discourse and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 48-82.
- Schnurr, S. and Zayts, O. (2011). Be(com)ing a Leader: A case study of co-constructing professional identities at work. In J. Angouri and M. Marra (eds). *Constructing identities at work*. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 40- 60.
- Svennevig, J. (2011). Leadership style in managers’ feedback in meetings. In J. Angouri and M. Marra (eds). *Constructing identities at work*. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 17-40.
- Silverman, D. (2011). *Interpreting Qualitative Data*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Zimmermann, D. (2008). Identity, context and interaction. In C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe (eds). *Identities in Talk*. London: SAGE Publications, 87-106.

APPENDIX 1

R: Charlie Rose, interviewer

C: Tim Cook, interviewee

Transcription conventions:

***: unclear or inaudible speech

[overlap]: overlapping speech

@: laughter

Rose: Tim Cook is here he is the CEO of Apple he succeeded Steve Jobs in August of 2011 Cook joined Apple in 1998 against the advice of his friends and his own better judgment he has said Apple in early 1998 was very different than the Apple of today the company had been losing sales for years and was commonly considered to be on the verge of extinction he has also said working at Apple was never in any plan that I had outlined for myself but was without a doubt the best decision that I ever made on Tuesday Cook announced what he called the next chapter in Apple story at the same venue where Steve Jobs introduced the McIntosh personal computer thirty years ago he unveiled three new products the iPhone six the iPhone six plus and the Apple watch he also launched Apple Pay a mobile payment system that aims to do something about the credit card I am pleased to have Tim Cook at this table for the first time welcome

Cook: Charlie it's great to be here thank you for inviting me

R: oh we've got much to talk about you call it the next chapter why

C: the Apple watch is the most personal device we've ever created the uh I think it takes us into a whole different area uh we had a we had an intense team working on this for three years and so we explored many different things and as the product came uh to it became not only the time piece that you would expect but a device that can do many different things including really an an whole new way of communicating and connecting with people and also it has a health and fitness component that we think has uh you know it could *** profound

R: take your blood pressure and lots of other things

C: well it can it can uh it'll start with heart

R: heart beat ***

C: right and it will uh be a sort of a personal trainer for you you can set goals and reward you for achieving certain things you can choose to interact with your doctor you can choose to combine it with other apps on the phone and get a full view of your health and so it's a whole new area for Apple and uh we think you know we're all about making great products and enriching people's lives and we see it as allowing us to do that on a whole different level and then of course iPhone six and iPhone six plus these are the best iPhones we've ever done and I think I think you'll look great you'll have in front of you there

R: this is my iPhone and we'll just show look at the size of it this is the iPhone six ***

C: this phone we've ever done

R: thinnest

C: is the thinnest we've ever done the screen is just to die for it's super-fast it's lightning fast uh has a whole uh whole new round of wireless technology it's so it's screaming fast on the wireless networks it's it's really unbelievable and it feels unbelievable on your hand hold it it's it's something it's really unbelievable the the design Johnny and his team did such a incredible job here it's really seamless between the glass it's like a singular form

R: yes but did back to what's next I mean this this represents a continuation of the iPhone

C: well a leapfrog I would say uh but yes it's an it's a iPhone six it's not the first iPhone uh but it's the biggest advancement ever in iPhone history and so we think that uh the upgrade cycled here and the number of people that will switch from from other smart phones it will be enormous

R: were you challenged by what Samsung does and what it has in the development of this size personal uh smart phone

C: no we honestly Charlie we could've done a larger iPhone years ago uh it's never been about uh just making a larger phone it's been making it's been about making a better phone in every single way and so we ship things when they're ready and we think that both the display technology here uh the battery technology *** but everything else and the software you can on here you can still this phone one-handed because you can tap it twice and the screen will come down and so the ingenuity here and the fact that we've integrated software hardware and services which I think only Apple can do uh this it's this phone now is the time for it

R: there are other watches on the market

C: sure

R: Samsung and others

C: sure

R: is the philosophy of Apple we don't have to be first we wanna be prepared to be the best

C: the the philosophy has always been to be the best not the first if you look back in time at Apple uh the iPod the iPod was not the first mp3 player uh it was arguably the best and arguably the first modern one but not the first the iPhone was not the first smart phone Blackberry was shipping phones Palm was shipping phones iPhone was the first modern smart phone and then if you look at iPad tablets were shipping a decade before and yet iPad arguably was the first modern tablet and the first one that met commercial in any any level of commercial success the watch which I'm wearing here will be the first [watch]

R: [may]I see that

C: you may see that

R: @@@

C: uhm and so here

R: *** this is that's a real uhm

C: so you can see

R: you can't get this today you can get them in

C: you can get it *** early next year but you can see some of the apps I've got on here I may have some things on [***]

R: [so]what is interesting is that outside entrepreneurs can design apps for this watch

C: yes we've opened it up to developers and one of the reasons we wanted to announce it before we're shipping is so that developers will have time to to develop software for it and we think that you know bet some first few days I would say there's gonna be a lot of stuff available for it

R: there's a fashion item aspect to this too

C: there is

R: Johnny brought in a friend Marc Newson

C: he did he did and uh Marc is unbelievable he's another great addition to the Apple team but Johnny and team recognized that to wear something it had to be incredibly personal it had to reflect your taste and your and express what you wanted to express about yourself sort of like uh your clothes and your shoes you're not gonna wear the same thing everybody else does and so most tech companies I think look at this as only technology we recognized that technology itself isn't sufficient that it had to have a style element it had to be something that you're proud of wearing I mean this is connected to your body and and so [I]

R: [it] makes the computer personal

C: it makes it very personal uh that doesn't take away from the function of it the function of it is killer I mean this there is a computer on a chip in here you know it's a first one we've ever done there's a four five hundred components wrapped in one uh it has everything from the GPU to CPU to memory and all the rest

R: you can't have an iPhone for it to work

C: it requires and iPhone yes so because they've been designed to work together and so things like uh messages to choosing the cellular system to pull down your messages however if you go for a run and you don't wanna carry your iPhone uh music is also in your watch and so with a Bluetooth headset you can run and listen to your music without your iPhone

R: the healthcare business is a huge sector of our economy this is your entrée into that in some way

C: yes this is huge***because uhm I think and I'm not looking at it just from the uhm the monetary piece of it is we we do wanna enrich people's lives so we wanna make great products that enrich people's lives neither one is sufficient by itself we wanna do both and so arguably with healthcare there is a wide open field to make some really profound contributions and so our entry into this is we announced health kit in June health kit allows uhh if you want if you wish on your phone you can begin to take all of the data that's in all of

your health apps and aggregate those you might elect just to use that yourself you might elect to interact with your doctor on them and so now the sudden we've also got a device that gathers certain fitness data about you and yet so this is yet another way to begin to build a comprehensive view of your life which should empower you to take care of yourself over time and when you need help it empowers you to take certain data to your doctor uh to get help from them all all while guarding your privacy so that nobody's getting the data if you don't want them to have the data nobody's sharing the data if you don't want them to share the data and no we're not keeping it

R: in introducing these products uh there was the *** to the past as I've suggested the arena where you had it is where Steve introduced thirty years ago McIntosh uh when you introduced the watch you famously said one more thing words that Steve had used uhm where is Steve in all this

C: well he is in my heart and he is deep in Apple's dna his spirit will always be the foundation of the company I literally think about him every day uh his office is still left as it was

R: on the fourth floor

C: On the fourth floor uh he's name is still on the door and we still if you think about the things that Steve stood for at a macro level he stood for innovation he stood for the simple not the complex he knew that Apple should only enter areas where we could control the primary technology uh all of these things are still deep in our company there's still things that we very much believe the strive for perfection for being the best for only doing the best products for staying focused the fact that despite this table being so small that you and I are sitting at you could put every Apple product on it every single one that we ship today and yet this year revenues will be uh you know approximately a hundred and eighty billion there's probably no other company on the face of the earth that could say that most companies begin to do larger and larger and larger portfolios because you always it's so easy to add it's hard to add it it's hard to stay focused and yet we know we'll only do our best work if we stay focused and so you know the hardest decisions we make are all the things not to work on uh frankly because there's lots of things we'd like to work on that we have interest in but we know we can't do everything great

R: is TV one of those

C: well TV is one that we continue to have great interest in uh so I choose my words carefully there but uh you know TV is one of those things that if we're really honest it's stuck back in the seventies uh to think about how much your life has changed and all the things around you that that has changed and yet TV when you go in your living room to watch the TV or wherever it might be it almost feels like you're rewinding the clock and you've entered a time capsule and you're going backwards the interface is terrible I mean it's awful and you watch things when they come on unless you remember to record them

R: so why don't you fix that

C: well yeah you know I don't wanna get into what we're doing in the future but umm it we've taken steps with Apple TV and Apple TV now has over twenty million users and so it's it has uh far exceeded the hobby label that we that we placed on it and we've added more and

more con to it um content to it this year and so there's increasingly more things that you can do on there uh but this is scenery we continue to look at

R: was this a question for you among some investors among some consumers among some people who write about technology there was the question uh Steve was a visionary can Tim continue the Apple tradition of creating new products every four years or less can he reach into the future does he have that kind of make-up did that concern you did you think about that were you committed to prove that Apple had a future beyond the groundwork that Steve Jobs had laid

C: when he called me one weekend uh in august of eleven and he said I'd like to talk and I said o- okay uh

and I go when and he goes now [laughter] I said I'll be right over uh and he told me he said that I've been thinking a lot Apple's never had a professional transition at CEO uh I'm determined that we will have one now I want you to be the CEO and honestly I didn't see it coming

R: you did not see it coming

C: I know you I know you look at me in disbelief but but uh you can say I was in denial or whatever but I thought I thought I felt Steve was getting better uh he was still at home but I felt he was getting better I was seeing him regularly and umm I guess at the end of the day I always thought he would bounce he always had he had had some incredible lows in his health and he had always bounced and I always believed he would and so it took me a a little a by surprise for that I mean he had he had talked me about being CEO before an so I always knew it was his long term thinking

R: that you would become a CEO

C: that I'd become a CEO

R: but not then

C: not that specific moment and so uhh he and I had a discussion back and forth about uh cause I was I was testing on him I said well you know what kind of things do you wanna do as chairman versus me did and uhh just sort of having a good banter with him and uh I go well I said for example ads do you want me to just do the ones I think are right and do you wanna be involved in it and he said well I hope you'll ask my opinion on some things @@@ but he I thought Charlie on that day that he would be chairman for a long time that I'd be CEO for a long time and that we would continue to work together and so and uh he knew when he chose me uh that I wasn't like him that I'm not a carbon copy of him uhh he and so he obviously thought through that deeply about uh who he wanted to lead Apple and so that I have always felt the responsibility of and I've uh wanted desperately to continue his legacy and uh the Apple I deeply love and so I I from the onset I wanted to pour every ounce that I had in myself into the company and uh but in terms of of being everything he was I've never had that objective I've never had the objective of being like him because I knew uh the only person I can be is the person I am

R: right

C: right and uh I'm not an actor I'd be terrible at Hollywood and umm and so that's what I've done I've I've tried to be the best uh Tim Cook I can be and uh I think that the reality is that Apple has always had incredible contributors at very high levels Johnny's been there forever and contributing editing incredible level as has uh Greg and Jeff and Dan and you just go around the table we have a new CFO now there's uh this group of people and we've recruited Angela you know Angela now runs retail Angela Ahrendts she is fantastic this level of people are are capable of doing incredible things and you know it's a privilege of lifetime to work with them

R: you have a picture in your office of Martin Luther King and a picture of Robert F Kennedy Robert F Kennedy after his brother's assassination someone said umm the difficulty for him well he'll have no RFK as he was to his brother Jack so I might ask the question do you have a Tim as you were Tim to Steve

C: I think each person if you're a CEO the most important thing is to ha- to me is to pick people around that aren't like you that complement you because you want to build a puzzle you don't wanna stack chicklets up and have everyone be the same and so I believe in diversity with a capital d and that's diversity in thought and uh diversity in any way that you wanna measure it and so the people that surround me are not like me they have skills that I don't have I may have some that they don't have what we do as a team collectively are able to do some incredible things and it's because we collaborate and I see as one of my key things in life is to make sure that we collaborate in an incredible level because we run a a company functionally we're not like the typical big company that has innumbered divisions and innumbered P and L's everybody is a functional expert and then we collectively to get things done we work together as a team because the work really happens horizontally in our company not vertically products are horizontal it takes hardware plus software plus services to make a killer product and so all of these people if you were to line us up and talk to everyone, you know several of them, we're all different and that's the power of it is that we're not trying to put everyone through a car wash and so that they look alike talk alike think alike at the end of the day we argue and debate if you were to come to our executive team meetings on Mondays uh you'd hear a lot of discussion and debate about something we don't always agree on everything uh but we have great respect for one another and we trust one another and we complement one another and that makes it all work

R: did the team, you leading the team, have any question that you could accomplish what you did knowing those questions were out there about the future of Apple

C: I think for me, I can't talk about what everybody else thinks, but for me one great skill I have is blocking noise and so I I typically read and listen to things that are deep and challenging uh and intellectual in nature not the just the noise I think if you get caught up in the noise as a CEO you're gonna be a terrible CEO because there's so much noise out there in the world that everybody is on the sidelines saying what you should do shouldn't do uh it's sad it's sort of like the old uh Roosevelt uh quote in the arena

R: right Teddy Roosevelt

C: yes

R: credit belongs to the man in the arena who gets dirty and all of those things

C: yes well I'm the dirty one and you have to block the noise and and so the question I think is did I have doubts the answer is no and did the executive team have doubts I think you can see it in our products that we were all betting on each other in a big way

R: but that goes back to my original question, Apple is becoming it's building on it's tradition but it's doing things different Steve said to you don't ever ask yourself what would Steve do correct

C: he did

R: don't ask that do what you think you need to do based on the circumstances that you face so is Apple becoming more open) uh I mentioned the fact that people who have *** can do it for the watch you are now engaged in partnerships with people like IBM you've made an acquisition tell me where is Apple going

C: are we more open yes

R: are we engaged by [partnerships] are we

C: [yes]

C: well

R: we interest in enterprise because we can partner with IBM

C: I think uhh IBM is that's a great one to talk about for one because I think that it will give you an insight into how we look at things and and we we this is probably different in the past is uh we look at these products and the iPads that aren't here and we think we can change the way people work we've changed the consumer's life we've changed the ways students learn and teachers teach but when you get to the working environment the change that we've made to us isn't significant enough and so we begin to ask ourselves why why haven't we done more the real answer is in the applications there's not enough apps that have been written for verticals for very deep verticals like what the airline pilot does what the bank teller does down at the level of the job and so we began to ask ourselves should we do this or should we partner or should we just forget it and I didn't want to forget it because this is a way to enrich people's lives in a big way to change the way people work I mean most of our lives is spent working and certainly our apps are changing the way I work but I'm not seeing it much in other places and so we begin looking out and thinking about well who could we partner with and Ginny and I been talking about some other things for a while I have uh great respect for her great trust in her [I think

R: [*** CEO of IBM

C: she's a CEO of IBM she's fantastic and we began to talk about this area you know this is an area where uh they've got things that we don't have they had deep vertical knowledge of many different verticals right they have a huge sales force and so IBM brings significant enterprise knowledge to the table we bring the products that enterprise want and so we have something they don't have w- we don't also compete on anything to me this is the perfect marriage there's no there's no friction there's just we have what they need they have what we need together we can provide something to customers that is blow-away (?) and so IBM is uh in the process with our help of designing many different apps for many different verticals from uh banking to all the different financial services to pharmaceutical to aerial space and

and manufacturing and so and so forth uh and they had to go to market that we don't have and so this is an this is an area where I think that everybody's gonna win uh we're gonna win IBM's gonna win and more importantly than all than both of us the customer's gonna win

R: why did you think you had to buy headphone manufacturer

C: in Beats what we saw is several things we saw [-

R: [talent

C: is ta- talent that uhm I'm super impressed with uh Jimmy and Dre are of all the charts creative geniuses uh they also had teams underneath them that I really liked uh Jimmy has a deep knowledge of the musical industry Dre knows artists Dre is an artist and they had started an a subscription service and the subscription service you know some people think they're all alike well let me tell you I was I went into the things skeptically

R: to the acquisition

C: not to the acquisition into their service cause Jimmy had told me how great it was and so one night I'm sitting playing with theirs versus some others and all the sudden it dawns on me that when I listen to theirs for a while I feel completely different and the reason is they've recognized that human creation was important in the subscription service the sequencing of songs you listen to affect how you feel it's hard to describe but you know it when you feel it and and so that night I couldn't sleep that night and so I was thinking we we need to do this they also have I think they've done a fabulous job with their brand and in the headphone business it's a fast-growing business they went into it not too long ago and you know done really well however they needed a global footprint we have a global footprint they they have been primarily U.S. not solely U.S. but primarily U.S. and so I felt we could get a subscription service we could get incredible talent and that I think we can all put our heads together and do some things that are beyond what either of us are currently doing and we can get a fast growing business and you know the financially is not the only element of looking at it at all but next year or in our fiscal year which is uh about to start it's accretive when's the last time you've heard of a technology CEO saying that they were doing an acquisition that was accretive idea I mean it just doesn't happen and so I think it's wonderful to get the influx of talent the different perspectives it's this idea of diversity uh that I use in a big way uh I I think it's really gonna help us and uh I am hundred percent sold on the subscription music sub-subscription service and of course we can scale it where Beats would have had more difficult time because they're a small company

R: is the new chapter at Apple also defined by the fact that you're moving away from just being essentially a hardware company

C: y-you know I I wouldn't say that we were never just a hardware company

R: okay

C: so I would I would define [-

R: [a significant part of your revenue come from the iPhone for example

C: but the a significant part of the iPhone is the software and the services it's just that we don't split out the price between a hardware and the software and the services

R: it's all part of your own ecosystem

C: it's part of our own ecosystem and we do that because it all works together it just works when you do it that way when you split the two you wind up with uh wh- I mean think about what happened in the PC area when you had a windows in a separate OEM that was doing hardware and then somebody else that was doing apps and you have a problem you're pulling your hair out you call the help desk and the help desk tells you to call another help desk and that help desk tells you to call somebody else and that the other guy doesn't seem to have a help desk so we recognized early on that these kind of devices you really need to have a womb to tomb view of them for the customer's sake and so if somebody calls us it's our problem we're not passing the buck and uh and so I I think you get a much better customer experience

R: but do you miss opportunity take advance of a whole group of people because

C: but look at our ecosystem Charlie I mean we've got uh nine million registered developers and so we're not having a problem getting people to develop for our platform if you were at our conference in June in San Francisco there's developers there from almost every country in the world and they're writing [***

R: [so have access to innovation

C: we have incredible access to innovation and and we also view it and treat it it's a privilege to work with developers we do and so we treat them like it's a privilege and in from their point of view they they get to design something from a company that has over 90 percent of their customers on one version of the operating system so we're not fragmented like Android is right we've got we'll release uh iOS8 next week and right now iOS7 the one we just released a year ago 92 percent of our customers are running iOS7 if you looked at a comparable number for Android it's very low it's extremely low if you looked at a comparable number for Windows on the PC side very low and so you can really write software to the latest or write your app to the latest software versus spending your time on all of these versions and iterations and so forth so it's great from their point of view and they get to sell their product worldwide think about how it used to be if you were a developer you had to go negotiate with every retailer and there's no global retailers and so you were negotiating in every country in the world trying to get your product on the shelf here you can push a button we review it and it quickly gets in the app store and it's in that app store in a 155 countries I mean it's really shocking the the jobs that this thing has created is unbelievable w- we're now between the people that we employ directly and the developers and the developers are big piece of this um we're responsible for a million jobs in United States and a lot of that are people that have concluded to write apps

R: who is your competition

C: well uhh Google

R: peop- people will say Samsung instantly because of the products and they make smart phones

like this not like this but they make smart phones they have the Android operating system which is largest operating system in the world

C: well w- Google supplies that too

R: right

C: and so uh I think I would say [-

R: [Google is your competition

C: Google is the would be the top and then they enable many people in the hardware business like Samsung

R: right

C: and Samsung is the best of the hardware uh companies in the uh Android sphere uh

R: Google's competition who else

C: hh y- you know who else umm

R: ***or amazon in terms of most people's considerations amazon apple facebook

C: yeah I don't consider Facebook a a competitor I I consider Facebook a partner

R: right

C: we're not in the social networking business

R: and will not be

C: uhh we have no plans to be in the social networking uh area uh we partner with both Facebook and Twitter and we have integrated both of them into the operating system and so we work closely with both of them so that our customers can get access in a different and unique way to their to their services and we like both companies [-

R: [amazon

C: uh amazon we don't work with that much uh we have little relationship there uh they sell as you know they sells they came up with a phone

R: right

C: uhh you don't see it in a lot of places uh they have some tablets uh but they're they're not a product company Apple's a product company and and so in the long term will they become a bigger product company I don't know you'd have to ask Jeff what his plans are uhm but but when I when I think of competitor I I would think of Google as as the

R: so all the successes you have pointed to, when you do something that's not as much of a success and I'm obviously thinking of maps

C: mm-hmm

R: and you look at it what did you do wrong

C: oh we screwed up to put it bluntly uh we there were many screw-ups in that one not just one uh there's many and we've learned and corrected and are continuing to invest in maps because our our our fundamental premise that maps were really key to Apple is the same when uh when we made that call many years ago uh but we did screw up on the on the release uh it should not have happened like it did it shouldn't have come out uh and you know sometimes when you're uh running fast you slip and you fall and I I think the best thing you can do is get back up and say I'm sorry and you try to remedy the situation and you work like hell to make the product right uh if you're probably never making a mistake you're probably not doing enough

R: I mentioned that at the beginning of the interview the fact that when you made the decision in 1998 about Apple you had some reservations but at the same time during your interview with Steve you said something like this, I was prepared within five minutes to throw caution to the wind, what did he say that made you believe this company is the place for Tim Cook

C: it was uh it was an it was an interesting meeting uh I've gotten a call several times from the search people that he had employed and I kept saying no I I was at Compaq I was happy and or thought I was, and umm and they were persistent and so I I finally thought you know I'm gonna go out and take the meeting Steve created the whole industry that I'm in I'd love to meet him

R: yeah exactly

C: and so I'm honestly going into this meeting

R: there's no downside to this

C: well I'm just thinking I'm gonna meet him and umm and all the sudden he's talking about his strategy and his vision and what he was doing was going uhh hundred percent into consumer when everybody else in the industry had decided you couldn't make any money in consumers so they were headed to servers and storage in the enterprise and I thought I'd always thought that following the herd was a not a good thing it was a terrible thing right

R: ***

C: you're either gonna lose big or lose but those those are the two options, he was doing something totally different and he told me a little about the design enough to get me really interested and he was describing what later would be called the imac and the way that he talked and the way the chemistry was in the room, it was just he and I, and I could tell I can work with him and I looked at the problems that Apple had and I thought you know I can make a contribution here and working with him and this is a privilege of a lifetime and so all the sudden I thought I'm doing it I'm going for it and you certainly you heard that there's a voice in your your ear that says go west young man go west, I was young at the time, but but you know you come back and you try to do the things people do with spreadsheets and stuff and none of it makes sense it didn't make sense uhh and yet my gut said go for it and I listened to my gut I'd there was literally uhh no one around me that was advising me to do it

R: but in your speech in Auburn in your Christmas speech you spoke of intuition

C: yes and it's that's what I mean by gut

R: yeah

C: uhh err my intuition was telling me loudly to go and it wasn't based on uhh you know as an engineer you wanna write down pros and cons and and the financial part you wanna look at and you want it to say go you wanna it sort of validate the decision that your gut's *** and it never did because you know Michael Dell had made a comment weeks earlier that if he were the CEO, and he was he was a very, is and was, a very respected CEO uhh that if he were the CEO of Apple he would uhh close it down and get the money back to the shareholders

R: yeah

C: that it had no future

R:*** he really said that yeah

C: you know and he was being he was just saying what everybody thought

R: they didn't know Steve Jobs

C: they didn't know Steve and so in that meeting I concluded all of those guys are wrong they don't know him and they don't know his vision and they don't they see things in the traditional way which Steve never did you know he was always looking well beyond the norm

R: and looking at things with beginner's eyes

C:yes he had a gift for that he clearly had a gift for that and he took that gift and embedded that in the company it wasn't a gift that he kept to himself and so one of I one of the, I loved many things about him as a as a dear friend, but he was also a great mentor he was a great teacher uhh this is something that's never written about him but uhh what what he left in not just me but many of us is what he taught us he was one of the best mentors in the in the world

R: this is more than perfectionism

C: oh it's much more than that no it's much more than that because that's just that's holding the bar so high that it's very hard to hit and but no it's teaching and it's teaching uhh and making sure people are learning and him taking such an interest he's going out of his way to do this uhh and I I saw him do that over many years with not just me but many people and I I think it's missed it's a huge huge part of what he did that's missed and uhh most of the things that I've read

R: the misconception misses that the teaching aspect

C: it does, that and the human aspect of him he was an incredible human being and uhh I think you know I've never read anything that really[-

R: [captured

C: [captured him uhh or captured the Steve I knew uhh

R: one of the products you introduced is Apple Pay

C: yeah

R: you have a relationship with credit cards in creating Apple Pay

C: yeah

R: some say why don't you just go around them you know be disruptive

C: as it turns out people love their credit cards and so I don't know what credit cards you have

R: too many

C: but many people love their credit cards because they might love that if you collect airline points

R: right

C: or there's something about it that's sticky and [so-

R: [so you thought -

R: go ahead

C: so we look at the industry and we said you know people like that part and so we're about making the user's life better making the experience better we saw all the mobile payment stuff that had been done as none of it was making anybody's better it was more about creating a business model for someone else to make money we started with the user and we said what do they really want well they don't nobody wants to carry a wallet you you don't want another thing you have to remember to put in your uh pants when you walk out the door you don't want another thing to lose you don't really want this n- this card with exposed numbers on it that has a huge security risk on it and and so we fixed the security issue our system is much more secure than the traditional credit card system is we kept the thing that people liked which is they do love their card and we said we don't want any of this data so we're not doing what other companies are doing we don't wanna know what you're buying we don't wanna know where you're buying it we don't wanna collect all this stuff on Charlie I don't wanna know where where you're spending your nights and so we fireball all the stuff we don't keep it it's not on our servers and and so we keep what's great and fixed what wasn't the retailers love it because it's a far more efficient way for people to check out

R: tell us how it works

C: it's very simple and so if you take uh one of our phones this is iPhone6 literally all you have to do this one's not wired but if it were all I would have to do is touch my uh touch the I I iTouch or the touch ID rather and hold it within a proximity of the terminal and that's it it's done the transaction is finished because you've authenticated with your fingerprint

R: right right

C: right which it's hard to steal a fingerprint and you've not pulled out a card you've not jostled through your wallet for something you may have lost you haven't had to run your credit card through a machine several times in for it to reject your card none of that is done it's as simple as boom boom it's done

R: technology is a very global thing as you will know as well as anyone uh emerging markets are where a lot of people are coming to the middle class and they have buying power

C: absolutely

R: China Brazil lots of other places how do you see that market uh and how does Apple do well in that market

C: well in China if you look back at the last year (unclear) business in Greater China is about 30 billion and to my knowledge that's larger than any American company certainly in technology maybe largest of any period uh we've put a lot of energy in there for for years uh we've had very fast growth but you're exactly right what ultimately what's causing that is you have a significant number of people moving into the middle class large numbers la-unprecedented large numbers this is also happening in Brazil it's happening in Turkey it's happening in uh Thailand it's happening in Malaysia it's happening in many different places Indonesia is beginning ***

R: does price point become an issue though in in terms of people who don't have the same uh per capita income as ***United States

C: sometimes

C: yeah ce- ce- certainly uh income uh is a gating factor uh but u- there's a lot of retailers that will allow smart phones to be paid for over time in China uh there's a subsidy on smart phones if you sign a contract much like the United States and so there are ways to make it more affordable also this is iPhone6 and 6plus but we also sell uh iPhone5S and iPhone5C

R: yes

C: and all of these just got lower prices on Tuesday [-

R: [because of the entry of the new products

C: because of the entry of the new products and so you will find in the emerging markets uh the mix of product sales are sometimes different in those markets versus other markets

R: you spend a lot of money on research

C: we spend a lot of money on R&D and that number has ramped dramatically that's true some of that is spent for things that aren't shipping yet like the Apple watch is an example of that you know we've have announced it now so that everybody can see it but we've been spending money for three years on it because we started the development about three years ago and there's obviously other things that we're working on right now isn't apparent and so uh we're always doing that we're and we're also working on things like this that that that is apparent

R: here's what's interesting about you and about Steve Jobs uh [***

C: [we're a bit secretive @@@

R: yeah exactly @@@ exactly it's hard to get something

C: @@@

R: uh there's also this though John Doerr told me this story once about going with Steve into a camera shop and you know Steve stood there and sort of asked to see this camera that camera and he said boy we could make a better camera you get a sense that that you guys have ideas for products that might be part of the future uh which no one knows about but you've been s- you're thinking about it you're looking ahead saying [***

C: [there are products that we're working on that no one knows about yes that that haven't been rumored about yet yes

uhh and part of- some of those are going to come out and be blow-away probably and some of those we will probably decide you know that one we're gonna stop and so we kick around a lot of things internally and we might start something and get down the road a little bit and have different have a different idea I mean Steve told a story on the uh publicly f-about the iPad iPad was started way in advance when it came out many years before it was put on a shelf

R: yeah this was not a new idea

C: it was not a new idea it was it was shelved because of the idea to make to make iPhone

R: uhh

C: and the team was was reallocated on iPhone and then the iPhone came out and after iPhone got up and running brought the iPad out and so there are always things that we're looking at that are drawing our dee expense where there's not associated revenue [***

R: [and there may be ***
you may find something along the route to doing somethings that you wanna do that you wouldn't have imagined or gotten there unless you started on that road

C: that's right you- a lot of what leads to innovation is curiosity it's curiosity to begin pulling a string and you see where it takes you and a lot of what we do isn't apparent to the public in the beginning where it's going to lead like touch ID as an example when we we did touch ID a year ago people thought a lot of people just thought touch ID was a way to get into your phone and it's very cool at doing that but then we also said well you can buy Apple- you could buy stuff from Apple with it obviously we the entire time we were planning to do a much broader roll-out for mobile payments with touch ID but we invested in a lot of things with it that have long tentacles and you know for decades or so not just for point products we-point products don't thrill us

R: uh hacking of iCloud cost a lot of people

C: it wasn't hacked uh there's uh there's a misunderstanding about this uh if you if you think about what hacking iCloud would mean it's it means somebody could it means somebody would get into the cloud and could go phish around in people's accounts that didn't happen what happened was that like let's take you- it didn't happen to you I hope but let's take you as an example somebody could say uh you know I mean I know Charlie's ID from somehow

R: I know his e-mail perhaps

C: maybe it's his e-mail and they may guess your password or that's not as likely they might fish it how do you phish it I could pretend to be somebody else and you could unknowingly give me your password and that happens on the internet too many times today that's the number one issue by far and it's not just it's not an Apple issue this is an internet issue you just saw that this happened to I think millions of gmail users

R: right

C: they were phished my understanding is it wasn't a breach there either of the infrastructure it was a phishing expedition there are lots of bad people that do this and what we said was instead of just saying hey there's lot of bad people who @@ do this we need to figure out wh-

how can try to protect our customers on this that's our top goal and and so we're working internally about how to bring more awareness to these schemes and and try to do things to to

R: in a public information process I mean w-

C: some of it is that some of it is like the old umm like an old public service announcement used to be we have to do that in in addition we have to do things uh where it notifies the customer quickly if it does happen that's reactive and you know we don't want it to happen at all but if it does you'd probably wanna know instantly and so there're there're things like that and some other things that I I can't describe right now where we can we think we can make a contribution beyond just doing just making sure the cloud's not hacked

R: this is different than the hacking of ***

C: very different it's totally different

R: that was part one about two-part conversation with Tim Cook the CEO of Apple part two will be one Monday we'll talk about many things including this question what comes after the internet thank you for joining us see you on Monday

R: a couple of bigger questions beyond Apple uhm you once said to me at a conference and I was that ready to go ready and interview someone big *** I said what do you think I should ask and you said either facetiously or not ask them what comes after the internet

C: I remember telling you that I remember your reaction you were like this um I wanted you to ask them because I wanted to hear what they were going to say uh I think you have to think about things like that and uh sometimes in the valley you can all everybody can get so fixated on one thing and lots of companies pop up and and do those things and you're not thinking enough about the next next next thing uh and so it's it's something that that we think about and uh I don't know what the answer is I don't know what the answer is we you know we always have some ideas here and there

R: well give me one

C: well I don't wanna give you one I don't want anybody else to copy it we have people who do the copying so I don't wanna help them do that

R: in this country we've had to uh because of Edward Snowden and other incidents try to come to grips with the idea of freedom privacy and national security where is that debate

C: I think it's a tough balance and I don't think that the country or the government found the right balance uh I think they aired too much on the collect everything side uh and I think that the president and the administration is is committed to kind of moving that pendulum back uh however you don't want it's probably not right to to not do anything and so I think it's a careful line to walk you wanna make sure you're protecting the American people uh but you don't wanna take there's no reason to collect information on you or [

Rose:

[but they people

C:
point nine nine percent of other people

[or ninety nine

R: lot people say you know have said to me *** a whole ton of information already out there that are in the possession of companies like google like so many other companies that that information is there and they worry about that too much personal information is out there and who has access to it that kind of thing which is different than the national security implications of what you do to listen in on people's phone conversations or what technology companies do to provide lists or whatever might happen

C: we've taken a very different view at this than a lot of other companies have is our view is when we design a new service we try not to collect data so we're not reading your email we're not reading your imessage if the government laid a subpoena on us to get your imessages we can't provide it it's encrypted and we don't know the key and so we and so it's sort of the door is closed uh but our business Charlie is based on selling these our business is not based on having information about you you're not our product our product is are these and this watch and macs and so forth and so we run a very different company I think I think everyone has to ask how do companies make their money follow the money and if they're making money mainly by collecting *** of personal data I think you have a right to be worried and you should you should really understand what's happening to that data and the companies I think should be very transparent about it uh from our point of view you can see what we're doing on the credit card thing we don't want it we're not in that business uh I'm offended by lots of it and in so you know I I I think people have a right to privacy uh so I I think that's going to be very key topic over the next year or so and uh we'll we'll reach higher and higher levels of urgency as more and more incidents happen I think that the for us in the Snowden thing just to go along on that just for a moment is what we wanted was we wanted instantly to be totally transparent because there was there were rumors and things being written in the press that that people had uh back doors to our servers *** none of that is true zero we would never allow that to happen that would have to cart us out in a box before we would do that if we ever give information and we finally got an agreement uh from uh the the administration to release how many times we had national security orders on Apple and in a six month period and we had to release a range because they won't allow us to release the exact number is between zero and two hundred and fifty that's the lowest number you can quote zero to two hundred and [fifty

R: [and then *** could have been two hundred and forty nine

C: correct but you so you can tell we have hundreds of millions of customers so it's a very rare instance that uh there's been any data asked one of the reasons is we don't keep a log you know so we're we're not the treasure trove of of places to come to

R: I mentioned Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King in your office tell me the values that you consider most important beyond the culture and the values of Apple Tim Cook the man

C: treating people uh with dignity uh treating people the same uh that everyone deserves a basic level of human rights regardless of their color regardless of their religion regardless of their sexual orientation regardless of their gender uh that everyone deserves uh respect and and you know I'll I'll fight for it until my toes point out and I think those two guys if you look back in history I think they're not the only two there were many that that really but they they laid their lives on the line and they knew they were doing it and I had the just tremendous respect for both of them and so I do I look at them every day because I think I think for people uh they're still too many cases in the world and in the united states where there's a

class kind of structure or we're voting or or people are trying to convince uh each other that this other group of people don't deserve the same rights and I think it's crazy I think it's un-American I think it doesn't belong and I also see as a as a businessman in Apple I can see the value in diversity I see a tremendous company that because we don't judge each other because we don't have different rights and so forth because we allow anyone in the front door uh I see a company that uh we're that that this inclusion really inspires innovation and an so I see the value of it from that point of view as well but from a more from a human point of view I feel it's just an right and I've seen I've seen it not occur and I've seen the devastation of it notoccurring and and so I wanna do everything I can do to to not only [-

R: [one
defense of this discrimination is that you've not been able not to have access to full range of not only of humanity but also you're doing a huge disservice to yourself uh because of the human potential

C: I agree

R: anything that restricts the human potential is doing a disservice to you and to everybody around you

C:I agree it is not I's not what the country was based on you know I get back to that it's uh there's some basic level of rights that our forefathers had the insight uh to think about and we're still fighting two hundred and fifty years a little less than that I guess afterwards to see that vision but it's worth the fight and uh we've certainly come a long way since uh doctor King's speech in the mall but we have a lot further to go we have a lot further to go

R: and finally there's the threat to the planet

C: there is and this is one that uh we're putting a lot of energy in we [-

R: [we at Apple

C: we at Apple uh you know we wanna leave the world better we found it and for what does that mean for us it means that we take toxins out of all of our products we've done that I think we're still the only consumer electronics company that's done that it means that we focus on renewable energy and so we have a data center that people thought we could never get to a hundred percent renewable energy there it's just too much of it's too much we'd never get there w-we're there we have it in Maiden North-Carolina you should go see it uh working with both the state and uh working with our the talent within Apple we were able to pull that off uh we we've got other data centers hundred percent renewable we're building the headquarters our new headquarters it'll be hundred percent renewable and we're working on our supply chain and we're we're digging deep within the supply chain and we've got initiatives going on there as well and so to me uh I know some people have issues with this but to me it's all about leaving the world better than you found it and I don't know about you but when I when I spend my spare time when I have any I like to be out in the national park and reminding myself of the land and the beauty of it and you can go to different places and see that slipping away and uh it's not right and we owe it to the generation to the younger generation to solve this and not to keep turning and looking the other way

R: those same values also ought to be applied to the people who make Apple products wherever they live and wherever they work

C: absolutely and you can see what we've done there we we have trained now well over million probably two million people on their rights and we're you and I have a good view of what our rights are that's not that's not the same in every country in the world and so the one of the best ways you can make sure that things are happening well is that people stand up and say something's happening that's not right here we also we've audited it so deep in our supply chain and we do it constantly uh looking for anything that's wrong whether it's uh down to the there's a safety exit plot uh we have gone beyond the auditing and are now essentially holding university style classes on the manufacturing campuses of our partners because people see you know just like you and I probably you you don't start in life at a at here you start in life at the bottom and crawl up and so we're trying to provide education which to me is the great equalizer on people to people on the factory floor who want and aspire to do more so we worked with local Chinese universities to employ uh classes right on campus to make it super convenient for people I really feel that we've done a tremendous amount in this this uh in this area and plus we've been incredibly transparent because this is an area unlike me being secretive about the future I want everybody to copy and I'd love that everybody takes exactly what we're doing and do it and if they got any better ideas I want them cause I think we all ought to be you know just like with the environment and human rights this is an area we ought to all share we could all improve the world on it's not building a new product where we want to keep it secretive

R: and the Apple of your future uh stands as Steve once said at the junction of tech and humanities

C: yes it does and you can see it in these products in this in this incredible watch uh you can feel it you can uh see the in everything that we do we have this focus on how am I changing the world how am I enriching somebody's life how am I making things easier for people and we're just not making products to sell you know that that's a very uh that doesn't get me up in the morning uh I get up in the morning and many other people get up in the morning to change things mean that's that's who we are as a company that hasn't changed that will alw- we may change other things we may become more open we may participate in these things we haven't done before but what drives us are making great products and enrich people's lives it's the same thing that has driven Apple forever

R: but it's been a good business aren't you now the largest company in the world in terms of market cap

C: we are but but we don't fixate on it Charlie we don't I don't get up in the morning thinking wow we're the largest and we act arrogant and [-

R: [I know well no you don't think it of that way you think of it and so you also have over a hundred billion dollars in the bank based on whatever your stock [unclear] has done which I don't know the numbers do think of that in terms of the opportunities it provides you to do all the things that I've just we've been talking about whether it's technology whether it's humanity whether it is being a good citizen

C: I do and I I see it as a responsibility uh I don't see it as a burden I see it as a responsibility I feel that this gives us even a greater ability to contribute more not not just in a monetary sense we'll always contribute the most to humanity through our products because these products will change people's lives and enable them to do things they couldn't do before we can reach

more people doing that but I'm proud to be working on uh on product red with Bono and uh eliminating AIDS in Africa I'm proud that we're out in the front on environment I'm proud that we're we're pushing like crazy in human rights I'm proud that we're working on education trying to change the way teachers teach and students learn uh these things excite me these things move the dial on the world and I I'm not start talking about the US I'm talking you know worldwide and uh I think these are the things that make our hearts sing these are the things that get us up in the morning and it drives us to do unbelievable things and work unbelievably hard it's not the largest market capital in the world this is not an objective that where people will will work the extra hour will go the extra mile those things aren't things that push people mean I don't know they don't push me anyway uh and I'm not saying that I don't I *** shareholders out there I'm not saying I'm not focusing on you I'm very focused on them but I'm talking about what drives people and what we've learned is something simple is it's very simple in a way is if we focus on great products that enrich people's lives and we do that well really well the financial returns will follow and our shareholders will be happy and it's a continuous circle and and so I I like that because it's simple too many companies focus on the let's try to get the largest market cap and that doesn't drive people you know I was at uh I was at Compaq at a time where the uh objective was to become a forty billion dollar company well employees don't get excited about that this isn't something you wake up and you go I'm gonna take the hill today to do for *** and you know it's just not that but changing the world these are the things that people work for an this pushes people and so this is who we are as people and it's the it's the values of our company it's been the values of our company forever Steve and it's Steve's credit he put these values in the company and not only so it wasn't just his values it was his mentoring and teaching that it's still this deep in the company and so if I step off the curb this afternoon I hope I don't but if I do those will be the values of the company tomorrow and the next day and the next day it's that deep and it's it's it is I I know I know I've probably said it too many times but it's a privilege of a lifetime to be there because I think there's no place like it on earth

R: what was it that Bono said to you

C: @@@ to get me to buy his free album

R: yes what did Bono say to to get you to buy free albums and what did he say you when he walked over to you at the presentation w- it was something I can't *** I'm not sure what it was

C: call me *** he can't shake me he can't shake me up um you know from our point of view it's kinda simple is we love music uh we were thrilled with the album we think the album is killer I don't know if you've listened to it yet I really encourage you to do it and so what we wanted to do was we wanted to give something to our customers and I think the vast majority of them are gonna love the music and love the gift some some may not love love it I I hope they all do uh but it it was more about our customers and so it felt great to participate in something that's music history with the largest album release ever but the real thing was giving something to our users and uh

R: so you can get the album free

C: yeah and it was it's I hope you listen to it the they have done a killer job they've worked on for five years uh the b- the band did an incredible work here and uh I think you're really gonna like it they performed one song at our event and I think the crowd really really liked it

R: thank you for coming

C: it's been a pleasure it's been a pleasure I will never forget this

R: thank you

C: thanks Charlie

R: Tim Cook CEO of Apple back in a moment stay with us