1. Introduction

As one cog in the organizational wheel of management and human resources, performance appraisal interviews (PAIs) are generally considered an institutional space for evaluating performance, setting goals, and agreeing on future development (Pälli & Lehtinen, 2014, p. 92). While management systems for performance management in organizations consist of “a variety of activities through which organizations seek to assess employees and develop their competence” (Fletcher, 2001, p. 473; see also Gordon & Stewart, 2009; Nielsen, 2014), PAI refers to “recurrent strategic interviews between a superior in an organization and an employee that focus on employee performance and development” (Asmuñ, 2008, p. 409). Moreover, PAIs constitute a setting where employees may be socialized into viewing the organizational context in a way that “furthers the organization's strategic interests” (Nielsen, 2009, p. 23); conceptualizing strategies as “social objects” that are constituted in the discourse or talk of organizational members (Samra-Fredericks, 2004, p. 126, see also Asmuñ & Oshima, 2018). The aim of this paper is to enhance our understanding of how managers and employees, in the context of PAIs, orient to and collaboratively negotiate ‘knowledge’ in social interaction, as part of strategic goals concerning employees’ expertise, development, and learning.

Drawing on ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (e.g., Heritage, 1984, 2012; Schegloff, 2007), we adopt a discursive perspective on knowledge, investigating how knowledge is talked about and dealt with by participants-in-interaction, as well as what knowledge talk is used to accomplish on an individual and an organizational level (e.g. Edwards, 1997; Edwards & Potter, 2005; Heritage, 2012; Stivers, Mondada, & Steensig, 2011). As such, the study links to practice-based theories on knowledge in organizations (Gherardi, 2006; Lave & Wenger, 1991) by approaching “the situated character of practical activity […] as a members’ phenomenon” (Llewellyn & Spence, 2009, p. 1423; see also Rawls, 2009). The focus is upon the reflexive and rationally accountable practical actions of organizational members (Garfinkel, 1967) through which “everyday practices intricately and collaboratively accomplish a sense of organization” (Samra-Fredericks, 2004, p. 126). Within such a perspective, knowledge is conceptualized as socially constructed and culturally embedded in practices of sharing, networking, and the development of social relations (Alvesson, 2004; Gherardi, 2006). Critical of essentialist theories of knowledge management, Alvesson (2004) argues that managerial initiatives are unlikely to succeed in building communities of practice as they depend on “bottom-up involvement and commitment” (Alvesson, 2004, p. 175). Instead, as Tsoukas and Vladimirou (2001, p. 991) point out, management of organizational knowledge implies “the sensitive management of social relations”. From such a perspective, knowledge management involves facilitating inter-personal knowledge sharing and processes of perspective making and taking through diverse forms of interaction and communication. As we will show, PAIs constitute a setting in which managers and employees bring up issues related to knowledge in ways that make relevant professional identities, organization of work, and a distribution of work tasks.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: We begin by reviewing previous research on PAIs by focusing on interaction, management/leadership, and knowledge. Identifying that talk about knowledge is rarely discussed in previous PAI studies, we continue by introducing our data consisting of video-recorded PAIs in a Swedish bank. We continue with a description of how we theoretically conceptualize knowledge in interaction and analytically approach our data in order to explore knowledge talk, before...
proceeding with the analysis of our empirical data, illustrating how knowledge (or an expressed lack thereof) is managed in PAIs.

2. Performance appraisal interviews as institutional interaction

The faith in PAIs as a tool for ensuring “the maximum utilization of every employee's skills, knowledge, and interests” (Arthur, 2008, p. 2) in the leadership and management popular literature is extensive. While the literature on PAIs is dominated by normative and prescriptive texts describing ‘best practice’ approaches (Asmuß, 2008) or “guidelines on how to use appraisals effectively” (Pälli & Lehtinen, 2014, p. 93), a growing number of studies have examined the local, situated accomplishment of doing performance appraisal (e.g. Adams, 1981; Asmuß, 2008; Pälli & Lehtinen, 2014; Sorsa, Pälli, & Mikkola, 2014; Scheuer, 2014; Nyroos & Sandlund, 2014; Mikkola & Lehtinen, 2014; Van De Mieroop & Schnurr, 2014). A number of these studies are rooted in a Scandinavian context, where – partly due to working life legislation, a strong union history, and societal norms of equality, PAIs generally have several purposes, such as following up on employee health, work satisfaction, collegial relations, and well-being (Sorsa et al., 2011), along with appraising performance and ensuring alignment with organizational goals. Coupled with the view of PAIs as a site for talking the organization into being (cf. Drew & Heritage, 1992) and for doing management while also providing the employee a space to talk about problems and voice concerns, PAIs are a site of sometimes conflicting goals and ideologies, which participants will have to manage in situ.

PAIs have been described as “critical to the effective use of human capital” (Clifton, 2012, p. 283) given that PAI agendas also include the collaborative identification of future training needs and the setting of individual goals for employees' work in relation to organizational objectives (Pälli & Lehtinen, 2014). Because of the strive to align employee goals and work strategies with overall institutional goals, PAIs, together with recruitment interviews, dismissal conversations, and meetings, are also part of doing management and leadership, as such interactions each “constitute important links in aligning corporate and organisational identity” (Aggerholm, Andersen, Asmuss, & Thomsen, 2009, p. 264). In fact, the PAI has been described as “one of the most common managerial practices in contemporary organizations”, perhaps particularly for implementing organizational strategy (Sorsa et al., 2014, p. 57).

The emphasis on leadership performance for organizational success has spurred increasing interest in PAIs. For example, taking a discursive approach to leadership processes, Van De Mieroop and Vrolix (2014) examined the gate-keeping function of management in PAIs. According to the authors, managers as interviewers are “responsible for ensuring that the interviewee's answers (…) are institutionalisable in that they reflect institutional practices, assumptions, and values” (Van De Mieroop & Vrolix, 2014, p. 3). Their examination of transcribed excerpts from PAIs revealed that in order for employee answers to be fileable, their institutionalization was preceded by interactional negotiations. By way of example, managers used re formulations that matched the sought-for competencies of the organization, and handled challenges from employees with encouragement and justification of the relevance of institutionalization of employee formulations. Similarly, Sorsa et al. (2014) examined how managers and employees collaboratively talked organizational strategy into being in PAIs. They demonstrate how linguistic and embodied resources are recruited by participants in making organizational strategy visible and “knowable” (p. 58); for example, in drawing on organizational strategy texts in their PAI talk as a point of shared orientation, toward which participants can adopt different positions and demonstrate their understanding of the organizational strategy words.

Knowledge has rarely been the main focus of interactional studies of PAIs, but the local management of participants' relative knowledge surface in some of them. For example, Sorsa et al. (2014) show how participants orient to wordings of organizational strategy texts and offer knowledge-based assessments of them in order to display their knowledge and understanding of organizational ideas. Along the same lines, Nyroos and Sandlund (2014) show how a pre-set question about individual employees' contribution to organizational goals invites responses that demonstrate the employee's knowledge of such goals in extended accounts. Furthermore, Asmuß (2013) argues that there is a strong relationship between interactional asymmetries and knowledge, visible, for example, in displays of entitlement, that is “conventional ascription of warrantable rights or entitlements over the possession and use of certain kinds of knowledge” (Drew, 1991, p. 45). In the PAI, entitlement may concern the relative rights to perform specific actions, such as giving negative feedback or proposing solutions, which in turn may “interfere or overlap with the participants’ local orientations to interactional rights and obligations” (Asmuß, 2013, p. 556).

In all organizations, employees and managers have responsibilities, different areas of expertise, and skills connected to the ways in which they perform their everyday work. Organizational members can be held accountable for actions in their designated domains, and consequently, there is a built-in institutional expectancy of epistemic responsibilities in relation to particular institutional roles. Managers can expect employees to have and demonstrate knowledge in areas that is part of their role domains, and in the PAI, employees are accountable for such knowledge. Despite the relevance of knowledge to participants in situated PAI talk, there have, to the best of our knowledge, not been any studies to this date that specifically target how issues of employee, managerial, and organizational knowledge are treated in a performance appraisal context. The aim of our study is to address this gap in the literature by examining how participants collaboratively construct, define, and negotiate knowledge within the context of PAIs. We examine how and when talk about knowledge is drawn upon and to what interactional ends. The study aims to extend the existing literature on management and leadership as situated practice by examining the various interactional work accomplished by talk about individual and collective knowledge, thus also shedding additional light upon a core ideological function of the PAI: to identify and manage matters of competence and align employee goals with organizational strategy. The study thus also aims to contribute to the literature viewing organizational strategy as a practical, members' accomplishment in situated interaction (cf. for example, Asmuß & Oshima, 2018; Samra-Fredericks, 2004).
3. Data, setting, and participants

Data was drawn from a corpus of 22 PAIs recorded in private sector organizations in Sweden between 2008 and 2009 as part of a research and development project on working life sustainability in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). PAIs were recorded in three organizations: a technology production company, a call center, and a regionally based bank. For the present paper, a sub-corpus of eight PAIs recorded in two bank offices was used. All PAIs were recorded on video, and the average length of recordings was 1 h and 17 min (total recording time: 8 h and 48 min). In this regional bank, PAIs were held annually with all employees. Participants (two managers and six different bank employees) had prepared for the PAI using a document with pre-set questions about work accomplishments, psychosocial work environment, and individual and organizational goals. Two questions were specifically related to our interest in knowledge talk: Do you think you get to use your knowledge and experiences in your work and In which areas do you feel that you need development and training (our translations). However, we have identified talk about employee and organizational knowledge across topics and questions, as participants frequently returned to issues discussed earlier in the PAI in relation to new questions, alternatively brought up issues related to knowledge in other contexts. Six PAIs were recorded in 2008, and the remaining two in 2009 featuring the same manager and two of the employees in their next PAI. Recordings were made in two different offices—three from a local bank office in a small town, and five from a business advising department in a different, slightly bigger town. All recordings were made with the written consent of participants, and the researchers set up the recording equipment but did not stay in the room.

4. Analyzing knowledge in social interaction

With an interest in how participants orient to professional knowledge in the context of PAIs, the study builds on an ethno-methodological and conversation analytic approach (EMCA, e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell & Stivers, 2013). EMCA aims to analyze and describe the sequential and temporal organization of mundane social activities (Schegloff, 2007) and considers social interaction as it is collectively organized by co-participants by mobilizing a range of vocal, verbal, and embodied resources which are publicly displayed and monitored in situ (Mondada, 2014). Building on analyses of video-recorded interaction in naturalistic settings, EMCA is concerned with examining the methods participants use to accomplish social actions, and allows for an understanding of the orderliness of interaction. The basic objective is to describe the procedures deployed by inter-actants to produce actions, and to interpret the actions of others (Heritage, 1984). Overall, the notions of epistemics and knowledge are central, as participants in interaction build shared understanding by recognizing what each knows about the world, and by adjusting their actions and understandings in accordance with that recognition (Heritage, 2013, p. 370). Rather than locating knowledge in internal processes and experiences, an EMCA perspective provides a crucial resource for examining the social character of knowledge in particular sequential and sociocultural contexts (e.g. see Edwards, 1997, 2006; Goodwin, 2007; Heritage, 2012).

In this paper, we are interested in how participants in the PAIs talk about knowledge, that is, how knowledge figures as a topic for talk and a matter under active management in interaction (Edwards, 1997, 2006; te Molder & Potter, 2005). The analyses thus focus on the situated and rhetorical uses of knowledge within the PAI context, what procedures the participants have for dealing with knowledge, and how knowledge is oriented to as an accountable matter (Edwards, 2006; Edwards & Potter, 2005). The analyses will highlight how participants, as they engage in talk about knowledge, take epistemic stances vis-à-vis each other and the unfolding organization of actions (Goodwin, 2007). As Stivers et al. (2011) point out, participants in interaction recurrently attend not only to who knows what, but also to “who has a right to know what, who knows more about what, and who is responsible for knowing what” (p. 18). We thus explore how participants, in sequences of knowledge talk, ascribe knowledge to self and others by asserting, contesting and defending knowledge claims in and through turns-at-talk and sequences of interaction in situated performance appraisal interviews (Heritage, 2013, p. 370; see also e.g., Heritage, 2012). Stance taking emerges as a result of joint engagement in evaluative activity (Kärkkäinen, 2007), where participants in interaction monitor each other with respect to epistemic access, epistemic primacy, and epistemic responsibility, and hold each other accountable for the rights and responsibilities associated with them. Epistemics in interaction thus entails morality and accountability that are governed by social norms associated with the appraisal context of PAIs. In the words of Stivers et al. (2011, p. 3), “[a]s in any normatively organized system, we can and do hold one another accountable for justifiably asserting our rights and fulfilling our obligations with respect to knowledge. It is in this way that we see the epistemic domain as morally ordered”.

In the analyses, we show how participants account for what they know or do not know. Accounts are not merely a representation of action, but a presentation of the actor’s preferred interpretation. Put differently, an account is “a linguistic device employed whenever an action is subject to evaluative inquiry” (Scott & Lyman, 1968, p. 46), produced “in order to forestall the negative conclusions which might otherwise be drawn” (Heritage, 1988, p.140). The performance of an account serves a formative function; language is used rhetorically to shape how others see us and our actions (Buttny, 1993). Next utterances transform talk in some fashion, dealing with it, not in its own terms, but addressing it in the way in which it is relevant to the projects of the subsequent speaker (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987). Accounts function in social interaction to change or mitigate a problematic event by justifying, excusing, mitigating, or explaining. In the course of offering accounts, participants are simultaneously attempting to preserve face and maintain social relationships (Buttny, 1993, cf. Stivers et al., 2011 on relational consequences of morally accountable choices). In the PAI context, employee actions-in-talk are heard by the recipient in a context of institutional talk about work, professional roles, and performance. In such efforts at self-presentation (cf. Cliffton, 2012; Goffman, 1959, 1967), employees must tread carefully when responding in ways that are potentially troublesome – interactionally as well as institutionally. The recruitment of accounts in talk about expertise/non-expertise in particular areas, and, conversely, the recruitment of knowledge talk for doing self-presentation, will
thus be shown to be methods available to participants for managing face, delicate actions, and accountability.

The video extracts have been transcribed using conversation analytic conventions (see Appendix A). Annotations and visualizations (in the shape of line drawings) of embodied actions, such as gaze directions, gestures and writing, have been included in the transcripts when analytically relevant. Pseudonyms are used for all participants.

5. Orientations to knowledge in performance appraisal interviews

We will now explore how participants in performance appraisal interviews manage and collaboratively negotiate knowledge in situ. As will be shown, professional knowledge is talked about in different ways with different interactional and organizational consequences. Something that the participants recurrently relate to as they talk about what they know or do not know, what they need to know and learn, is a distribution of knowledge between the individual employee and their colleagues in the local work force.

A first extract from a conversation between a manager (Sven) and an employee (Eva) will serve as an illustrative example.

Extract 1. Balancing individual and organizational knowledge, [LKE; 11.38-11.53].

In lines 3–4, the manager makes relevant a distinction between collective and individual knowledge as he talks about the importance of not being “at our maximum in everything” but knowing “our area”. The sometimes fuzzy boundaries between what constitutes collective versus individual knowledge, or put differently, generalist versus specialist knowledge, are recurrent themes in the data. As will be demonstrated, this distinction is constructed as having direct consequences upon the organization of work. When responding to the manager’s synthesizing statement, the employee thus transforms the gist of the formulation into a practical implication by adding that one should know a little of everything in order to be able to transfer the customer onwards, that is, to the right colleague (lines 6–7). In these few turns, we see how the organizational perspective represented in the manager turns on lines 2–4 is contrasted with the individual perspective taken by the employee in lines 6–7.

In what follows, we explore how different constellations of managers and employees deal with boundaries between individual and collective knowledge, and the interactional work accomplished by such negotiations. Our presentation of findings is divided into three sections introducing three single cases. In all three, the participants negotiate knowledge in relation to organizational and individual aspects, but they do so in rather different ways. Firstly, we examine how an employee makes relevant boundaries and limitations of knowledge by reflecting upon what he knows and does not know (Extracts 2a–2b). Secondly, we explore how talk about individual and collective knowledge is linked to a negotiation of the employee's role and professional identity in the organization, where the employee is attempting to avoid responsibilities with reference to her lack of knowledge (Extracts 3a–3c). Finally, we investigate how negotiations of knowledge and strong claims of expertise may be linked to a distribution of labor and complaints about a heavy workload (Extract 4).

5.1. Negotiating knowledge boundaries in relation to epistemic domains

In our first analytic section, we will show how an employee reflects upon his knowledge, how the manager responds to these reflections, and how the employee deals with the requirement that is formulated. The analyses demonstrate how the employee talks about what he knows and what he does not know in ways that (1) make relevant differences between novices and experts, (2) display how the employee reflects upon his own knowledge in relation to more knowledgeable colleagues, customers, and different products, and (3) present his approach to improving his knowledge about certain products. As will be shown, formulations of the boundaries between specialist and generalist knowledge may require extended negotiation regarding their relation to specified products and actual work tasks.

Below, Extracts 2a–2b features Patrick, the manager of a business and small enterprises advising department of the bank, and the
employee Nick, one of the financial advisors for business customers. The sequence begins with Patrick posing one of the pre-formulated questions for the PAI: *Do you think you get to use your knowledge and experiences in your work.* Nick initially responds in an affirmative way (*yeah I think so*) but with a mitigating epistemic stance (Kärkkäinen, 2007). While not responding verbally, the manager’s note-taking (line 5) can be understood as treating the answer as a fileable response. After a rather long silence (line 5), the employee goes on to relate his own knowledge and professional experience to a recent policy change, in which “customer meetings” (line 7) are in focus. He accounts for how this focus on customer meetings means that “you have to ju (0.4) hh bring all the stuff out” (line 8, i.e., presumably presenting customers with information about their different options). As such, Nick tackles the question by orienting to organizational policy as an impetus for putting his knowledge and experience to the test, since the customer meetings require that he can present information to a customer:

**Extract 2a.** “You are in the border zone sometimes”, [SKF; 29:55-30.35].

1 PAT: får du användning för dina kunskaper och <erfarenheter> do you get to use your knowledge and <experiences>
2 i ärbetet då in your work then.
3 (0.8)
4 NIC: ja de tycker ja. yeah I think so.
5 #picks up pen, starts writing--->#
6 NIC: *u:uh* (. ) för det (. ) de blir ju mer å mer de: *u:uh* (. ) ‘cause it (. ) it is ju more and more that
7 pat ---------------------stops writing#
8 NIC: i de här fokus:: (. ) *u:uh* kundmöten att(h) (1.1) in these focus:: (. ) *u:uh* customer meetings that(h) (1.1)
9 m-man ska ju: (0.4) .hhh ta fram alla grejer you have to ju: (0.4) .hhh bring all the stuff out
10 å då:r *uh* så de är klart att ja visst(h) (0.3) and where *uh* so it’s true that of course(h) (0.3)
11 man e ju på gränsen ibland då när man pratar om you are ju in the border zone sometimes when you talk about
12 <specialist(hh) (0.8) produkterna> <the specialist(hh) (0.8) products>
13 PAT: mi. ((nods))
14 NIC: <föräskringer> (. ) <placeringen> å sätt >utan man <insurances> (. ) <placements> an’ all that >but you<
15 .hhh (1.2) ”hmmp(hh)” (0.5)
16 (pt) man måste balansera på va man ska (pt) you havetuh balance what you should
17 >säja å inte säjarå< för att *e:ih* ( . ) att inte säja >say an’ not say then< coz *e:ih* ( . ) to not say
18 fel såker me-men ändå talà om va som finns, the wrong things bu- but still explain what there is,
19 (1.9)
20 PAT: mm: ((nods))

After formulating the customer meetings as a site for applying acquired knowledge and experiences, Nick introduces a potential problem, which involves stretching the boundaries of his own knowledge when it comes to explaining and selling “the specialist (hh) (0.8) products” (lines 10–11). Nick’s “man e ju på gränsen ibland” (in the border zone, line 10) does not specifically mention knowledge – a literal translation would read “one is ju on the border sometimes”, with the epistemic adverb ju generally appealing to shared knowledge (cf. Heinemann, Lindström, & Steensig, 2011), but in the context of the specific mention of “the specialist products”, Nick displays a potential limitation of his own knowledge when it comes to explaining certain bank products and services to customers.

As the sequence continues, Nick provides specification of the “specialist products” in a three-part list format (line 13, see e.g., Sandlund, 2014) and reflects on his epistemic access to them. He elaborates by formulating a practical consequence of such a knowledge-based problem (lines 16–17), thus making relevant an inherent risk when doing work in “the border zone” of one’s expertise. He outlines a dilemma potentially arising in interactions with customers, where the limits of his own knowledge of particular products poses a risk of saying “the wrong things” (line 17). At this point, Nick has made relevant his professional role as a customer advisor in which he is to be trusted as an expert who should be able to present all the options available to a customer, and a potential problem should be give a customer a less well-informed piece of advice. Nick’s account thus revolves around the boundaries of specialist/generalist knowledge and the balance required when such boundaries are challenged in interactions with customers. As a consequence, the pre-set question is treated as an occasion to make public a particular perspective on employee knowledge in relation to past or hypothetical encounters with customers. Patrick displays receipt of Nick’s turn with rising intonation, but the response is minimal and is hearable as awaiting further talk from Nick.

As Nick continues in **Extract 2b**, he proposes a solution to the problem: that “this basic (0.2) knowledge of insurance- > on the insurance > part then” (lines 20–22) should be refined. Note that Nick invokes an organizational perspective in his turn design – while drawing on his own limitations when it comes to advising on specialist products, he does not solely speak from an individual
perspective in offering a solution. The solution presented, that is, that generalist knowledge on specialized products should be developed (for himself, and perhaps also for the other advisors) is further exemplified on lines 25–27. Using the generic Swedish pronoun “man” (lines 20, 27) presents the issue as a general suggestion for development for the department, rather than just for facilitating his own customer interactions:

**Extract 2b.** “Have you had a development in that”, [SKF; 30:35-31:21].

In line 20, Nick proposes a tentative solution to the problem of risking to say the “wrong” things, which casts insufficient knowledge as partially remediable through learning (“should be developed”). In lines 24–26, he mentions two of the specialists in the bank, Fred and Nils, who are responsible for going over pensions and risks with the business customers. However, Nick’s proposal entails a suggestion that this task could be handled in customer meetings not involving these specialists – should the appropriate knowledge be developed. In line 27, he recasts his prior suggestion, now indicating that he already does this to some extent, but his turn packaging indicates that this is not entirely unproblematic: “coz>that you try to do but but-<”, further evidencing his accounts of not yet having specialist knowledge. Using the Swedish generic pronoun “man”, Nick’s turn design allows for a hearing referring to either the collegial group, or to himself in his role as a business advisor.

In overlap, Patrick (lines 28, 29, 31) displays that he does treat Nick’s prior turns as referring to Nick specifically. His “BUT YOU THInk that- y- you think that you have < had > a development in that too or†” disattends to Nick’s detailing the particulars of the

---

1While the regional dialect often uses “man” for the first person pronoun also, in Standard Swedish, the use of “man” best corresponds to the English use of “one” or a generic plural “you”, which was selected here. While it is difficult to be certain about each individual case in the corpus, it is at least possible to hear “man” in Nick’s turns as referring to the collective of the organization.
issue, cuts right to the issue initiated in the pre-set question about the employee's knowledge and experience, and requests confirmation as to whether Nick thinks that he has "had a development" in this particular area. Interestingly, this question co-occurs with a comparatively long exchange of mutual gaze. Moreover, the manager, who has been writing for some time, retracts the pen from the paper and moves his pen-holding hand back and forth, thus highlighting the importance of the question that is posed before being able to continue writing (fig. 2.1). Formulated as a claim to be agreed with, but with the turn-final "or" leaving room for a disagreeing response (see Drake, 2015; Stokoe, 2010), Patrick focuses on Nick's acquired knowledge in financial advising and undercuts Nick's reflective talk. Having exposed his lack of knowledge in certain areas, the employee is held accountable for remedying the problem and the manager appears to focus in particular on whether Nick has received the kind of "development" necessary for his professional role. This is also evident in the timing of Patrick's note-taking (line 32) after Nick has confirmed Patrick's summing-up turn – Patrick's scribbling at this particular point indicates that a fileable response to the question has been obtained (Pälli & Lehtinen, 2014).

Nick, however, does not adopt Patrick's shift to his individual role displayed by the use of singular pronouns; instead, he re-orientes to the collective perspective displayed in prior talk. In the remainder of his response turn, he systematically uses the plural we when accounting for the need for additional training (lines 32, 33, 34). As a consequence, the participants can be heard as orienting to different aspects of the topic, where Nick links his examples to the group of business advisors as a collective, whereas Patrick's understanding check orients to Nick's knowledge and skills as an individual employee. The timing of Patrick's note-taking is interesting in the PAI context, as Patrick, responsible for filing information from the PAI, may be more oriented toward pursuing a fileable response than Nick, who treats the pre-set question as an opportunity to raise issues of reflection and/or concern (cf. Van De Mieroop & Schnurr, 2014). Nick's account (lines 32–34) also works to preempt any premature conclusions with regard to his (and his colleagues') ability to handle needs for additional knowledge that arise in relation to customers (cf. Heritage, 1988). Put differently, even though he has expressed some uncertainty in relation to specialist products, himself and his fellow advisors talk about this "all the time" and are attentive to needs for additional training and learning in order to secure the best organizational outcome.

The detailing of remedial actions concerning how to improve knowledge about different products, is oriented to the accountability implied by the manager's question about development. In the final part of Extract 2b, Nick accounts for a strategy of not only bringing in specialists to advise customers, but also, learning from them. This new account reintroduces Nick's earlier proposal – that the business advisors should be able to go over pension plans and insurances with customers without the specialists present. However, this time, the specialist products are not presented as a knowledge problem, but as an opportunity for learning (lines 37–38). The customer meetings involving specialists are presented as a site for acquiring the knowledge necessary for presenting customers with an overview of the specialist products in subsequent meetings. Interestingly, Nick positions himself on the same level as a customer when participating in the meeting. Using the formulation "just by being part of the meetings with them you sit there like a customer (.). hhh almost and learn (0.3) > what they are talking about <", Nick offers further substantiation of how the business advisors as a collective take responsibility for learning and knowledge acquisition. He continues (lines 36–40) with an upshot of the arrangements: by having listened to the specialists explaining options to customers, Nick has learned enough to "go over those sketches" himself.

In Extracts 2a–2b, employee knowledge is dealt with in two ways relevant to the present paper. Firstly, we can note that here, talk about an employee's knowledge beginning with a pre-set question item like Do you think you get to use your knowledge and experiences in your work? is treated as talk about knowledge boundaries. Nick's introduction of a potential problem with regard to specialist knowledge casts his advisory role as not just about giving correct advice to customers, but also about knowing when to ask for specialist assistance. Knowing the boundaries of one's own knowledge, then, is also in itself a display of professional competence. Secondly, as the manager displays a primary orientation to obtaining a fileable answer to the pre-set question, Nick shifts from a problem focus to a transformation of the lack of specialist knowledge into potential occasions for learning, which in turn makes possible a re-distribution of certain tasks (going over the sketches with customers) to the non-expert advisors. As such, in talk about knowledge limitations versus expertise, the organization of work in the bank is made relevant, along with an opportunity for displaying a willingness to learn and to take on more advanced tasks.

5.2. Negotiating knowledge in relation to a professional role in the organization

We continue by showing how talk about knowledge boundaries may be collaboratively transformed into opportunities for renegotiating the organization of work. We will return to the employee Eva and the manager Sven (Extract 1) in a sequence where Eva, who is a private banking advisor, positions herself as someone who sometimes lacks knowledge and prefers to transfer customers to more knowledgeable colleagues. The interaction in Extracts 3a–3c occurs right before Extract 1, and is what eventually leads up to talk about the relation between individual and collective knowledge. As we will show, Eva's praise of her colleagues' superior knowledge becomes an intrinsic aspect of a negotiation and definition of her own role in the organization.

Preceding Extract 3a, the participants have been talking about the importance of transferring customers to the right person. Offering herself as a good example, Eva has described how she readily refers customers to more competent colleagues whenever she is not able to answer questions. Orienting to the possible problematic aspect of telling customers that she does not have adequate knowledge, Eva provides further justification for her reported ability to refer customers to colleagues by saying that she does not have any problems in telling customers that she does not know (lines 1–3):
The manager supports the employee's account by producing several “no”, shaking his head, and starting up the affiliative formulation “they (don’t) care”, in all confirming the employee’s interpretation of what customers might think. Eva, who overall speaks rather rapidly and emphatically in this extract, momentarily slows down as she reflects on what customers might think about her not knowing: “and that I don’t think ...” thus taking up a stance of less certainty. She recovers her more emphatic way of speaking, adding that even if the customers were to mind, it would not matter. Approaching is a climax in which the employee produces a self-deprecation, using an extreme case formulation (Edwards, 2000; Pomerantz, 1986), and admitting that she is far from perfect (lines 15–16). The utterance is inflected with breathy laughter, adding an affective layer to her turn. In combination with the shrunken shoulders and downward gaze (fig. 3.1), the production of her turn marks the assessment as a delicate moment, and an attempt to solicit affiliation from the manager (Glenn & Holt, 2013, pp. 15–16; Glenn, 2013). The manager, who has repeatedly initiated aligning responses (lines 8, 12, 14) now initiates disagreement with a negation “no but” (line 17) which is disattended by Eva. With an identical “no but,” that changes the trajectory of the interaction away from the self-deprecation, Eva specifies that she feels that there are “some things” that she does not dare go into. Rather than dealing with the self-deprecation, the manager produces an affiliative “and we shouldn’t do it either” (line 21), by using second person plural “we”, establishing the said as something that concerns all members of the organization. Upon hearing his affiliative turn, Eva raises her gaze and looks at the manager (fig. 3.2). She responds by linking to the organizational perspective introduced by the manager, and adds an account for why it is indeed the right choice to transfer customers to more knowledgeable colleagues: “no, because *<uh>* it’s ju w- wo:rrse to give a +gaze down---> <fel> (. ) < {v}ar}> då. <wrong> (. ) <answer> then.

The manager supports the employee's account by producing several “no”, shaking his head, and starting up the affiliative formulation “they (don’t) care”, in all confirming the employee's interpretation of what customers might think. Eva, who overall speaks rather rapidly and emphatically in this extract, momentarily slows down as she reflects on what customers might think about her not knowing: “and that I don’t think ...” thus taking up a stance of less certainty. She recovers her more emphatic way of speaking, adding that even if the customers were to mind, it would not matter. Approaching is a climax in which the employee produces a self-deprecation, using an extreme case formulation (Edwards, 2000; Pomerantz, 1986), and admitting that she is far from perfect (lines 15–16). The utterance is inflected with breathy laughter, adding an affective layer to her turn. In combination with the shrunken shoulders and downward gaze (fig. 3.1), the production of her turn marks the assessment as a delicate moment, and an attempt to solicit affiliation from the manager (Glenn & Holt, 2013, pp. 15–16; Glenn, 2013). The manager, who has repeatedly initiated aligning responses (lines 8, 12, 14) now initiates disagreement with a negation “no but” (line 17) which is disattended by Eva. With an identical “no but,” that changes the trajectory of the interaction away from the self-deprecation, Eva specifies that she feels that there are “some things” that she does not dare go into. Rather than dealing with the self-deprecation, the manager produces an affiliative “and we shouldn’t do it either” (line 21), by using second person plural “we”, establishing the said as something that concerns all members of the organization. Upon hearing his affiliative turn, Eva raises her gaze and looks at the manager (fig. 3.2). She responds by linking to the organizational perspective introduced by the manager, and adds an account for why it is indeed the right choice to transfer customers to more knowledgeable colleagues: “no, because *<uh>* it’s ju wo:rrse to give a +gaze down---> <fel> (. ) < {v}ar}> då. <wrong> (. ) <answer> then.

In Extract 2a, Nick also raised the potential problem in giving wrong answers to customers (lines 16–17). However, the employees position themselves epistemically in two different ways with respect to customers. Where Nick is careful to tell customers as much as
possible about the products without stepping into areas where he is not sure, Eva instead suggests telling the customers that she does not know. Next, we proceed by exploring how Eva positions herself as less knowledgeable in relation to a colleague, claiming that she will never be able to master an area in the same way as she does. The manager minimally acknowledged Eva’s conclusion (lines 23–24 above), however, he next proceeds in a mitigated and embedded way, raising the possibility of finding the time to acquire more knowledge instead.

**Extract 3b.** “Never going to grasp”, [LKE; 09.54-10.27].

26 SVE: sen tror ja kanske att (...) dom områden som en känner sjä ... then I think that maybe (...) the areas where one feels unsure then that. ... h. we really try to hitta tidern=vi försöker kanske använda Tove på find times. we try to perhaps use Tove for
29 EVA: [m
30 SVE: pensions[biten som [är ett viktigt område för våra= the pension part that is an important area for our=
31 EVA: [.hm [ja .hm yes
32 SVE: =mål här frgmöver. för att de de de som kan öka, =goals here in the figure. ‘cos that is what can grow, för de= de- de skulle ja känna att ja s- (...) fortfarande because that- that- that I would feel that I s- (-) still bara vill (0.6) flytta till henne ba- only want to (0.6) transfer to her on-
34 SVE: m
36 EVA: en kan ta å frågera mej [kunden och få dom intresserad= one can ask the customer and make them interested=
37 SVE: [m [m
38 EVA: =å sen få fly- =and then be allowed to tra-
39 SVE: m
40 EVA: för de känner ja. de kommer ja aldrig å klara å (. because that I feel. that I’m never going to (. bemästra (. (. så som [hon gör. grasp[ (. (. the way she does
41 SVE: [.hh [nej[ .hh no
42 EVA: [nej (. (. nej å ja respek(.)[terrar de. no (. no and I resp(.)[ect that
43 SVE: [.hja .hja
44 EVA:

In a study on the preference organization of assessment sequences, Asmuβ (2008, p. 425) showed how participants in PAs orient to criticism as a socially problematic action, despite the fact that negative feedback is (supposedly) an integral part of PAs. Similarly, on lines 34–36, the manager subtly refers to something that the participants have talked about earlier: that Eva has not been completing the in-house training programs and that she must find time to do so. The implicit demand is further mitigated by a referral to Eva with “one” and a collective “we”, thus making the claim relevant for other employees too, including himself. Moreover, as Clifton (2012) has shown, the use of an institutional “we” shifts responsibility for face-threatening acts from the speaker to the organization at the same time as it builds a team-identity. However, rather than pursuing this line of argument, the manager changes footing and raises the possibility of using another advisor, Tove, for pension matters. Underlining that this is an important area for the bank, Tove is described as a person with knowledge significant for the organization. When the manager does not pursue his request that Eva find time for in-house training and instead orients to a different solution, Eva is liberated from having to respond to the implicit criticism (cf. Asmuβ, 2008). Instead, both participants work to establish Tove as a person with superior epistemic access (Stivers et al., 2011) and Eva takes the opportunity of saying that she feels that she would “still only want to (0.6) transfer to her” questions about pensions. The utterance is delivered in a hesitant way marked by repetition “that- that- that” (line 33), abandoned turns at talk (lines 34, 38), silence (line 34), and affective formulations drawing on what she “feels” (lines 33, 40). It also includes the adverbial “still”, which makes relevant that Eva has previously transferred customers to Tove. She is thus displaying reluctance to learn about pensions, and grasps the opportunity of telling the manager that she “still” wants to continue referring customers although she can make the customer “interested” (line 36). An account for why this is necessary follows, in that Eva compares herself to Tove, saying that she will never be able to master the pension system like Tove does. Consequently, she positions herself as not only less knowledgeable than a colleague, but as someone who will never be able to learn. The manager responds that he respects this, affiliating with the employee’s feeling of not being able to get the grasp of an area the way her colleague does.

As we have shown, the employee displays an unwillingness to learn and take on additional responsibilities. This is accomplished by describing herself as less knowledgeable than colleagues, building a contrast between herself and the assessment of others (Extract 3b), and by claiming that she does not mind displaying her lack of knowledge to customers (Extract 3a). In contrast to how the employee in Extracts 2a–2b was reflecting upon his own knowledge, and where it was possible for the manager to straight-forwardly ask whether he had had a knowledge development, Eva’s manager Sven is presented with a dilemma. On the one hand, he has to manage the interactional delicacy of the employee’s self-deprecation, and on the other, he must hold Eva accountable for learning...
new things and taking on responsibilities. In Extract 3c, the manager pursues this line of argument and refers to an agreed-upon distribution of responsibilities, and holds Eva accountable for her own area of expertise.

**Extract 3c. “Distribution of responsibilities”, [LKE; 10.54-11.26].**

67 SVE ja- ja känner ju jättemycke så här att allting ändrar
1 I feel ju very much like this that everything changes
68 sig så oerhört mycket så att (.) kan vi dela upp om-
så tremendously! so that (.) if we can split the ar-
69 områdena som vi har gjort (.) i den här (.)
the areas as we have done (.) in this (.)
70 ..
71 SVE [ansvarsfördelningen] distribution of responsibilites
72 EVA ...
73 SVE är en kan va lite dyktigare än all- alla andra på de.
and one can be a bit bet|ter than all- all the others on that.
74 om vi tar bolånedelen här.
if we take the home loan part here.
75 EVA ...
76 SVE de finns ju liksom ingen an:le:dn:ing att väldigt många
there’s ju like no reason:in that very many
77 ska kunna den (.) i- i detalj utan de är
should know that (.) in- in detail but it’s
78 SVE [bättre att (.) att den- den ligger då på Eva att-
better that (.) that it’s- it’s on Eva then that-
79 EVA ...
80 SVE (.) att är de nätting med dom här
(.) that if there’s something with these
81 s- [spun:kin å (.) å alla typer av bottenlän=
s- spun:nik and (.) and all kinds of first mortgage loans=
82 EVA ...
83 SVE =så- så kan en använda dej som resurs i den- den bitten
=then- then one can use you as a resource in that- that part
84 EVA "hm"

In the beginning of Extract 3c, the manager introduces another reason for why it is necessary that the employees have their separate areas of expertise, which is that “everything changes so tremendously”. The image of a rapidly changing world is painted as a backdrop to an organizational challenge, where the distribution of responsibilities is presented as a solution to the problem of securing up-to-date information and knowledge in the bank. This distributes the different areas of expertise across the different professional roles, and thus implicitly reinforces a division of labor. This is in line with what Sven and Eva have been talking about earlier, but Sven now makes the issue concrete by referring to something that Eva is good at: home loans (line 74). This is interesting from an epistemic point of view, as Eva has contrasted herself with other colleagues who she claims know much more than she does. At this time, the manager instead formulates Eva as a resource to the others (line 76–77). The manager elaborates on the implications of this distribution of responsibilities in a positive frame in stating that “one can be a bit better than all the others,” continuing with the concrete example home loans, which happens to be the area that Eva is required to master. Thus, he is striking a balance between empowering the employee – there is an area in which she is an expert – and simultaneously demanding that she takes on responsibilities. By referring to something that they have agreed upon (i.e., a distribution of responsibilities) the manager holds the employee accountable for following the agreement and for maintaining an area of expertise. The organizational perspective is reinforced by talking about the employee in third person (line 78) which has the effect of distancing the manager from the fact that he is formulating a demand on the employee: she is clearly assigned a work task. Eva is positioned as a knowledgeable colleague, but required to accept responsibility for this area of expertise.

In Extracts 3a–3c, employee knowledge is made relevant in three ways important to the present paper. Firstly, talk about knowledge limitations versus expertise is oriented to as a reason for not having to learn. Rather than constituting a learning opportunity (cf. Extract 2b), this employee sees her lack of knowledge as an argument for not having to do things. Secondly, knowledge talk is linked to a distribution of labor. The manager’s talk about transferring customers provides the employee with ample opportunities to argue that this is what she is already doing, thus claiming an identity as a professional employee even though she is simultaneously avoiding responsibilities. Thirdly, the manager and the employee collaboratively negotiate her professional role in the organization in ways that balance the employee’s way of presenting herself as an imperfect person that lacks knowledge with the demands for an area of specialization. Put differently, and in line with Clifton’s (2012, p. 302) findings, the participants collaborate to achieve facework and to “establish an ethos of ‘no fault’ so that they maintain a good working relationship.”

5.3. Negotiations of knowledge in relation to a distribution of labor

In our final extract, we will show how one team member’s claims of not knowing as a reason for transferring work tasks may have
consequences for other members’ work load, with an uneven distribution of labor as a result. Extract 4 involves the same manager, Sven, as in Extracts 1 and 3a–3c, but in a PAI with a different employee, Tove. Tove has worked for a long time in the bank, and during the course of the PAI, the participants repeatedly construct her as a seasoned, knowledgeable, and competent employee. Almost 50 min into the conversation, within the context of a question about the employee’s own efforts, What do you think about yourself then Tove, the employee initially rejects her accountability for answering such a question: it is not up to her to assess her own performance. As the manager responds by praising her, Tove turns matters around and describes how the fact that she is a knowledgeable employee sometimes causes problems for her. The sequence is initiated by a telling about a person at another office who was not allowed to retire because of his competence (not in the transcript), which is then paralleled by a description of the employee’s own situation.

Extract 4. “Coz I happen to know everything”, [LKT; 49.11-49.47].

Knowledge talk here occurs in the context of a complaint that is composed of several interrelated sub-complaints having to do with the employee’s work overload resulting from her being “too good” at her job. Tove attributes the heavy workload to the fact that she “knows everything” and that she is consequently assigned many different work tasks. She describes herself as being sent there and having to do everything from working in the telephone bank to all kinds of other things (Sw. colloquial expression “ditten och datten”, ‘this and that’). The great number of things that Tove has to do is further emphasized by gestures bodily displaying an enumeration of work tasks (fig. 4.1). The reason why is made explicit on line 13, where Tove takes a strong epistemic stance: “just coz I happen to know evinghing then”. During her turn production, she gazes directly at the manager (fig. 4.2) who responds minimally.

Knowledge talk here occurs in the context of a complaint that is composed of several interrelated sub-complaints having to do with the employee’s work overload resulting from her being “too good” at her job. Tove attributes the heavy workload to the fact that she “knows everything” and that she is consequently assigned many different work tasks. She describes herself as being sent there and having to do everything from working in the telephone bank to all kinds of other things (Sw. colloquial expression “ditten och datten”, ‘this and that’). The great number of things that Tove has to do is further emphasized by gestures bodily displaying an enumeration of work tasks (fig. 4.1). The reason why is made explicit on line 13, where Tove takes a strong epistemic stance: “just coz I happen to know evinghing then”. During her turn production, she gazes directly at the manager (fig. 4.2) who responds minimally.

Self-praise is an interactionally delicate activity and vulnerable to accusations of bragging (Speer, 2012). Tove also downgrades her claim of epistemic supremacy (lines 15, 17) as she reformulates that she knows everything that is needed but not everything that is to be known, thus opening up for the possibility that there might be things that she can learn, while maintaining that she knows what is needed at this local office.

As was the case in Extract 3a, the employee produces an extreme case formulation, in this instance on the opposite side of the epistemic gradient (cf. Heritage, 2013), claiming knowledge of everything, what Pomerantz (1986) describes as a maximum case. Again, the manager is presented with an interactionally delicate moment. His response is again not oriented to the question of knowledgeableability, but instead makes relevant a description of the employee as loyal (line 16) who puts up with a stressful situation...
for the sake of the bank. However, the manager changes footing, and in orienting to the employee's work situation instead holds himself accountable, stating that “it’s really bad of me actually” (line 19). Tove, who has already explicitly framed what she is about to say as not to be understood as a critique of the manager (line 4), refuses to hold him accountable and instead assumes responsibility by saying that she should signal when too much work is coming her way. The manager readily acknowledges this, whereby Tove responds that she is not going to be able to do it. When Tove retracts from her willingness to share responsibility for a solution to the problem on lines 23–24, this displays that the complaint might not primarily be oriented toward seeking a solution to the problem, but rather to be ‘fishing’ (Pomerantz, 1980) for a compliment.

The employee's complaint makes relevant the relation between individual employees' knowledge and collective knowledge. The potential risk in one employee knowing “too much”, is related to the importance of retaining knowledge within the organization, distributing it across the work force so that even if one employee leaves, the required professional knowledge remains within the organization. Tove's telling about an employee at another office just prior to Excerpt 4 is designed to show this vulnerability, and although Tove is presenting the problem from an employee's point of view, the organizational dilemma is implicitly addressed. The manager's way of responding by referring to the employee's loyalty is interesting in this respect, as it addresses the affective quality of her relation to the organization.

6. Concluding discussion

Our study of knowledge talk in performance appraisal interviews shows how managers and employees draw upon formulations of individual and organizational knowledge in interactional projects negotiating knowledge boundaries and expertise, professional roles, and the organization of work. Knowledge is talked about in relation to organizational goals, where the importance of distributing knowledge among all members of the workforce is emphasized, while individual employees are also held accountable for accepting responsibility for an area of expertise. Knowledge is also talked about in terms of boundaries of knowledge or epistemic domains (Heritage, 2013). On the one hand, this is accomplished by talking about boundaries between individual and collective organizational knowledge, where the participants negotiate the right amount of shared knowledge in the workforce in contrast to specialist knowledge. On the other hand, participants talk about boundaries and limitations of individual knowledge. In this latter context, we located orientations to learning, as talk about epistemic domains brings to the fore how employees reflect upon what they know and what they need to learn, or not. We have thus shown how talk about knowledge limitations versus expertise can be used arguments for learning from colleagues, as well as for resisting additional responsibilities (i.e. a displayed preference for transferring customers to more knowledgeable co-workers as opposed to acquiring more knowledge). Finally, the analyses show how talk about knowledge boundaries is collaboratively transformed into opportunities for negotiating the organization of work and a division of labor in terms of specific work tasks and work load, since what one employee knows or does not know has implications for themselves as well as for colleagues.

Participants, thus, orient to knowledge in relation to colleagues, clients, and work tasks. They position themselves epistemically as learners (admitting to not knowing but prepared to learn from colleagues), as knowing much less than colleagues (and not able to master tasks in the same way), and as knowing everything (and having to take on others' tasks). Our analyses indicate that the epistemic relation to the customer is treated as the most sensitive, and that saying “wrong things” to customers must be avoided at all cost; an unknowing stance in relation to a customer is thus sometimes a preferred position. References to customers are powerful, since customers are essential to the survival of the organization.

As managers and employees orient to epistemic domains and organizational goals, different perspectives operate simultaneously. The managers in our data tend to take an organizational perspective, explicitly talking about goals, the work force as a whole, and the individual employee in relation to the organization (cf. Sorsa et al., 2014; Van De Mieroop & Vrolix, 2014). Although predominantly making relevant an individual perspective, the employee may also raise issues from an organizational point of view. However, employee talk about the organization is vulnerable to the manager reorienting the employee to an individual perspective (e.g., presenting something that needs to be developed as a collective concern opens up for the manager to bring back the question to the employee as an individual by asking if he has developed). Moreover, the employee may refer to organizational goals in order to achieve an individual goal (e.g., avoiding work tasks with reference to what is best for the organization: not giving bad advice).

The appraisal component of PAIs may be expected to have an impact on how participants display knowledgeability, in that positive self-presentation is part and parcel of the PAI (Asmuß, 2008; Nyroos & Sandlund, 2014). Even though questions in PAIs target both the appraisal of past performance and the identification of future development needs (Mikkelsen, 1998), expressing a lack of knowledge may clash with social needs for coming across as knowledgeable. Our analyses, however, show that expressing a lack of knowledge can work to accomplish different interactional goals in relation to, for example, a preferred division of labor. As such, particular epistemic positionings may be adopted strategically, and the role of epistemic stance taking in relation to epistemic boundaries or states is crucial. Depending on the epistemic positions taken by the employee, the manager is faced with different interactional challenges. As we have shown, in sequences where the employee describes insufficient knowledge in relation to specific products, but also displays a willingness to learn, the manager can quite easily cut to the chase through a polar question on whether the employee has indeed developed new knowledge. Here, the manager's disattending of reflective talk, and orientation to 'development' represents one practice for doing leadership in the PAI, as managers can “steer the on-going meaning construction toward obtaining an institutionalisable answer” (Van De Mieroop & Schnurr, 2014, p. 14). As such, the present study offers additional understandings of situated leadership practices (Pälli & Lehtinen, 2014; Van De Mieroop & Vrolix, 2014).

Conversely, when the employee claims a position as knowing less than colleagues and not being able to learn, requiring the employee to take on additional responsibilities and learn more is interactionally delicate, as such demands imply invalidation and
negative assessments of the employee’s perspective (cf. Asmuß, 2008) and threaten. As Clifton (2012) has shown, PAI participants collaboratively attend to each other’s face and tend to avoid face-threatening and dispreferred actions. As a consequence of the “lack of topic penetration” which “marks topics as delicate” (p. 303), individual development goals may thus run the risk of being under-articulated. Interestingly, an epistemic claim on the opposite gradient may be just as interactionally delicate. When an employee claims to know everything with a heavy workload as a consequence, the manager not only has to handle the delicacy of responding to self-praise (cf. Speer, 2012), but also the implied management criticism of an uneven distribution of labor. Importantly, in these two latter interactional contexts, the epistemic stances as more or less knowledgeable also work to accomplish additional interactional goals, such as invoking empathy or soliciting praise. Consequently, the appraisal context per se does not seem to prevent employees from categorizing themselves as less knowledgeable. Instead, a knowledgeable and professional employee is constructed as someone who has the ability to act both as a generalist and an expert, who knows the boundaries of his or her knowledge, and who knows what colleagues know in order to transfer clients to the most appropriate organizational member.

Drawing on conceptualizations of organizations as talked into being (Drew & Heritage, 1992), the detailed analyses of turn-by-turn knowledge talk empirically demonstrate how a sense of ‘organization’ is collaboratively accomplished in everyday practices such as PAIs (Samra-Fredericks, 2004). The negotiations of individual and collective organizational knowledge are indeed part of the organization’s practical strategy work, where the employees’ professional roles are related, in situ, to important goals for the bank (pensions), recent reorganizations of work (new kind of customer meetings), and what has been agreed upon in order to cope with a rapidly changing world (a distribution of responsibilities). In line with Nielsen’s (2009) findings, the PAI may thus work as a site where employees are socialized into viewing the organizational context in ways that secure strategic interests and where attempts are made to align individual employees’ goals with those of the organization. Hence, we argue that PAIs can also be viewed as a site for the situated practice of organizational knowledge management, where negotiations of knowledge are incorporated into strategic goals concerning employees’ expertise, development and learning.
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Appendix A

Transcription conventions adapted from Jefferson (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[]</th>
<th>Overlapping talk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Equal signs indicate no break or gap between the lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.8) ()</td>
<td>Numbers in parentheses indicate silence. A dot in parentheses indicates a micropause less than 5/10 of a second.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . ?</td>
<td>The punctuation marks indicate intonation. The period indicates falling intonation, the comma continuing intonation, the inverted question mark indicates slightly rising intonation and the question mark rising intonation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>::</td>
<td>Colon signs are used to indicate prolongation or stretching of the immediately prior sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>A hyphen after a word indicates a cut-off or self-interruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>Underlining indicates some form of stress or emphasis. The more the underlining the greater the emphasis. Especially loud talk is indicated by upper case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* *</td>
<td>The degree signs indicate that the talk between them is markedly quiet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* *</td>
<td>The asterisks indicate a creaky voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>The up arrow marks a sharp rise in pitch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; &lt;</td>
<td>Right/left carrots indicate that the talk between them is speeded up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>Left/right carrots indicate that the talk is slowed down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hh</td>
<td>Hearable inbreaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hh</td>
<td>Hearable outbreaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>()</td>
<td>Double parentheses are used to mark transcriber’s descriptions of events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Empty parentheses indicate that something is being said but no hearing can be achieved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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