CHAPTER 2

Theoretical Orientations 2

This chapter continues the review of the literature begun in Chapter 1. The focus here is on text and context.

2.1 Text and Discourse

The terms *text* and *discourse* are central to this work. They, in fact, occur even in the title. However, despite several attempts over the past three decades to distinguish the two terms, the precise nature of their difference still remains fuzzy. A very large part of the blame for this, I feel, can be attributed to the fact that each scholar seems to want to define the terms in his own way. Some confine "texture" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976) to its material attributes (cohesion, suprasentential nature etc) and reserve the word "discourse" for the linguistically-realized social interaction which goes on with and within texts. As it is felt that a rehearsal of the various uses of the terms will serve no useful purpose and adding new definitions is probably going to delay the process of disciplinary growth and self-definition, I will merely resort to telling what definition the terms have within this study.
My heuristic for doing this is to configure a definitional collage by putting together some existing definitions. This way I have more control over the inclusion or exclusion of features and the foregrounding or backgrounding of features that make my definition adequate and appropriately attenuated for the needs of this study.

2.1.1 Text

The term "text" and how I perceive its possibilities as an analytical resource for the discovery of social practices and processes is adapted mainly from systemic linguistics, particularly from Halliday's 1978 book, *Language as Social Semiotic* and Gunther Kress's 1989 book. I only add to these when I have not found a statement about a feature I deem necessary in the work of these systemic linguists.

According to Graddol (1994: 46) the modern word text was derived from a Latin word meaning "to weave". The concept of text today is woven of many different strands. So, instead of attempting a single definition which probably would break from information overload, I provide a more leisurely definitional collage of the term. This is my definitional collage, with the definitional features taken from extant literature in italics, and whatever gloss seems necessary, in normal font:

1 *Language always happens as text, and not as isolated words and sentences.* (Kress, p.18) In this sense a text is a language happening.
Texts are material objects and as such they are part of the business of life. *Texts are the material form of language; in particular, texts give material realisation to discourses. Most texts can be described as communicative artefacts. A great deal flows from their status as artefacts. They are commodities which can enter social and economic relations: they can be advertised, sold for profit, presented as gifts, owned as property.* (Kress, p.18)

From an aesthetic, social or educational perspective it is the text which is the significant unit of language. (Kress, p.18)

Persistence and change in the social system are both reflected in text and brought about by means of text. Text is the primary channel of the transmission of culture...text (is) the semantic process of social dynamics...It provides a means of acting on and reflecting on the environment to be sure - but in a broader context, in which acting and reflecting on the environment are in turn the means of creating the environment and transmitting it from one generation to the next. That this is so is because the environment is a social construct. (Halliday:141) In this sense a text is a social event and a sociohistorical process. (See also de Beaugrande, 1994. *The text is not merely a linguistic unit, but a unit of human action, interaction, communication and cognition*.)

A text is a site for the construction of reality. *It is natural to conceive of text first and foremost as conversation: as the spontaneous interchange of meanings in ordinary, everyday interaction. It is in such contexts that reality is constructed, in the microsemiotic encounters of daily life* (Halliday,p.140)

Text is a particular representation of reality derived from making specific choices from within the paradigmatic system of choices that the language as code offers. *The system is a meaning potential, which is actualized in the form of text* (Halliday, p.141) *It is the actual seen against the background of the potential* (Halliday, p. 40) *To my mind, the key concept is that of realization, language as multiple coding. Just as there is a relation of realization between the semantic system and the lexicogrammatical system, so that can say is the realization of can mean, so also there is a relation of realization between the semantic system and some higher-level semiotic which we can represent if you like as a behavioural system. It would be better to say that can mean is 'a realization of can do', or rather, 'is one form of the realization of can do'* (Halliday, p.39-40)
Texts are simultaneously communal and individual. Because linguistic, discoursal and generic choices are choices provided by the system evolved by text history and the history of language use, texts are communal. Texts are individual in that ultimately the chooser, the decision-maker, is the one who determines which choices, if any, s/he will make from the resources available in the system. Text is an inscription of fleeting social meaning and the dynamics by which this meaning is constructed....*a text is an instance of social meaning in a particular context of situation. We shall therefore expect to find the situation embodied or enshrined in the text, not piecemeal, but in a way which reflects the systematic relation between the semantic structure and the social environment. In other words, the 'situation' will appear as constitutive of the text; provided, that is, we can characterize it so as to take account of the ecological properties of language, the features which relate it to its environment in the social system.* (Halliday, p.141)

A text is not just a physical entity made up of sentences; it is a semantic unit. *A text...is a semantic unit which is not composed of sentences but is realized in sentences.* (Halliday, p.135)

A text is in essence a process even though at a trivial level it is a product, "the product of the process of production " (Fairclough, 1989). *The text is a continuous process. There is a constantly shifting relation between a text and its environment.... The dynamic, indeterminate nature of meaning...emerges as the dominant mode of thought as soon as one comes to...focus on text as actualized potential.... The essential feature of text, therefore, is that it is interaction. The exchange of meanings is an interactive process, and text is the means of exchange.*(Halliday: 139) Texts are also part of process in the way they become part of social process. *Creation is only one half of the history of a text - the remainder of its history tells of its use.... The same text can be read many times and used in many different ways by different people. Texts can be relocated, recontextualized, plagiarized...* (Graddol, 1994: 49)

Texts are polysystemic and multisemiotic. *...texts are the product of an interaction of a variety of 'languages' or semiotic systems, none necessarily homologous with any other...it is practically impossible to find a text that mobilizes only one language...if we are to account for what it is to make a text, we are unlikely to find out a great deal from studying the properties of only one of its languages.* (Freedman, cited in Threadgold, 1988:328)
2.1.2 Discourse

As the definition of text given above incorporates as embedded in texts, those features that are considered the dynamic aspects of discourse as a mass noun - its interactive nature, its function as social action, its existence as a shaping and shaped entity within a larger semiotic of which it is a part - the term discourse as it will be used in this thesis will have a much narrower sphere of meaning. It will be used in just two senses. Firstly, discourse will refer to the dynamic aspects embedded in a text, what goes on in a text. See, for instance, the use of the term in the following sentence, "The cogency of the discourse in text 1 makes it superior to the discourse in text 2." Secondly, it will refer to the specific meanings, values and ways of communicating peculiar to specific institutions or social groupings. In this sense, Discourses are systematically-organized sets of statements which give expression to the meanings and values of an institution.

...A discourse provides a set of possible statements about a given area and organizes and gives structure to the manner in which a particular topic, object, process is to be talked about in that it provides descriptions, rules, permissions and prohibitions of social and individual actions.

(Kress, 1985:7)

An important observation that needs to be made about discourse in this sense of the word is that several discourses can co-exist without any one necessarily more dominant than the others. Thus, Kress (1985: 17), identifies "medical, Christian, populist, (Jungian) psychiatric, patriotic, sentimental/parental, romantic,
patriarchal, technological, prophetic, feminist discourse in a text of about 750 words. In this sense texts are hybrid.

2.2 Intertextuality

2.2.1 What is intertextuality?

The notion of intertextuality has been defined basically as the relationships that exist between texts. Lemke defines the term as follows:

Intertextuality is an important characteristic of the use of language in communities. The meanings we make through texts, and the ways we make them, always depend on the currency in our communities of other texts we recognize as having certain definite kinds of relationships with them: generic, thematic, structural, and functional. Every text, the discourse of every occasion, makes sense in part through implicit and explicit relationships of particular kinds to other texts, to the discourse of other occasions....The discourse practices of a community both build systems of texts related in these ways and establish the recognized kinds of relationships there may be between texts or the discourse of different occasions.

(Lemke, 1985: 275)

A text may function intertextually in a number of ways; for example,

1. as a member of a genre e.g. as a fable with its characteristic structure in terms of its length, its animal characters, its ending with a moral statement

2. as part of a larger structure of action over time. Bazerman, for instance, cites the following example:
Systems of genre... are interrelated genres that interact with each other in specific settings. Only a limited range of genres may appropriately follow upon one another in particular settings, because the success conditions of the actions of each require various states of affairs to exist. That is, a patent may not be issued unless there is an application. An infringement complaint cannot be filed unless there is a valid patent. An affidavit about the events in a laboratory on a certain date will not be sworn unless a challenge to the patent is filed.


3 in terms of the function(s) it performs in relation to other discourses e.g. tax documents are the ultimate authority for all the documents a tax accountant writes (Devitt, 1991)

4 in terms of the relationships it enters into with other texts in the order of discourse to which it belongs.

The basic questions of intertextuality and their import in investigating the meaning-making matrix, according to Lemke, are:

...which texts go together, and how? That texts 'go together' means that there is some sense in which they are relevant contexts for each other's interpretation, that socially significant meanings are being made by the community through the interrelations of these texts. To say how they go together is to specify what kinds of relationship between them help make these meanings. The kinds of relationships made between texts and the sets of texts related in these ways together define the system of intertextuality in the language use of a community.

(Lemke, 1985)
Holthuis (1994:127) makes essentially the same point with examples from day-to-day living, introducing, however, the notion of mediation, where explicit reference to other texts is motivated by direct or indirect textual reference:

Intertextuality subsumes the relationship between a given text and other relevant texts encountered in prior experience, with or without mediation....A reply in conversation or a recall protocol of a text just read illustrate intertextuality with very little mediation. More extensive mediation obtains when replies or criticisms are directed to texts written down at some earlier time.

Another question related to intertextuality is the relative agency of reader and writer in the invoking of intertextually-informed response to a text. Holthuis again raises this issue:

I shall presuppose a conception of intertextuality concerning the dichotomy between a) the 'intertextual disposition' of texts, which shows the determining potential of texts in the light of the fact that the text itself motivates interpretation by means of its various text signals and b) aspects of intertextually oriented text processing which sees intertextuality as a specific meaning constitution and in this respect must be regarded as an 'inter-action' between text and reader, depending on the textual qualities on the one hand and on the reader's 'intertextual competence' on the other.

An issue I think is of particular importance in the constitution of the notion of discourse community and the formation and maintenance of disciplinary universes has not however, been raised explicitly by any theoretician dealing with the construct of intertextuality. The issue relates to the stability and permanency of relationship(s) between the denoted text and the connoted text. Here I mean not only the recognition of the existence of a relationship between any two or more
texts but also the habitual expectation of particular types of relationships. To illustrate, if the relationship between two texts is that one is a parody of the other, the perception of the parody and the depth and intensity of response are a function of the particular reader's knowledge of the original and his individual capacity to perceive the elements parodied. If any one individual fails to perceive the relationship, this may be a personal loss but it certainly would not have repercussions on any group of which he is a member. This obviously is not always the case. Amy Devitt's (1991) work on intertextuality in tax accounting is particularly insightful in this respect. In explaining the rationale for her study which was "designed to discover the kinds of texts written within a single community and how those texts function for the community", she posits that

(the) repeated, structured activities and relationships of the profession constitute the rhetorical situations to which the established genres respond....In examining the genre set of a community, we are examining the community's situations, its recurring activities and relationships. The genre set accomplishes its work (Devitt, 1991:340).

Her research, in fact bears her out:

For tax accountants, texts serve as their primary resource, as both their subject and their authority.

Devitt states that eight out of the thirteen genres used by the tax accountants had as their subject other texts e.g. IRS regulations, notices, tax form enquiries etc In fact she says,
Because the tax codes and regulations constitute the accountants work in so many ways and because they are the source of the accountant's expertise, the education of aspiring accountants emphasizes their learning what these documents contain and how to use them. The students are being trained in the profession's epistemological assumptions, that these documents are the source of all knowledge and authority.

(Devitt, 1991:350)

The last sentence of her article, in fact speculates on the possibility that texts may be as integrally related to the epistemic constitution of other professions as well, not merely to tax accounting:

For the tax accountant - and perhaps to other professionals - texts are so interwoven with and deeply embedded in the community that texts constitute its products and its resources, its expertise and its evidence, its needs and its values.

(Devitt, 1991: 354)

The inference from this, for me, is that studying the stable relationships that exist between texts in a profession (or domain or discipline) may, in fact be a powerful heuristic for discovering the elements constitutive of its internal workings.

Intertextual study also appears to provide a rich source of insight into another feature of discourse between (as opposed to within) professions in the modern world. Large-scale industries and corporate enterprises employ many different kinds of professionals today. While it is for their professional expertise that these people are employed, their expertise is garnered mainly in the service of the primary goal of such enterprises viz the making of profit. This ancillary,
expertise-in-the service-of profit-making role that each of these professionals has requires new work priorities and orientations as well as new symbiotic relationships with other professionals that are unique to the organization of modern life and therefore, unique also to discourse. The kind of intertextual analysis that this study proposes, it is suggested, has the potential of unpacking the social semiotic that enables symbiosis between these experts.

2.2. 2 The importance of intertextual analysis to the present study

The attempt to understand social processes using text alone as a heuristic would be limited if we define text as it occurs in the title of this thesis as a single text type or genre would be limited. It would be limited by the fact that while the operations of a social group (a domain, discipline or profession) may be realized in and through texts, it is not realized by any one type of text or genre. As Devitt points out it is the set of texts the group presupposes, produces and has recourse to in the routine performance of its work that cumulatively accomplishes its work. In this sense each text of a group is a collocate of all the other texts. Fairclough (1989) encapsulates this interrelationship in the construct 'orders of discourse', the interconnected set of genres that perform the work of an institution or society.

It is clear from this that sole reference to a single genre, like the annual report, would only provide a partial picture of the meaning making matrix within which the genre exists and derives its significative potential. For text to work at its maximum efficiency in reflecting the social structure and epistemic
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constitution of the group of which it is the tool, 'text' needs to be defined as a mass noun to include all the genres in the order of discourse to which the annual report belongs. This is the ideal. Taking on board the analysis of the entire order of discourse of the Malaysian business community would be practically beyond the scope of this thesis. Intertextuality, however, is built into the design of the study. The analysis is still focused on the annual report but it is intertextually aware and sensitive textual analysis; 'text' in this study refers to the annual report and such other texts that bona fide members of the discourse community would read into their understanding of the discourse of the Annual Report.

Another reason why intertextuality is important to this study is the recognition today that context for any text necessarily includes the intertextual context:

It is not just by construing semantic relations to the immediate textual, even situational, context that we make a word or phrase mean. It is also by construing relations to other texts and situations in which that word or phrase has been used... What is often missing in contextual models of reference is intertextual contextualization.

(Lemke, 1988:165)

2.2.3 Intertextually-motivated research issues for the study

A number of issues relevant to our understanding of the relationship(s) between texts and social processes are raised by the research in intertextual relations that we have just looked at:

a What, if any, relationship is there between the Annual Report and other
socially adjacent public and private orders of discourse e.g. the discourse of advertising and law? What do these relationships say about the social structure and social processes within which these interpenetrating discourses exist?

b The Annual Report is a text with many different sections within it. What internal relations exist between these component sections of the Annual Report? What features of social structure and social process entail the architecture of the Annual Report?

c What, if any, are the intertextual chain relationships that are embedded in the annual reports? What kinds of society-text relationships are they indices of?

d What role, if any, do these intertextual relations play in the forging and maintenance of not only the individual professions in the company but also the nature of interrelationships between professions?

2.3 Genre Analysis

The focus on approaches to text analysis here is on genre studies, rather than text studies in general because genre is social, situated practice and the present study's social constructionist view of language requires approaches that have a social orientation.
Traditionally a literary construct, *genre* (and its scholarship) has extended its reach to include more functional genres like interviews, science research articles, classroom discourse, lawyer-client as well as doctor-patient talk. Hyon (1996) has suggested that these studies fall into roughly three research traditions: ESP-based research, research within the more general aegis of what has come to be called New Rhetoric in North America and the largely Australian endeavour to study genre using Halliday's systemic functional framework.

The review here will follow Hyon's broad categories although the details upon which critical attention will fall will vary somewhat from his emphasis. This is to reflect this study's interest in the *humanness* of communication. The geographical assignment of research traditions, although true in a rough and ready way, ignores the fact that there are scholars in each tradition all over the world. So, for the purposes of this review the physical geography will be dissolved and only the grouping according to intellectual tradition retained. To reflect the theoretical orientations of each, the researcher will rename the traditions: ESP-Based Genre Analysis, Ideology-Based Systemic Genre Analysis and "New Rhetoric" Genre Analysis. Those studies in Australia that have school pedagogy as a base (the work of Frances Christie and J.R. Martin) have been left out of the review on the grounds that the discussion of the other traditions incorporate the aspects of these studies that are relevant to this investigation and their specific school orientation makes their focus largely irrelevant to this research effort.
The researcher's ambitions in the review of each of the three traditions are somewhat different and what is foregrounded in each is reflective of the aspect of each tradition that has most influenced this study. The researcher has hardly drawn upon the ESP tradition except occasionally as part of the heuristic for showing different moves within a CEO's report. Hence she has paid little attention to its methodology or to its findings. Since it has been very influential in the field, it seemed inappropriate to leave it out altogether. The focus has been, therefore, on an evaluation of its contribution. The second tradition has most contributed to the heuristics, particularly to the assumptions about the relationship between language and social structure and process, and concomitantly, on the type of linguistic analysis most suitable for the purposes of this study. The greatest attention in the review of this approach has therefore been on its theories regarding language and its approach to language study. This study is most closely related to the third approach in its investigative goals. The goals of these studies and their findings are therefore the primary location of critical attention.

The human in all three traditions is studied as it finds expression in the group. Language as most people now accept is an instrument, specifically an instrument of social action. It is an instrument "of continuity and of change, of tradition and of revolution" (McKeon, 1987). In the three traditions of genre to be looked at the emphasis falls differently; some emphasize tradition and convention, others foreground contestation and change. There are studies that look at individual
performance (Greg Myers, 1985; Bazerman, 1988; Berkenkotter, Huckin and Ackerman, 1994, Winsor, 1989; for example are reviewed here) but even these look at the individual in the perspective of the community. The primary focus of this review therefore would be on what purpose text analysis serves in each tradition and what insights the consequent analyses give into such core notions as community, ideology and creativity.

2.3.1 ESP-Based Genre Analysis

Halliday's response to Parret's question, "Do you stress the instrumentality of linguistics rather than its autonomy?" was,

...Probably most people who have looked at language in functional terms have had a predominantly instrumental approach; they have not been concerned so much with the nature of language as such as with the use of language to explore something else. But I would say that in order to understand the nature of language itself we also have to approach it functionally. So I would have both perspectives at once. It seems to me that we have to recognize different purposes for which language may be studied. An autonomous linguistics is the study of language for the sake of understanding the linguistic system. An instrumental linguistics is the study of language for understanding something else - the social system, for example.

( Halliday, 1978: 36)

In Halliday's terms, ESP-based genre research (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993; Menon, 1995; Hopkins and Dudley Evans, 1988; Azirah Hashim, 1996) has been largely instrumental, a means adopted by the ELT community to accommodate the urgent need of its members to re-examine and re-source the
roots of their own expertise and professional authority in the face of the repeated challenges they have received from developments in the theory of language and what "knowing a language" constitutes as well as from the "field", where the traditional sources of their authority (their superior knowledge of the English language) are constantly under siege from a realization that their students were superior to them in their familiarity with the content that the language purveys.

Given its genesis in pedagogy, the research attention in this tradition, quite understandably, has been on the "teachables" and the identification of the socially expected. This is clear, for example, from Bhatia's definition of genre as

a recognizable communicative event characterized by a set of communicative purpose(s) identified and mutually understood by the members of the professional or academic community in which it regularly occurs. Most often it is highly structured and conventionalized with constraints on allowable contributions in terms of their intent, positioning, form and functional value.

(Bhatia, 1993:13)

The twin pillars of writing instruction - "communicative purpose" and audience (here "members of the professional and academic community") - feature prominently. The focus is on the social: the "recognizable communicative event", its "highly structured and conventionalized" nature and the "constraints on allowable contributions". In the analysis of the structure, centrality is accorded to "positioning, form and functional value". The place of creativity is recognized

For example,
These constraints, however, are often exploited by the expert members of the discourse community to achieve private intentions within the framework of socially recognized purpose(s).

(Bhatia, 1993:13)

However, the acknowledgement is only an aside; it is not the object of serious academic pursuit within this tradition of genre analysis.

The typical mode of analysis is the identification of moves and the listing of typical linguistic exponents that realize each move. The general assumption here is that there are multiple literacies - that the discourse of each discipline and profession would be configured in distinctively different ways - but that within each discipline or profession, there is a prevailing canon that everyone in that profession or discipline would conform to.

The attitudes that are extant in the literature regarding this form of genre analysis and the assumptions that underpin it, like many other areas of language and discourse study, reflect the ideological tensions that divide linguists and educators today. For example, one group of educators sees the downside of genre analysis. The assumptions about why any genre is learnt by the ESL/EFL student that underpins ESP-based genre analysis is one target of criticism. Steve (1994: 390 quoted in Bhatia, 1997:318), for example, points out:
Foreign languages are usually taught with the goal of being able to communicate with/participate in that language's 'native' society. In this instance, it is necessary to teach the structure of the language as well as the social semiotic as seen by the target culture. However, in most of the cases in Asia and Africa, the goal is not to learn English to participate in the Anglo social semiotic, but to transfer the native social semiotic on to the English base and thus nativize it as an effective means of communication for that culture, without reference to the Anglo culture.

Of course, the answer to such a criticism would be that the very assumption of multiple literacies that underpins genre study must militate against any monolithic concept of the sort of social embedding on which it rests. This is the theory. The practice, however, doesn't validate the theory. Most studies use native speaker exponents to establish normative behaviour and analyse non-native varieties as deviants, not as alternatives. The pedagogy operates on a deficit model; anyone who has not mastered the native variety or deviates from its norms is in need of remedial action, is the normative ESP position. So, although there is nothing in the ontogenesis of genre theory that necessitates, or even encourages, a unitary view of the possibilities of any one genre, the overlay of educational assumptions in this approach to genre directs research focus in the direction of 'Anglo' hegemony. Given the fact that today the role of English in the outer and expanding circles (Kachru, 1986) is not confined to non-native - native (NN-N) communication but includes intra-circle communication within members of the outer circle and the inner circle or inter-circle communication between members of outer and expanding circles, the social assumptions underpinning the pedagogy themselves become suspect. These two perceptions appear to
undermine the pedagogic value of the studies of genre within this framework. Scholars within the tradition themselves, for example, Bhatia (1997) and Dudley-Evans (1997) advocate opening the canon at least to acknowledge the reality of world Englishes.

Other views, albeit stated in different contexts, prevent such apparently cogent views from being accepted without misgivings. See, for example, Derrida's (1992) views:

...Certainly, we need to open the canon, to broaden it, to question it, but we can't do so before acquiring at least a minimal knowledge of the basic foundations of the canon

At the pragmatic level also this contention to "open the canon" raises some questions about what can constitute "the canon". In view of the sheer volume of output in the 'Anglo' model, can we, for example, regard the discourse of the reputable scientific journals as "the canon"? Or, from the headstart that the "anglos" had in international business and their sheer economic power and global spread, can we regard their discourse of international business as "the canon" for international business? Would pragmatic reasons (largely political and economic) need to be allowed to supercede cultural reasons?
A further problem with this variety of genre analysis that reifies the native speaker model is that it causes a form of language death. As Swales (1997), Dudley-Evans (1997) and Maureenan (1993) and Yunick (1997) among others have pointed out,

A concern for the teaching of genres in an ELT/ESL context is the pervasion of the English code to genres previously owned by another tongue.... particular contexts and genre have been given over to the English code as the language of science and medicine in Scandinavia, and there is concern that, through learning of genres, the remaining Scandinavian discourse patterns will also be lost....sociolinguistic facts, even the carefully contextualized ones which are the result of genre analysis, are only one layer in a multi-layered value-oriented social dialectic. This is not to say that sociolinguists and language teachers should abandon the notions of advocacy and empowerment - but that in doing so, they must too become critically aware of what their linguistics facts can and cannot buy, inside and outside the classroom.

(Yunick, 1997: 331-332)

The next difficulty with genre studies of the kind conducted by Swales and his imitators is, in a sense related to the last difficulty discussed. In the same way ESP-type genre studies tend to be too exclusive in the sociocultural sense, in the rhetorical sense too they may be not sufficiently inclusive. Being too focused on those characteristics that are distinctive of a genre, they may fail to account for those features of discourse that cut across all genres, for example, how the relationships that obtain between older and younger members of a society or senior and junior members of an organization affect discourse regardless of the genre into which the discourse moulds itself. Register analysis as well as the kind
of analysis which Winter and Hoey (1986) have done, where they look for a problem-solution pattern in discourse of many different kinds would argue for many levels of communal ownership of semiotic resources. If a text is woven from strands of many kinds and deriving from many different levels and kinds of social organization, focusing on only those aspects that derive from genre occludes the perception of the multiple ways in which language enters into relationship with other semiotic systems and with social processes in a text. For this reason, Yunick (1997) argues that genre analysis, which focuses on the immediate context, must be complemented by register analysis, which cross-cuts genres in a search for regularities within a domain of study or work.

Perhaps it needs to be argued that the complementarity for which Yunick argues does not go far enough. It needs also to look at regularities in human communication of the sort suggested by Grice's (1975) Co-operative Principle and Leech's notions of politeness as well as aspects of the primary culture within which any one instance of discourse is embedded.

Another important insight that other forms of genre analysis, e.g Critical Discourse Analysis, unpack is the perception that genre is not only the site for cultural reproduction; it is also the site of cultural contest where, as Yunick (1997:331) points out "thrusting professions do not simply translate competence into performance: they choose among ideologically-positioned meanings to create
and recreate themselves and their surroundings”. In emphasizing convention, this type of genre analysis ignores the sites of difference, thereby failing to notice a number of features of discourse other approaches have pointed out: the inception of change from within tradition; the heteroglossia; the multiplicity of discourses that co-exist within a genre and so on.

So what are the strengths of this form of analysis? The issue of its educational value, especially its role in providing a scaffolding for interlanguage accommodation has been rehearsed several times before. (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993, Chitavelu and Sitavelu, 1992, Chitavelu, 1995). However, this aspect of the benefits of genre analysis will not receive much attention in this review as it is not relevant to the study’s focus on meaning construction in and through texts.

What will however, be pointed out is how this form of genre analysis demonstrates the perceptual benefits accruing to a form of analysis that blinds itself to the dynamics of diachronic change and thereby manages to capture the dynamism of synchronic relationships, specifically the relationship between a text and the goals of the discourse community whose mechanism of operation it is. Because it takes a positivist stand on discourse and adopts an unquestioning stance on the ideology that underpins the genre that it analyses, this kind of analysis is able to understand the workings of disciplinary knowledge in discourse better although New Rhetoric with its emphasis on contextual determination of
meaning, is better equipped to explore the role of individual creativity within the continuing tradition.

2.3.2 Ideology-Based Genre Analysis: Critical Discourse Analysis

While the ESP-inspired genre analysis adopted whatever ideology was inscribed in the texts it analyzed, and left unexamined its affective dimensions, the genre-analysts grouped under this category have a definite non-linguistic agenda as is clear from the statement of objectives from its proponents cited below:

Discourse is a major instrument of power and control and Critical Discourse Analysts, unlike Chomsky, feel that it is indeed part of their professional role to investigate, reveal and clarify how power and discriminatory value are inscribed in and mediated through the linguistic system. Critical Discourse Analysis is essentially political in intent with its practitioners acting upon the world in order to transform it and thereby create a world where people are not discriminated against because of sex, colour, creed, age or social class.

(Caldas-Coulthard and Coulthard, 1995: xii)

Kress again re-iterates the same point, saying that the goal of CDA is

... broadly speaking, that of altering inequitable distributions of economic, cultural and political goods in contemporary societies. The intention has been to bring a system of excessive inequalities of power into crisis by uncovering its workings and its effects through the analysis of potent cultural objects - texts - and thereby to help in achieving a more equitable social order

(Kress, 1995: 15)
This again is, in Hallidayan terms, instrumental linguistics but it is instrumental in a way. Linguistics has probably never before been instrumental. It creates a paradigm shift, moving the very goals of the discipline. It attempts to do this, firstly, by shifting the centre of focus from "knowledge-telling" (with the assumption that knowledge exists objectively out there waiting to be "discovered") to the knowledge user, the human beings who create and are created by what they "know". While ESP genre analysis can be termed in this sense object-focused and therefore more asocial, CDA research can be seen to be more concerned with the experiencing subject and in this sense more subject-focused and in this sense also more social. Secondly, there is also a shift in what is deemed constitutive of the discipline. Thus far, the thrust of scholars generally has been towards the notion of linguistic science, a philosophical stance that denies the legitimacy of evaluation and subjectivity. In CDA, however, subjectivity and moral commitment are seen as legitimate concerns of linguistics:

To the extent that ideologies are tacit, removed or deferred and self-advantaging, they are the root of human evil and leave us complicit with, and thus responsible for, the evil that is in the world. We cannot, perhaps, remove the evil, but we can remove our moral complicity. We do this, I believe, by doing a species of linguistics, namely discourse analysis (explicating our tacit and removed/deferred theories, especially our tacit and removed/deferred ideologies). That is why linguistics is a moral matter and why, in the end, to me, linguistics matters.

(Gee, 1990:24)
Linguistics is seen as a means of uncovering the insidious but pervasive workings of ideologies that create and/or perpetrate inequality through a number of mechanisms: denial of access, different knowledge distribution, the privileging of the discourse of certain groups over others etc. In this sense linguistics is seen as an agent of change, a provider of scholarship in the service of humanity. What the ESP-type discourse analysts, quite unconsciously, take as the natural consensus, CDA scholars perceive as the very site most needful of investigation and contestation. In this sense, CDA focuses on the disabling, disenfranchising and centrifugal or heteroglossic tendencies created by community-generated ideology while ESP-type genre analysis focuses on the enabling, empowering, centripetal and consensual aspects of the ideologies embedded in genres.

Many of the studies that seem to have this orientation are extremely insightful. (Mumby and Stohl, 1991; Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 1996; Van Dijk, 1998). The major objection to CDA, which many of its own proponents acknowledge and point out (van Dijk, 1998; Kress, 1985) is that because of its predisposition towards discovering inequalities and injustices, it tends to pay exclusive attention to genres in which there are obvious power differences: classroom discourse, police investigations, racist discourse, political discourse, media discourse, job interviews. A related problem is the possibility that the predisposition to discover unfair inequalities, may mentally predispose the analyst to interpret and assign values to discourse elements in a way he may not have done had he come to the discourse without any previous evaluative mental frame
which creates a propensity to "prove" a point rather than allow the data to "speak" to him unmediated by any orienting hypothesis.

The present study attempts to investigate the social process - both negative and positive dimensions of it - as it is reflected in the text. This study is social but it does not seek to be an agent of social reform. Hence the goals of CDA are not of direct concern to this study except in the broad sense of legitimating subjective observation as an acceptable source of data gathering and interpretation. What is of tremendous consequence to this study, however, is the view of language that undergirds much of this work and the number of "terms of art" that this study has found to be of tremendous value in its own reporting of the results of the text analysis. The rest of this section, therefore will focus on these two aspects of the work.

CDA scholars, as van Dijk (1998) points out, use different language models. However, the view of language that is most pervasively used is that of Halliday. The researcher shall therefore quote extensively from Halliday as a means of explaining the tacit theoretical assumptions about language that is operative in this study as well as in the work of CDA scholars like Kress, van Leeuwen and Fairclough.

One aspect that is central to CDA (as well as the present study) is Halliday's view of language as a system of choices from which individuals draw
differentially according to their personal and social needs and the notion of language as "meaning potential" that arises as a concomitant of this view.

...each of these systems, semantics, grammar and phonology, is a system of potential, a range of alternatives. If we take the grammatical (lexicogrammatical) system, this is the system of what the speaker can say.... What the speaker can say, i.e. the lexicogrammatical system as a whole, operates as the realization of the semantic system, which is what the speaker can mean - what I refer to as the 'meaning potential'. I see language essentially as a system of meaning potential. Now once we go outside the language, then we see that this semantic system is itself the realization of something beyond, which is what the speaker can do - I have referred to that as the 'behaviour potential'.... To my mind, the key concept is that of realization, language as multiple coding. Just as there is a relation of realization between the semantic system and the lexicogrammatical system, so that can say is the realization of can mean, so also there is a relation of realization between the semantic system and some higher-level semiotic which we can represent if you like as a behavioural system. It would be better to say that can mean is 'a realization of can do', or rather, 'is one form of the realization of can do'.

(Halliday, 1978:39)

Halliday's (1978:40) view on system and process, paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations is also of central concern:

If we go back to the Hjelmslevian (originally Saussurean) distinction of paradigmatic and syntagmatic, most of modern linguistic theory has given priority to the syntagmatic form of organization. Structure means (abstract) constituency, which is a syntagmatic concept. Lamb treats the two axes together: for him a linguistic stratum is a network embodying both syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations all mixed up together, in patterns of what he calls AND nodes and OR nodes. I take out the paradigmatic relations (Firth's system) and give priority to these; for me the underlying organization at each level is paradigmatic. Each level is
a network of paradigmatic relations of ORs - a range of alternatives, in the sociological sense. This is what I mean by a potential: the semantic system is a network of meaning potential. The network consists very simply of a set of interrelated systems, the system being used here in the Firthian sense, though perhaps slightly more abstract, and making fuller use of his own "polysystemic" principle. The network is a representation of options, more particularly of the interrelations among options. Hence, a semantic network is a representation of semantic options or choices in meaning.

Although Fairclough (1989) makes a distinction between text and discourse, he as well as others like Kress and van Leeuwen in their practice see text as Halliday does: as "actualized potential" and therefore as a "path through the system".

There are many purposes for which we may be interested in the text, in what people actually do and mean and say, in real situations. But in order to make sense of the text, what the speaker actually says, we have to interpret it against the background of what he 'can say'. In other words, we see the text as actualized potential; it is the actual seen against the background of the potential. But note that the actual and the potential are at the same level of abstraction. This is what makes it possible to relate the one to the other. They are at the same level of coding within the system, so that any text represents an actualization (a path through the system) at each level: the level of meaning, the level of saying (or wording, to use the folk-linguistic term for the lexicogrammatical system), and of course the level of sounding or writing.

Another Hallidayan view that pervades the CDA analysis of text is his view of reality as discoursally constructed and, as a corollary, text as a particular
construction of reality, not the representation of a pre-existing and objectively identifiable state of being:

It is natural to conceive of text first and foremost as conversation: as the spontaneous interchange of meanings in ordinary, everyday interaction. It is in such contexts that reality is constructed, in the microsemiotic encounters of daily life.

( Halliday, 1978:140. My emphasis)

There are other theoretically relevant assumptions that CDA, following social theorists like Foucault, Gramsci, Habermas and more recently Giddens, makes pertaining to the relationship between language and society. As these are also framing assumptions that inform this study, particularly its views of what constitutes "language" and what constitutes "social process", the rest of this section will describe these assumptions in some detail. Although the basic points raised can be found in the writings of most CDA scholars, the quotations used here are all from Fairclough. This is for a purely pragmatic reason; Fairclough wrote the book from which all these quotations are taken with a conscious will to make it "accessible not only to students and teachers in higher education, but also to a variety of people from other spheres" and so even those linguistic facts generally assumed to be known as well as those inferences that are usually left tacit are made explicit and transparent.

Fairclough explains the language-society relationship assumed in CDA in this way:
I have glossed the discourse view of language as 'language as a form of social practice. What precisely does this imply? Firstly, that language is a part of society, and not somehow external to it. Secondly, that language is a social process. And thirdly, that language is a socially conditioned process, conditioned that is by other (non-linguistic) parts of society.... My view is that there is not an external relationship 'between' language and society, but an internal and dialectical relationship. Language is a part of society; linguistic phenomena are social phenomena of a special sort, and social phenomena are (in part) linguistic phenomena.

Linguistic phenomena are social in the sense that whenever people speak or listen or write or read, they do so in ways which are determined socially and have social effects....

Social phenomena are linguistic, on the other hand, in the sense that the language activity that goes on in social contexts (as all linguistic activity does) is not merely a reflection or expression of social processes and practices, it is a part of those processes and practices....

But it is not a matter of a symmetrical relationship 'between' language and society as equal facets of a single whole. The whole is society, and language is one strand of the social.

(Fairclough, 1989:22-23)

This view of language has heuristic repercussions, repercussions that this study has also accepted and incorporated into its method of text analysis:

So, in seeing language as discourse and as social practice, one is committing oneself not just to analysing texts, not just to analysing processes of production and interpretation, but to analysing the relationship between texts, processes, and their social conditions, both the immediate conditions of the situational context and the more remote conditions of institutional and social structures.

Corresponding to these three dimensions of discourse, Fairclough suggests three dimensions or stages of analysis:
Description is the stage which is concerned with formal properties of the text. Interpretation is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction - with seeing text as a product of a process of production, and as a resource in the process of interpretation... I use the term interpretation for both the interactional process and a stage of analysis....

Explanation is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context - with the social determination of the processes of production and interpretation and their social effects.

(Fairclough, 1989:26)

In laying the psycholinguistic foundations for how society conditions people through the way it inscribes particular ways of thinking and speaking into their habitual language use, Fairclough, borrowing from the artificial intelligence notions of frames, schemas scripts etc, introduces the concept, "members' resources" that the researcher appropriates in attempting to explain the way professional and disciplinary stocks of knowledge operate in the Annual Report. Fairclough (1989) echoes frame theory in his initial description of members' resources:

...the most important result of work on comprehension is the stress which has been placed upon its active nature: you do not simply decode an utterance, you arrive at an interpretation through an active process of matching features of the utterance at various levels with representations you have stored in your long-term memory. These representations are prototypes for a very diverse collection of things - the shapes of words, the grammatical forms of sentences, the typical structure of a narrative, the properties of types of object and person, the expected sequence of events in a particular situation type, and so forth. Some of these are linguistic, and some of them are not....let us refer to these prototypes collectively as 'members' resources' or MR for short....MR are
socially determined and ideologically shaped, though their 'common sense' and automatic character typically disguises that fact. Routine and unselfconscious resort to MR in the ordinary business of discourse is, I shall suggest, a powerful mechanism for sustaining the relations of power which ultimately underlie them.

(p10-11)

People internalize what is socially produced and made available to them, and use this internalized MR to engage in their social practice, including discourse...it is not just the nature of these cognitive resources that is socially determined, but also the conditions of their use - for instance, different cognitive strategies are conventionally expected when someone is reading a poem on the one hand, and a magazine advertisement on the other.

(p24-25)

Fairclough's notion of MR also contributes towards building the theoretical foundations for the researcher's use of text analysis as a heuristic for attempting to establish the links between situated language use (text) and social process. The argument for the researcher's choice of text as heuristic is that what serves as *traces* for the ordinary language user can also serve the analyst as traces to track the relation between specific situation and broader social process. This possibility is one Fairclough not only actualizes in his own practice as an analyst but also one he implies in his reference to the interplay between the properties of the text and MR:

The formal properties of a text can be regarded from the perspective of discourse analysis on the one hand as *traces* of the productive process, and on the other hand as *cues* in the process of interpretation. It is an important property of productive and interpretative processes that they involve an interplay between properties of texts and a considerable range of...'members' resources' (MR) which people have in their heads and draw upon when they produce or interpret texts - including their knowledge of
language, representation of the natural and social worlds they inhabit, values, beliefs, assumptions, and so on.

(Fairclough, 1989:24)

Fairclough's conceptualization of the working of MR also holds within it a possible key to the relation between community and individual creativity in the construction of reality in any one discourse:

The MR which people draw upon to produce and interpret texts are cognitive in the sense that they are in people's heads, but they are social in the sense that they have social origins.

(Fairclough, 1989:24)

CDA has also contributed a number of terms of art to this study. One of these is ideology. The term ideology, of course, is not new. It has been used in politics, for example, to mean a set of beliefs on which people, parties and countries base their actions. Its use in linguistics and its particular redefinition within CDA, however have a verve and explanatory power that are new. As this concept has already been discussed in section 1.6, we shall merely concentrate on those aspects Fairclough highlights (See particularly pages 2, 33 and 77):

- Ideologies are 'common-sense' assumptions which are implicit in the conventions according to which people interact linguistically.

- People are generally not consciously aware of these ideologies.
• The nature of the ideological assumptions embedded in particular conventions, and so the nature of the conventions themselves, depends on the power relations which underlie the conventions.

• Ideologies are the means of legitimizing existing social relations and differences of power, simply through the recurrence of ordinary, familiar ways of behaving which take these relations for granted.

• Ideological power, the power to project one's practices as universal and 'common-sense', is a significant complement to economic and political power.

• The familiar common sense world of everyday life (Garfinkel) is a world which is built entirely upon assumptions and expectations which control both the actions of members of a society and their interpretation of the actions of others.

• Such assumptions are implicit, backgrounded, taken for granted, rarely explicitly formulated or examined or questioned.

The CDA scholars see these ideologies as one primary site for investigation of the mechanism by which inequalities are structured and perpetuated. In this study, which is not specifically concerned with this social agenda, the concept is appropriated primarily as an explanatory device in the investigation of persuasion and persuasiveness as well as as a descriptive term for the store of disciplinary knowledge that corporate members wield in the construction of arguments, ambience and so on.

One corollary of the social constructionist view that meaning is constructed, not discovered, is the recognition that in every discourse social roles
for the participants - listeners, speakers, readers, and writers - must get created. These participants can be assigned roles as actors or as those being acted upon. For one to be able to speak economically and efficiently about participant roles, a label for this construct is needed. Fairclough has invented the term subject position, which, as he himself points out captures the ambivalence:

Focusing upon 'social roles' or what I shall prefer to call subject positions, there is a sense in which we can say that the teacher and the pupil are what they do. The discourse types of the classroom set up subject positions for teachers and pupils, and it is only by 'occupying' these positions that one becomes a teacher or a pupil. Occupying a subject position is essentially doing (or not doing) certain things, in line with the discoursal rights and obligations of teachers and pupils - what each is allowed and required to say, and not allowed or required to say within that particular discourse type. But it is also the case that in occupying particular subject positions, teachers and pupils reproduce them; it is only through being occupied that these positions continue to be part of social structure.... Let us look at my choice of the term subject (position) instead of 'social role'. Subject has yet another of those 'felicitous ambiguities'.... In one sense of subject, one is referring to someone who is under the jurisdiction of a political authority, and hence passive and shaped: but the subject of a sentence, for instance, is usually the active one, the 'doer', the one causally implicated in action.

(Fairclough, 1989:38-39)

To the researcher, it seems that the contribution of CDA to the growth of linguistics as a discipline is tremendous. It has awakened an awareness of some of the insidious ways in which language works as a social force; it has identified ideology as a new and rich area for linguistics to mine and the ingenuity and linguistic imagination and sensitivity of CDA scholars have put into the hands of
linguists very powerful ways of investigating social processes using analysis of the language code as a heuristic. Their work has also demonstrated the need to look beyond linguistics for explanations of how human communication works. An awareness of these contributions forms a very important part of the orientations and analytical apparatus of the present study. As was pointed out earlier, this study also owes many of its terms of art to this school of linguistic analysis.

The goal of exclusive attention to the disabling function of discourse, however, has not been bought into. The notion of ideology is adopted but both its enabling as well as disabling functions are investigated, where appropriate.

2.3.3 New Rhetoric Studies

A number of initial observations can be made about the New Rhetoric approach to genre:

1 The studies that fall into this group are very varied. What holds them together is a broad agreement in the direction of attention, viz to "encompass all inquiries into the use of symbols, with no suppositions as to the answers to our questions ...[and seeing] what our contending viewpoints together reveal about skilled human discourse (Bazerman, 1993: 7)
The orientation they attempt to adopt is one of dispassionate observation:

As dispassionate a view as we poor limited, located, self-interested humans can muster of all the symbolic practices we can identify, with their causes, processes, means, and consequences - cognitive, social, linguistic, textual, economic, political. (Bazerman, 1988)

The primary focus of their investigative efforts is less genre structure and more genre use in different professional, organizational and disciplinary communities. Their practice works largely in conformity with Miller's injunction in her seminal paper Genre as Social Action:

A rhetorically sound definition of genre must be centered not on the substance or the form of discourse but on the action it is used to accomplish.

They do not identify with any particular heuristic tradition. "Interpretive flexibility," says Bazerman (1993:3), "allows rhetoric, like Alice, to grow as small or as large as you wish". The methodology is not predetermined; it is fitted to the research task. Enos (1993:8), for instance, talks about providing new knowledge that will make our understanding of rhetoric more complete by constructing new methods of adjudicating the saliency of observations and by discovering new sources from which observations can be made.
The Annual Report is the interface between a corporate entity and the general public. In this sense the Annual Report is a public relations document and an instance of corporate discourse. Different sections in the report are produced by or with the help of professionals with different disciplinary backgrounds. As the focus of "new rhetoric" studies is on organizational discourse and discipline and profession-related discourse, the review of studies that fall into this category will also be simultaneously a review of discourse studies in these domains. As the heuristics for this study comes largely from CDA and since there is no characteristic approach to methodology that can be termed "new rhetoric" methodology, this review will concentrate mainly on describing a selected few studies that will (1) highlight the findings that provide theoretical frames for understanding the data, (2) suggest trends that will help the reader to assess where the present study fits into the "conversations" of the discipline and (3) provide insights into some of the constructs that have been found to be useful in explaining the semiotic structure of these domains.

Of the three traditions this is probably the one with the greatest meta-theoretical orientation in that there is a concerted and self-conscious effort on the part of the scholars to reflect on their own theories as well as the theories of others. What a genre or a discourse community means is a recursively attended to preoccupation. Berkenkotter and Huckin, for example, after a lengthy discussion of the literature on genre enunciate five "principles that constitute a theoretical framework":
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1. **Dynamism**: Genres are dynamic rhetorical forms that develop from responses to recurrent situations and serve to stabilize, experience and give it coherence and meaning. Genres change over time in response to their users' sociocognitive needs.

2. **Situatedness**: Our knowledge of genres is derived from and embedded in our participation in the communicative activities of daily and professional life. As such, genre knowledge is a form of "situated cognition," which continues to develop as we participate in the activities of the culture.

3. **Form and content**: Genre knowledge of genres is derived form and content, including a sense of what content is appropriate to a particular purpose in a particular situation at a particular point in time.

4. **Duality of structure**: As we draw on genre rules to engage in professional activities, we constitute social structures (in professional, institutional, and organizational contexts) and simultaneously reproduce these structures.

5. **Community ownership**: Genre conventions signal a discourse community's norms, epistemology, ideology, and social ontology.

It is clear even from a cursory look at these "principles" that they differ from ESP-based genre theory on a number of counts. Firstly there is their overt recognition of the dynamism of genre. The perception of the dynamism derives from two sources: one, their attention to the evolution of genres over time in response to the sociorhetorical needs of the community that uses them and two, their observation of the interactive functioning of genre both in the context of the discourse community and the rhetorical context of the orders of discourse within which they derive their significative value. Secondly, there is the emphasis on situatedness. This derives largely from their social constructive view of the workings of discourse. Although ESP-type genre analysis pays lip service to
situatedness, its attention, except in the work of Swales and Bhatia who attempt to take a rhetorical view of the moves, is mainly on the external form and content. The situation focus of the new rhetoric studies makes possible the perception of several microsocial relationships between a genre and the semiotic matrix within which it operates at the point of observation. These microsocial observations contribute the data necessary to arrive at an inductive, data-grounded definition or redefinition of the constructs that engage linguists and language educators. One aspect of situatedness that their work draws attention to is timeliness as a factor in professional communication. The duality of structure Berkenkotter and Huckin talk of is also hinted at tangentially in the work of Swales and Bhatia, but they are not central foci as they are in the work of new rhetoric scholars.

The broad conceptual summaries such as the one we just looked at are useful reference points. However, what perhaps is most significant and most distinctive in their work is their actual fine-grained observations of genres in their natural settings and the multiple microsemiotic inferences that these observations make possible. New rhetoric work relates to the heuristic of using very close observations of individual literate practice as a means of discovering a community's culture, specifically its discursive practices and norms. Some seminal works in this area are Flower and Hayes' (1993) work on freshman composition; Myers' (1985) analyses of drafts of two eminent scientists' proposals, Berkenkotter, Huckin and Ackerman's (1988) study of the progressive
approximations of a Ph.D. rhetoric student to the expectations of the academic community at various stages in his acculturation process, and Bazerman's (1985) study of the reading processes of seven leading-edge research physicists. This line of inquiry is not of direct relevance to this study. Generally the purpose of these studies is to show how the centripetal values of the experts/gatekeepers of a community interact dynamically with the sometimes centrifugal tendencies of a writer's/reader's personal ambitions, schemas for tasks and procedures etc within the rhetorical problem space to resolve themselves into a socially and personally acceptable discourse product (if the focal person is the writer) or an acceptable "reading" of the text (if the focal person is the reader). Bazerman, for example, shows how text for his scientists is "an active social tool" in the use of which "purpose and schema are intertwined, so that the reader's schema incorporates active purpose and purpose is framed by the schema" (p.4). Bazerman clearly demonstrates that expert schema "extends beyond textbook knowledge of accepted facts and theories and includes dynamic knowledge about the discipline's current practices and projections of its future development" (p6). "The way one reads," concludes Bazerman, "is a strategic consequence of what one is trying to achieve". Myers makes visible some of the social considerations that shape the way the proposals of two biologists evolve. His purpose again is to make visible the processes involved in reading the ecological signs and adapting one's professional practice to ensure one remains ahead of the pack. This sensitivity to the professional and social environment and the need to put one's best foot forward characterizes the rhetorical problem space a CEO occupies.
when he writes the annual report. What we see is the proactive dynamic nature of expertise.

One very important strand of new rhetoric work on genres is based on the view of genre as a product of historically evolving recurrent needs. Most notable among these studies is perhaps the work of Bazerman on the evolutionary changes in research articles of the first scientific publication in English: The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Through his analysis of 100 articles written between 1665 and 1800 Bazerman makes a number of data-based observations and inferences. He notes the role of publication in the prominence that experiments achieved as the primary mode of scientific knowledge-seeking. He also demonstrates the possibility of using text analysis as a means of performing historiography. He shows, for instance, the evolution of the need for communal validation and the corresponding evolution of an extended and replicable methods and materials section. His study also reveals how "the emerging form of the experimental report offered a way to harness stories of the smaller world of the laboratory to general claims about the regularities of the larger world of nature". While these give empirical proof of the dynamism of genre that Berkenkotter and Huckin talked of and illustrated - the contending, growing and complementary forces that constitute the meaning-making semiotic of science - the most important aspect of this work for the present study is the discussion of the notion of accountability. Bazerman, extending from an earlier work by Ludwik Fleck begins this part of the discussion by claiming that the
differences between fiction and non-fiction "hang on differences of accountabilities (of both degree and kind) that connect texts to the various worlds they represent and act on". Communities, he suggests, have fundamental accountabilities and means of enforcing and elaborating these accountabilities. He states, for example, that scientific discourse is built on accountability to empirical fact while "legal discourse is held accountable on one hand to a hierarchically arranged series of court decisions, laws, and constitutions, and on the other to evidence gathered through procedures defined by the system and represented in a manner established by tradition and explicit rule".

This construct of accountability is extremely useful in at least three ways:

(1) in raising the issue of what the professional groups whose voices are heard in the annual reports are accountable for and whether accountability is assigned (if so, by whom) or negotiated through discourse, textually, intertextually or through some other semiotic means?

(2) in providing an explanatory framework for the study of the relative identities, social roles and accountabilities of the different professionals who participate in the profit-making enterprise.

(3) in explaining the architectural, structural and the relative content of fiction
and non-fiction seen as "allowable contributions" (Swales, 1990) in the various sections of the Annual Report.

These are sociorhetorical processes - the socially-derived interpersonal and interfunctional interactions between professions, the negotiation of identities, roles and accountabilities between symbiotically functioning professionals; the interdependence and interaction potential of the various parts of a text - that are at the heart of this thesis.

2.3.4 Summary of genre features

On the basis of this review it can be said that, according to the gurus the following are characteristic (though not necessarily constitutive) features of genres:

1. Genres fulfil community purposes
2. Genres embody ideologies, if by ideologies we mean assumptions that are tacit and "natural". These can be enabling or disabling.
3. Genres are the product of a community's habitual work
4. Some body (or bodies) has a gatekeeping function i.e. it has the authority to control the way people write or interpret a genre through a system of sanctions and/or rewards. It would usually be
those who are deemed "expert" members of the discourse community.

There is a group of people collectively called the "discourse community" who share genres and knowledge about genres. Recognition of genres is a function of intertextual perception arising from habitual use.

Genres change over time.

Genre sets combine together to form orders of discourse and orders of discourse collectively accomplish that part of a discourse community's work that requires to be discursively negotiated.

2.4 Writing in Organizational Contexts

2.4.1 Why the study of organizational contexts is important

Contexts are important in the study of texts for at least three reasons:

1 Although meanings find their expression in texts, their origins are outside the text and are negotiated (about) in texts, in concrete situations of social exchange (Kress, 1989: 18). Organizations are an important source of "situations of social exchange". In fact it is believed that a close link exists between the nature of an institution (e.g. medicine, law, accounting) and the kinds of occasions - and therefore the kinds of texts- that characterize it.
Both discourse and genre arise out of the structures and processes of a society: discourses are derived from the larger social institutions within a society; genres are derived from the conventionalised social occasions on and through which social life is carried on. (Kress, 1989:20). In this sense organizations which are one of the "larger social institutions within a society" are the exigence that provoke written responses and the source of the intertextual context of any text emanating from them. Since organizations are "culture-bearing milieux" (Louis, 1883) and meaning is "ineluctably local" (Geertz, 1983: ), organizations are the "universes of meaning" (Geertz, 1983:25), the semiotic system within which texts must seek their meaning.

As Harrison points out,

As social communities, organizations embody coherent systems of consensual meaning that, taken together, form the grounds for and hence impart significance and comprehensibility to rhetorical activity.

(Harrison, 1987:5)

This section will therefore look at a number of issues related to organizations since an annual report is a product of an organization. Once there is a recognition of the rhetorical (in addition to the expressive or purely informative) function of writing, then a central issue in writing research and theory becomes explaining the sorts of relationships that exist between writing and the context in which it takes place. There is a growing interest in examining writing as social
activity that is grounded in social life yet at the same time creates and configures the very life in which it found its genesis and raison d'être. Yet there hasn't been a corresponding level of enthusiasm for studying writing in organizations. Most discussions of context like those of Hymes, 1972; Piazza, 1987, Mosenthal, 1983 are still generalized descriptions of context not of direct interest to this study. I shall therefore confine my discussion of context to four sources: a book on management by Asma Abdullah (1996), a human resource trainer in Malaysia; r, an article on frameworks for studying writing in organizations by Teresa Harrison (1987), a rhetorical theorist; and finally two articles, one by Herndl et al (1993) and another by Mumby and Stohl (1991), writers I would deem empiricists guided by a social constructionist view of language since they seek answers to organisation-discourse relations within the parameters of specific work-related problems in actual worksites.

2.4.2 Views of Context

Harrison posits that there are, broadly-speaking, two approaches to context. The traditional approach as articulated by Bitzer (1968), she says, conceives of a rhetorical situation as

composed of three elements - audience, exigence and constraints - that together create an event calling for a rhetorical response that "fits" the demands of the situation. In this view, rhetorical situations are objective events that may be known objectively and the existence of which is assumed to be prior to the unfolding of rhetorical activity.

(p.6)
Harrison herself proposes an alternative approach consistent with the "new rhetoric" position that at least some forms of knowledge are created in rhetorical activity. Viewed in this way, Harrison claims, context encompasses the elements that combine to form rhetorical situations, but, more important, it embodies a particular way of seeing those elements and the rest of the world - a set of assumptions that give meaning to stimuli and enable individuals to define experience. Individuals share such assumptions about the world in communities of thought that establish standards for determining what counts as knowledge and thus define (p8) ... organizations (as) "culturelike" phenomena constituted both by systems of knowledge and by patterns of symbolic discourse that are related to actions undertaken by organizational members (p15)

In this view, the notion that context is community of thought emerges. The present study, accepts neither position wholesale. It deems both approaches too passive to account for the pro-activity and individual "reading" of the situation by the individual engaged in the writing. It adopts, therefore, a view of context in which context is the mental construct of the rhetoric-provoking situation formed in the mind of the writer informed by his own activated mental frames of relevant past experience and his "reading" of the current situation. Here the mind of the writer is seen as the ground where the various semiotic resources abstractly available to users achieve specific dynamic meaningfulness.
2.4.3 Key variables in the study of a business organization

This study is not ethnography; it does not attempt to describe the culture of an organization through total immersion in the day-to-day activities of the organization.

But it is ethnographic in that it attempts to see to what extent this day-to-day life which is the subject of ethnography is reflected in the Annual Report, which is a text produced by an organization to account for its activities during the year. This section therefore will discuss briefly the issues that cultural anthropologists and business people in general feel are important indices of the culture of an organization. My main source of information for this section is Asma Abdullah's book *Going Glocal*, specifically pages (40-54).

According to Asma,

the culture of an organization is often an expression of a set of deep-seated underlying assumptions and values that a given group has invented, discovered or developed in learning to cope and adapt to its environment....Like the culture of a society, an organizational culture consists of its structured systems of policies and procedures and the hidden aspects of its underlying assumptions and values....Over the years, the values of an organization become the driving forces which influence the behaviours of employees and the way they get things done .... the culture of an organization ...the face a company presents to the world.

(Asma, 1996:40-41)

An important specific feature of Malaysian corporate entities and their culture is also raised by Asma,
In the Malaysian context, an organization or corporate entity is not only established to achieve a specific task and to make a profit, but also to demonstrate a sense of social responsibility for the advancement of the community and the country.

Asma (p47 -54), drawing from the work of other corporate anthropologists like Peter Drucker (1994) and Edgar Stein, identifies five key elements in organizational culture: (1) underlying assumptions (2) values (3) rituals (4) heroes and (5) symbols,

2.4.3.1 **Underlying assumptions**

Asma notes underlying assumptions

a *about the environment* This refers to the specific task in hand which includes the major external factors that the organization faces: the society at large, the market, the customer and technology.

b *about the specific mission of the organization* This takes into account what an organization considers to be meaningful results and what it needs to do in order to make a difference in the economy and the society at large.

c *about the core competencies of its workforce*. This addresses the abilities, skills and work-related areas for employees to excel in.
2.4.3.2 Values

Values in an organization are often based on its set of underlying assumptions. They define what management considers worthwhile and essential in shaping its philosophy, mission statements, strategic plans, affecting results-oriented behaviour of the workforce and determining employee-employer relationships. The cultural resilience of the organization rests on how these core values are internalized and celebrated by those who have become its socialized members, i.e. long-term employees.

2.4.3.3 Rituals

These refer to established ways, standards of decorum of interpersonal behaviour and mode of presentation which every employee is required to recognize as they affect his performance. They are a means of how the organization provides visible and realistic examples on the accepted mode of getting things done. Strong rituals which promote values of efficiency, effectiveness, time specificity, productivity and quality are important to the well-being of the organization. Some examples of organizational or corporate rituals are the anniversary get-togethers, celebrations, annual events, writing and speaking styles, which members have to adopt in their day-to-day work rituals.
2.4.3.4 Heroes

These refer to leaders, managers and even supervisors who personify the values of the organization. They provide tangible or "living" symbols or role models of acceptable behaviour for employees to adopt. They epitomize the strengths of the organization. Some companies create their own heroes in the form of super sales-person, "best employee of the month" or "best team" award.

2.4.3.5 Symbols

These refer to the visible objects and clearly identifiable artefacts such as the design of the building, the type of equipment used, the furniture, logo, language and vocabulary used etc. Symbols are used to enhance commitment and compliance among insiders and give outsiders a mental image of what the company stands for.

I use this framework in the analysis of the "institutional force" of statements within the discourse of the CEOs and in understanding the illocutionary and possible perlocutionary force of some discourse strategies - for example, a company's selection of pictures for use in its Calendar of Events section. Asma's framework understandably pays scant attention to the role of discourse within each of the five dimensions she mentions: its role in creating
and reproducing underlying assumptions, heroes and values, its ritualistic and symbolic reinforcement of company objectives. I add to her framework therefore Harrison's (1987:13) concept of organizations as patterns of symbolic discourse. Harrison points out a number of possible indices of how the symbol system operates: the use of specialized terminology, the use of images and metaphors in portraying the character of organizational processes and activities. She also draws attention to how slogans like "the Hewlett-Packard way" or "Everybody at Northrop is in marketing" capture and represent in a few words dominant institutional values and beliefs that explain the bases for organizational action. (Harrison, 1987: 14).

2.4.4 Three studies of corporate discourse practices

In this section I review three studies that provide the impetus for re-examination of some canonical values and beliefs about context, discourse and community. The first study I wish to look at is Herndl, Fennel and Miller's (1991) study of "the relationship between communication and social structures" in which they show how the rich social differentiations created by different work functions and allegiance to different work groups are embedded in the way people structure their discourse and the way they construct identities for themselves and others in the same worksite. Herndl et al investigated five memos exchanged between the Engineering Branch and the Nuclear Services branch at Babcock and Wilcox, the builder of the reactor at Third Mile Island where there was a nuclear accident in March 1979. Herndl et al used three methods of analysis of the data: linguistic
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analysis, pragmatic analysis and argument analysis. Their analysis of the data showed a number of discourse-related phenomena that could account for the miscommunication within the company that subsequently caused the accident. For illustrative purposes I will focus on their findings regarding the exchange of memos between Kelly, a manager in the engineering division and Walters from the nuclear services branch to illustrate the social construction of "context" and the effects of this concept of context held in the mind of the writers on their production and interpretation of the memos from each other. Firstly, Herndl et al established through linguistic analysis that the writers of the memos were fully competent writers and readers and therefore linguistic incompetency was not the cause of the accident. The findings of the pragmatic analysis, however, illustrated how microsocial structures - materially present and discoursally constructed - shape discourse and how discourse in turn affects how a situation is construed. At Babcock and Wilcox there was a clear division of labour, institutionalized in the organizational structure that assigned to the Nuclear Service branch the responsibility for preparing manuals and instructions for customers and operators i.e for the maintenance of an interpretive framework. Engineering, on the other hand, was committed to an explanation of new data that do not fit the existing interpretive framework. So when Kelly of Engineering discovered that the instruction manual had to be changed to avert any danger, he perceived his telling of Nuclear Services to change the manual to be overstepping his authority, as something that can be construed by Nuclear Services as an implied criticism of their work and this had an effect on how he wrote his memo: he "couches his
memo as a request for response, sacrificing propositional clarity for political
expediency". Kelly hedges his criticism in several ways: he assigns agency not to
any employee but to two events in Toledo; he inserts "perhaps" to his criticism
and includes himself in the group of those responsible ("Perhaps we are not giving
enough guidance"); he does not adopt an assertive voice but merely "wonders"
what "guidance, if any" the company should provide. Herndl et al then go on to
describe Walters’ offended and offending response which converts the context
further. It now becomes "part of a negotiation of their social status and their
relative institutional positions. There now are two problems, one a technical
problem and the other a political threat to Walters' institutional position and
Walters chooses to respond to the political threat. Herndl et al continue to give
other textual evidence of the social construction of the situation at Babcock and
Wilcox but perhaps this cameo is sufficient to give some intimation of the
fluidity, the rich heteroglossia and the fineness of differentiation of context and
community within an actual situation.

The second study that I have chosen to review, though
somewhat ominous in its social and moral implications, is another excellent
example of the social construction of values within organizations. Mumby and
Stohl in a study of how absence and presence from work are construed in
institutional contexts demonstrate the multiplier effect of the introduction of
"team" as a value, a mechanism of control and a concept for the organization of
work in business organizations. As a result of their investigation, Mumby and
Stohl conclude,
To the extent that discourse structures the identities of social actors, we can say that power is not merely interdictive or restrictive, but actually plays a productive role in the construction of social reality.

(p316)

They demonstrate this by illustrating how the concept of "team" infiltrates identities and manages the semantics or significative potential of "absence" at all levels:

At the system level, absence means lack of worker commitment, poor work attitude, lack of responsibility and failure to fulfill contractual obligations. At the group level, absence means added stress on team members, co-workers taking up the slack, betrayal of communal obligations and a threat to the team identity. At the individual level, absence means guilt and/or deviance. (p318)

The third study is about the corporate construction of knowledge. Winsor (1989) in her observation of the discursive practices of an engineer as he performs two tasks required of him at the workplace discovers the extent of community participation in the structuring of these two writing tasks. She in fact discovers that although one person may write a document, the institution is actively involved in the writing at all levels. It creates the purpose for the writing. Writing a technical paper is good for the company image or good for its sales division and so on. If we accept the view that discourse is social action, then perhaps this finding that texts are integrally related with the identity and work of an organization is not new or surprising. However, another finding of Winsor is both new and surprising. Genre theory has generally been built on data
from the academic community and hence its view of authorship is probably framed by the epistemological assumptions about authorship prevalent in that community. A central offence against the academic community by people the community recognizes as its members is plagiarism and disrespect for copyright laws. This is perhaps because the grail that an academic follows must lead to "epistemia" (the land of knowledge). Ownership of this intellectual property therefore is important under such a regime. We generally assume that this is a universal ideology. In situations where epistemic communism exists, that is where the organization is the owner of all knowledge, then no knowledge belongs to anyone and all writers are only scribes. Although an engineer is a member of a disciplinary and professional group where copyrights persist, within a profit-making organization, the epistemological assumptions of their discipline are superceded by the epistemology of knowledge-constitution as configured within the business organization's frames of reference. The highest warrants for argument within a business organization, according to Toulmin et al, are "profit and survival of the company, although they also include authority, practicality, efficiency and analogy" (Toulmin, 1979: 301-2). In the context on which Winsor based her study, knowledge was considered the product of group effort. The inscribing therefore was also not an individual effort. Authors lifted from relevant previous texts often without alteration or acknowledgement.

2.5 Conclusions from studies
The studies included in the synoptic view of the field given in Chapters 1 and 2 precipitate for closer observation a number of epistemological and theoretical insights/assumptions. Some of these are targeted at understanding the metacognitive orientations and decisions that affect text production and interpretation processes which may be reflected in the Annual Report. Others involve processes at the microsocial level of lexical and syntactic choice. These and their possible implications for the present study are summarized below for ease of reference:

1 While many studies emphasize the social construction of the semiotic resources operational within a community (ESP-based genre studies, for example), others (e.g. Bakhtin, 1981) emphasize the heteroglossia, the individual thrust that is forged from the community-owned resources. How do these apparently opposing pulls resolve themselves at the textual level? Are some Annual Reports heteroglossic and others more conventional or are the conventional and the heteroglossic dialogically present in all annual reports?

2 Each discipline and profession has its own epistemologies and ontological realities in obedience with which (See Swales "allowable contributions") and within whose semiotic system (See Lemke, 1992) members and their textual productions find their meaning and social import. What are the ways in which the various
professions whose expertise symbiotically resource the workings of a modern corporate enterprise operate in the textual accomplishment of their long term professional/disciplinary objectives and the short term institutional/private moment-related objectives?

Community ramifies in many directions in the literature: as human community, as institution, as profession, as discipline, as audience, domain. How do these co-present multiple communities operationalize their influence on the rhetorical construction of the realities to be represented in the annual reports? What do these findings say about the notion of "discourse community"?

Related to 1 above is an unresolved tension that emerges in the literature: that between the structuralist positivist view that there is an objective reality that pre-exists the text and which it is the text's role to represent and the post-structuralist, post modern notion that there is no objective reality; that there are only versions of reality and that these are discursively-constructed. The positivist view is often inscribed in many disciplines, for example science, that attempt to discover the truth. What view of reality underpins the professions in the annual reports? How, for example, is the conflict between informing (which implies telling the truth as it is)
and *persuading* (as selling a particular version as the truth) resolved in the Annual Report that today performs both functions?

The intention in formulating these questions is certainly not based on the naïve hope of answering them systematically. They are, in this sense, not research questions as traditionally understood. They are, rather, intended to have an orienting, sensitizing function. The focus of this study is specifically on Malaysian annual reports. However interpretations, as frame theory has demonstrated, are always and inevitably a function of past-induced trajectories of thought. These questions and the studies that provoked them are intended as guides nudging one to take account of "types" against which the "tokens" that emerge in the study can find their theoretical niche.

The title of this thesis, "Text as Mirror of Social Process" involves understanding two phenomena - text and social process - and the relationship between them. Chapters 1 and 2 attempted to provide a basis for understanding the construct *text* and the theoretical issues in which it is embedded, including the debate on whether texts merely represent /reflect a pre-existing reality or in fact create that reality. The next chapter takes up the social process dimension of the title.