

Discourse & Society

<http://das.sagepub.com>

Understanding the new management ideology: a transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism

Eve Chiapello and Norman L Fairclough

Discourse Society 2002; 13; 185

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://das.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/13/2/185>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Discourse & Society* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://das.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://das.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

*Understanding the new management ideology:
a transdisciplinary contribution from critical
discourse analysis and new sociology of
capitalism*



Discourse & Society
Copyright © 2002
SAGE Publications
(London,
Thousand Oaks, CA
and New Delhi)
Vol 13(2): 185–208
[0957-9265
(200203) 13:2:
185–208; 022406]

EVE CHIAPELLO

HEC SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

NORMAN FAIRCLOUGH

LANCASTER UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT. Our aim in this article is to explore how one might approach the language of new capitalism working in a transdisciplinary way, bringing together new sociology of capitalism (Chiapello) and critical discourse analysis (Fairclough). We focus upon 'new management ideology', and in particular on a recent book by a highly influential management 'guru' (Rosabeth Moss Kanter). The article begins with a discussion of new management ideology based particularly upon the work of Boltanski and Chiapello, followed by an outline of the version of critical discourse analysis we draw upon, and an analysis of a number of extracts from the book. In the conclusion we consider the implications of the analysis for transdisciplinary research.

KEY WORDS: *capitalism, ideology, management, management gurus, spirit of capitalism, transdisciplinary research*

Our aim in this article is to explore how one might approach the language of new capitalism working in a transdisciplinary way. We come from different disciplinary and theoretical traditions, economic sociology (Eve Chiapello) and a form of critical discourse analysis (henceforth, CDA) developed within linguistics (Norman Fairclough). We shall focus upon 'new management ideology', and in particular on a recent book of a highly influential management 'guru', Rosabeth Moss Kanter, who is Professor of Business Administration at Harvard Business School (Kanter, 2001). To fit the scope of our analysis within the confines of a single article, we concentrate on one chapter of the book, Chapter 9 ('Leadership for Change').

CDA is analysis of the dialectical relationships between discourse (including language but also other forms of semiosis, e.g. body language or visual images) and other elements of social practices. Its particular concern (in this approach) is with the radical changes that are taking place in contemporary social life, with

how discourse figures within processes of change, and with shifts in the relationship between discourse/semiosis and other social elements within networks of practices. We cannot take the role of discourse in social practices for granted, it has to be established through analysis. And discourse may be more or less important and salient in one practice or set of practices than in another, and may change in importance over time. The new sociology of capitalism offers an account of the changes in the developed capitalist societies since the 1960s, using as pivotal the concept of 'spirit of capitalism' which comes from Weberian sociology but which has been re-worked to fit analysis of contemporary capitalism. An alliance of the two approaches can, we believe, be productive for the study of language of new capitalism.

We see 'transdisciplinary' research as a particular form of interdisciplinary research. Our concern is not simply to bring together different disciplines and theoretical-analytical frameworks in the hope of thereby producing richer insights into new management ideology. We are also concerned with how a dialogue between two disciplines and frameworks may lead to a development of both through a process of each internally appropriating the logic of the other as a resource for its own development.

We begin with a discussion of new management ideology based particularly upon the work of Boltanski and Chiapello (1999), followed by a brief outline of the version of critical discourse analysis we draw upon, and an analysis of Chapter 9, focusing upon a number of extracts, which brings these two perspectives together. In the conclusion we consider the implications of the analysis for transdisciplinary research.

1. The theoretical framework of the 'new spirit of capitalism'

New management ideology is part of the broader ideological system of 'the new spirit of capitalism'. It is the part addressed to managers and people occupying intermediate levels in big companies. It focuses on explaining and justifying the way the companies are organized, or should be organized.

THE NOTION OF SPIRIT OF CAPITALISM

The '*spirit of capitalism*' is the ideology that justifies people's commitment to capitalism, and which renders this commitment attractive. It is a necessary construct because in many ways, capitalism is an absurd system: wage-earners have lost ownership of the fruits of their labour as well as any hope of ever working other than as someone else's subordinate. As for capitalists, they find themselves chained to a never-ending and insatiable process. For both of these protagonists, being part of the process of capitalism is remarkably lacking in justification. Capitalistic accumulation requires commitment from many people, although few have any real chances of making a substantial profit. Many will be scarcely tempted to get involved in this system, and might even develop decidedly adverse feelings. This is an especially thorny problem in modern economies that require a

high level of commitment from their employees, in particular from managers. The quality of the commitment that one can expect depends not only on economic stimuli, but also on the possibility that the collective advantages that derive from capitalism can be enhanced.

The 'spirit of capitalism' is the ideology which brings together these reasons for commitment to the system. The term 'ideology' is used here in a different sense from common conceptions that define it in terms of truth and falsehood. The 'spirit of capitalism' does not just legitimize the process of accumulation, it also constrains it – indeed it can only legitimize it in so far as it constrains it, for people are endowed in this neo-Weberian sociological perspective with real critical capacities with effects on the world. If one were to take the explanations contained in the spirit of capitalism to their logical conclusion, then not all profit would be legitimate, nor all enrichment fair, nor all accumulation legal. Actors' internalization of a particular spirit of capitalism thus serves in the real world as a constraint on the process of accumulation. A spirit of capitalism approach thus provides a justification both for capitalism and for the criticisms that denounce the gap between the actual forms of accumulation and the normative conceptions of social order.

An ideology is a system of ideas, values and beliefs oriented to explaining a given political order, legitimizing existing hierarchies and power relations and preserving group identities. Ideology explains both the horizontal structure (the division of labour) of a society and its vertical structure (the separation of rulers and ruled), producing ideas which legitimize the latter, explaining in particular why one group is dominant and another dominated, one why person gives orders in a particular enterprise while another takes orders. Ideology is thus closely linked to Weber's concept of legitimacy, for according to Weber domination and compliance require the belief of the dominated in the legitimacy of the dominant. Ideology is one of the central vectors of this legitimacy, even though Weber lacked a concept of ideology (Ricoeur, 1997).

As Schumpeter and Marx realized perfectly well, one of the main characteristics of capitalism as a social order is that it constantly transforms itself. Capitalism in the general sense is capable of assuming highly variable historical forms, which continue to be capitalist through the continuity of a number of central features (wage-labour, competition, private property, orientation to capital accumulation, technical progress, the rampant commodification of all social activities). The 'spirit of capitalism' is therefore an ideology which serves to sustain the capitalist process in its historical dynamism while being in phase with the historically specific and variable forms that it takes. Thus there are in a sense two levels within the configuration of ideas of the 'spirit of capitalism' of a particular epoch: those which account for the process of capitalism over the long-term (most of which have been shaped by economic theory), and those which accord with its historical incarnation at a given period within a given region.

Three dimensions play a particularly important role at this second level in providing a concrete expression for the spirit of capitalism:

1. The first dimension indicates what is '*stimulating*' about an involvement with capitalism – in other words, how this system can help people to blossom, and how it can generate enthusiasm. This '*stimulating*' dimension is usually related to the different forms of '*liberation*' that capitalism offers.
2. A second set of arguments emphasizes the forms of *security* that is offered to those who are involved, both for themselves and for their children.
3. Finally, a third set of arguments (and one that is especially important for our demonstration) invokes the notion of *justice* (or *fairness*), explaining how capitalism is coherent with a sense of justice, and how it contributes to the common good.

Thus one might argue that to successfully commit people to the capitalist process, the ideology which legitimizes it needs to provide answers to these three implicit questions: what is stimulating about it, how does it provide security, how does it assure justice?

When seen in this light, the spirit of capitalism can be said to have undergone a number of historical changes. From the literature on the evolution of capitalism, one can sketch at least three '*spirits*' that have appeared, at least in Western Europe, one after the other, since the nineteenth century (Table 1).

1. The first, described amongst others by Sombart, corresponds to a predominantly domestic form of capitalism. Its main incarnation is the entrepreneurial *bourgeois*. The '*excitement*' dimension is manifested by an entrepreneurial spirit; its security dimension by respect for *bourgeois* morality. In this instance, fairness mechanisms essentially revolve around charity and personal assistance.
2. A second '*spirit*' (descriptions of which were found between the 1930s and the 1960s) focuses on the idea of the large, integrated firm. Its main incarnation is the salaried director. Security is to be achieved through mechanisms such as career development and by the link between private capitalism and the rise of a welfare state. Fairness takes on a very meritocratic form in that it incorporates skills whose certification involves the awarding of credentials.
3. A third form of capitalism, which began to manifest itself during the 1980s.

Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) focused on the way in which the spirit of capitalism changed between the 1960s and 1990s. They devoted the first two chapters (of a book containing seven) to describing the changes on the basis of an analysis of texts (as Weber and Sombart had done previously) that provide moral education on business practices. For our era, this meant two bodies of work from the field of management studies: one from the 1960s; and one from the 1990s (each representing around 500 pages and 50 texts). The text we chose to analyse in this article is a good example of the kind of texts they studied, and in fact Kanter was one of the authors (in French translation) in the 1990s corpus.

From a CDA perspective, a '*spirit of capitalism*' can be regarded as an '*order of discourse*', a configuration of discourses articulated together in a particular way, dialectically enacted as ways of acting (and discursively in genres) and inculcated as ways of being or identities (and discursively in styles). See further below.

TABLE 1. *Three spirits of capitalism*

	<i>First spirit End of nineteenth century</i>	<i>Second spirit 1940–1970</i>	<i>Third spirit Since 1980s</i>
Forms of the capital accumulation process	Small family firms Bourgeois capitalism	Managerial firms Big industrial companies Mass production State economic policy	Network firms Internet and biotech Global finance Varying and differentiated production
Stimulation	Freedom from local communities Progress	Career opportunities Power positions Effectiveness possible in 'free countries'	No more authoritarian chiefs Fuzzy organizations Innovation and creativity Permanent change
Fairness	A mix of domestic and market fairness	Meritocracy valuing efficiency Management by objectives	New form of meritocracy valuing mobility, ability to nourish a network Each project is an opportunity to develop one's employability
Security	Personal property Personal relationships Charity Paternalism	Long-term planning Careers Welfare state	For the mobile and the adaptable, the ones who know how to manage themselves, companies will provide self-help resources

THE FAIRNESS DIMENSION OF THE SPIRIT OF CAPITALISM: THE 'CITÉ' MODEL

To be able to identify the exact nature of the notion of fairness as depicted in the management texts they studied, Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) used a theoretical construct that Luc Boltanski had developed together with Laurent Thévenot in an earlier publication (Boltanski and Thévenot, 1991): the 'justificatory regime' model ('*Cité*' in the French). This construct had initially been designed with a view to highlighting the conditions that make it possible to say whether an evaluation or distribution of goods was being done in a fair and legitimate manner. Such judgements can be accepted as legitimate and support an agreement between different people because they are supposed to be unrelated to the

characteristics of those who have made them and, particularly, independent of their power. They refer to 'legitimate orders' which are endowed with a very general validity, and which are at a level above the concrete and particular situations evaluated, constituted by conventions generally accepted in a society for judging the fairness of social arrangements.

Boltanski and Thévenot (1991) called these 'legitimate orders' *Cités* (thus referring to classical political philosophies whose object had been to design a legitimate order based on a principle of justice) and argued that they can be used to reach *agreement* as well as to support *criticism*. However, as opposed to political philosophies that had usually attempted to anchor this social order in a single principle, they argued that, in complex modern societies, several justificatory regimes can coexist within the same social space, even though their relevance may vary in accordance with the situation (i.e. with the material or symbolic nature of the objects involved). They identified six justificatory regimes:

1. the Inspirational *Cité*,
2. the Domestic *Cité*,
3. the *Cité* of Renown,
4. the Civic *Cité*,
5. the Market *Cité*, and
6. the Industrial *Cité*.

Each of these justificatory regimes is based upon a different principle of evaluation ('equivalency principle') which entails a form of general equivalency (a standard) without which comparative evaluations become impossible. In terms of a given standard (e.g. efficiency in the Industrial *Cité*), people's 'test results', and hence their specific (e.g. industrial) value for the rest of society, can vary. A person's worth, assessed through a legitimate process and in terms of a given standard, was called his/her 'greatness'.

In the Inspirational *Cité*, greatness is defined as being akin to a saint who has reached a state of grace (or an inspired artist). This quality appears after a period of ascetic preparation, and is expressed mostly through manifestations of inspiration (sainthood, creativity, an artistic sense, authenticity, etc.). In the Domestic *Cité*, people rely on their hierarchical position in a chain of personal interdependencies in order to achieve greatness. The political ties that unite people spring from a model of subordination which is based on a domestic pattern. These ties are thought of as a generalization of generational ties that combine tradition and proximity. The 'great one' is the elder, the ancestor, the father to whom respect and allegiance are due, and who in turn grants protection and support. In the *Cité* of Renown, greatness depends only on other people's opinions, i.e. on the number of persons who will grant credit and esteem. The 'great one' in the Civic *Cité* is the representative of the group, the one who expresses its collective will. In the Market *Cité*, the 'great' person is the one who makes a fortune for him- or herself by offering highly coveted goods in a competitive marketplace – and who knows

when to seize the right opportunities. Finally, in the Industrial *Cité*, greatness is based on efficiency and determines a scale of professional abilities.

Justificatory regimes are described using a basic 'grammar' that specifies among other things:

1. an *equivalency principle* (in reference to which an evaluation can be made of all actions, things and persons for that particular *Cité*);
2. a *state of greatness*, a 'great one' being a person who strongly embodies the *Cité's* values, and the *state of smallness*, defined as lack of greatness;
3. a *format of investment*, this being a major pre-condition for each *Cité's* stability because, by linking greatness to sacrifice (which takes a specific form in each *Cité*), it ensures that all rights are offset by responsibilities;
4. a *paradigmatic test* which, for each justificatory regime, best reveals a person's greatness. In order to avoid an idealistic construction that is overly reliant on verbal argumentation, people's claims had to be confronted with the real world, hence pass a series of more or less standardized procedures called *tests* ('*épreuve*' in French). In the end, it is the outcome of these tests that lends substance to the judgements people make. This is what provides them with the strength that they need to stand up to challenges.

In terms of justificatory regimes or 'cités', the dimension of justice of the first spirit of capitalism depends mainly upon the Domestic and Market regimes, whereas the Industrial and Civic regimes become more salient in the second.

In their study of the third spirit of capitalism, Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) showed that the six justificatory regimes identified by Boltanski and Thévenot (1991) cannot fully describe all of the types of justification that can be found in the 1990s texts. A new and increasingly influential justificatory logic has emerged which emphasizes mobility, availability and the variety of one's personal contacts: a Projects-oriented or Connectionist *Cité* (Table 2). This refers to a form of justice or fairness that is appropriate in a world that is organized by networks which are connectionist and reticular in nature.

In the Project-oriented *Cité* the general standard with respect to which

TABLE 2. *Part of the grammar of the project-oriented or connectionist cité*

Equivalency principle (general standard):	activity; project initiation; remote links between people.
A state of smallness:	inability to get involved, to trust in others, to communicate; closed-mindedness, intolerance, stability, over-reliance on one's roots, rigidity. . . .
A state of greatness:	adaptability, flexibility, polyvalence; sincerity in face-to-face encounters; ability to spread the benefits of social connections, to generate enthusiasm and to increase team members' employability.
Format of investment:	ready to sacrifice all that could curtail one's availability, giving up lifelong plans.
Standard (paradigmatic) test:	ability to move from one project to another.

greatness is evaluated, is *activity*. In contrast with the Industrial *Cité* in which activity means 'work' and being active means 'holding a steady and wage-earning position', in the Project-oriented *Cité* activity overcomes the oppositions between work and non-work, steady and casual, paid and unpaid, profit-sharing and volunteer work. Life is conceived as a series of projects, the more they differ from one another, the more valuable they are. What is relevant is to be always pursuing some sort of activity, never to be without a project, without ideas, to be always looking forward to, and preparing for, something along with other persons, who are brought together by the drive for activity. When starting on a new project, all participants know that it will be short-lived. The perspective of an unavoidable and desirable end is built in the nature of the involvement, without curtailing the enthusiasm of the participants. Projects are well adapted to networking for the very reason that they are transitory forms: the succession of projects, by multiplying connections and increasing the number of ties, results in an expansion of networks.

In the Project-oriented *Cité*, a 'great one' must be adaptable and flexible. But these qualities by themselves cannot suffice to define the state of 'being great' because they could also be implemented in an opportunistic way, to pursue a strictly selfish course towards success. In contrast, a 'great' person will take advantage of his/her given qualities to contribute to the common good. In the Project-oriented *Cité*, a 'great one' therefore also generates a feeling of trust. S/he does not lead in an authoritarian way, as did the hierarchical chief, but manages the team by listening to others with tolerance and by respecting their differences. S/he redistributes among them the connections s/he has secured through networks. Such a project manager hence increases all his/her team-mates' *employability*.

The corpus of 1990s texts is marked by the salience of legitimations based upon the Project-oriented *Cité*, and the decline of the Industrial and Civic *Cités* which were salient in the second spirit of capitalism, as well as the virtual disappearance of the Domestic, part of whose vocabulary is nevertheless drawn upon but completely recontextualized within the Project-oriented *Cité*. There is also an increase in the salience of the Inspirational and, to a lesser degree, the Merchant *Cités*.

Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) is oriented to the language of the new capitalism, seeing each *Cité* or justificatory regime as associated with a specific vocabulary in terms of which the categories of the 'grammar' of each *Cité* (the state of 'greatness', the state of 'smallness', the format of investment, etc.) can be described. In terms of CDA, a *Cité* or justificatory regime can be regarded as a discourse. Because a *Cité* is a durable and transferable structure (transferable across fields, e.g. between the capitalist organization, the family, the political system) at a relatively high level of abstraction, we use 'Discourse' with a capital 'D'. This convention is also useful in that each such Discourse is itself analysable as a configuration of discourses (lower case 'd') as we show below. Many of these discourses appear as metaphors or similes, e.g. the 'changemasters' of Kanter's text

become 'idea scouts', they 'establish their own listening posts'; creativity is 'like looking at the world through a kaleidoscope'. In analysing a text such as the one we focus on here, CDA is concerned not only with identifying within it elements of the order of discourse and the Discourses of a particular 'spirit of capitalism' and particular *Cités*. It is also concerned with how the work of texturing, making texts as a part of making meaning, in such influential texts as Kanter's itself contributes to the dissemination of the new 'spirit of capitalism'.

2. Critical discourse analysis

CDA is based upon a view of semiosis as an irreducible element of all material social processes. Social life is seen as interconnected networks of social practices of diverse sorts (economic, political, cultural, family, etc.). Centring the concept of social practice allows an oscillation between the perspective of social structure and the perspective of social action and agency – both necessary perspectives in social research and analysis (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999). By 'social practice' we mean a relatively stabilized form of social activity. Examples would be classroom teaching, television news, family meals, medical consultations, or work situations inside innovation projects (such as the one represented in the Kanter text).

Every practice is an articulation of diverse social elements in a relatively stable configuration, always including discourse. Let us say that every practice includes the following elements: activities, subjects and their social relations, instruments, objects, time and place, forms of consciousness, values, discourse (or semiosis). These elements are dialectically related (Harvey, 1996). That is to say, they are different elements but not discrete, fully separate, elements. There is a sense in which each 'internalizes' the others without being reducible to them. So for instance, social relations, social identities, cultural values and consciousness are in part semiotic, but that does not mean that we theorize and research social relations for instance, in the same way that we theorize and research language – they have distinct properties, and researching them gives rise to distinct disciplines.

Discourse figures in broadly three ways in social practices.

1. It figures as a part of the social activity within a practice. For instance, part of doing a job (e.g. as a shop assistant or a manager) is using language in a particular way; so too is part of governing a country. Discourse as part of social activity constitutes *genres*. Genres are diverse ways of acting, of producing social life, in the semiotic mode. Examples are: everyday conversation, meetings in various types of organization, political and other forms of interview, book reviews, or guides for managing e-firms (like Kanter's book).
2. Discourse figures in representations. Social actors within any practice produce representations of other practices, as well as ('reflexive') representations of their own practice, in the course of their activity within the practice. They

'recontextualize' other practices (Bernstein, 1990; Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999) – that is, they incorporate them into their own practice, and different social actors will represent them differently according to how they are positioned within the practice. Discourse in the representation and self-representation of social practices constitutes *discourses* (note the difference between 'discourse' as an abstract noun, and 'discourse(s)' as a count noun). For instance, the lives of poor and disadvantaged people are represented through different discourses in the social practices of government, politics, medicine and social science, and through different discourses within each of these practices corresponding to different positions of social actors.

3. Discourse figures in ways of being, in the constitution of identities – for instance, the identity of a political leader such as Tony Blair in the UK is partly a semiotically constituted way of being. Discourse as part of ways of being constitutes *styles* – for instance, the styles of business managers, or political leaders.

Social practices networked in a particular way constitute a social order – for instance, the emergent neo-capitalist global order referred to above, or at more local level, the social order of education in a particular society at a particular time. The discourse/semiotic aspect of a social order is what we can call an *order of discourse*. It is the way in which diverse genres and discourses and styles are networked together. An order of discourse is a social structuring of semiotic difference – a particular social ordering of relationships amongst different ways of making meaning, i.e. different discourses and genres and styles. One aspect of this ordering is *dominance*: some ways of making meaning are dominant or mainstream in a particular order of discourse, others are marginal, or oppositional, or 'alternative'. For instance, there may be a dominant way to conduct a doctor–patient consultation in Britain, but there are also various other ways, which may be adopted or developed to a greater or lesser extent in opposition to the dominant way. The dominant way probably still maintains social distance between doctors and patients, and the authority of the doctor over the way interaction proceeds; but there are other ways which are more 'democratic', in which doctors play down their authority. The political concept of 'hegemony' can usefully be used in analysing orders of discourse (Fairclough, 1992; Laclau and Mouffe, 1985) – a particular social structuring of semiotic difference may become hegemonic, become part of the legitimizing common sense, which sustains relations of domination, but hegemony will always be contested to a greater or lesser extent, in hegemonic struggle. An order of discourse is not a closed or rigid system, but rather an open system, which is put at risk by what happens in actual interactions.

The 'spirit of capitalism' as defined above can be seen as an order of discourse characterized by dominant discourses (enacted as genres, inculcated as styles) but also by oppositional or 'alternative' discourses (genres, styles). This accords with the view in Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) that any capitalist order is constantly traversed by critique. They show how the birth of the third spirit of

capitalism is a response to and incorporation of what they call the 'artistic critique' of the 1960s and 1970s.

We said above that the relationship between discourse and other elements of social practices is a dialectical relationship – discourse internalizes and is internalized by other elements without the different elements being reducible to each other. They are different, but not discrete. If we think of the dialectics of discourse in historical terms, in terms of processes of social change, the question that arises is the ways in which and the conditions under which processes of internalization take place. Take the concept of a 'knowledge economy' and 'knowledge society'. This suggests a qualitative change in economies and societies such that economic and social processes are knowledge driven – change comes about, at an increasingly rapid pace, through the generation, circulation and operationalization of knowledges in economic and social processes. The relevance of these ideas here is that 'knowledge driven' amounts to 'discourse driven': knowledges are generated and circulate as discourses, and the process through which discourses become operationalized in economies and societies is precisely the dialectics of discourse.

Discourses include imaginaries – representations of how things might or could or should be. The knowledges of the knowledge-economy and knowledge-society are imaginaries in this sense – projections of possible states of affairs, 'possible worlds'. These imaginaries may be enacted as actual (networks of) practices – imagined activities, subjects, social relations, etc. can become real activities, subjects, social relations, etc. Such enactments include materializations of discourses, in the 'hardware' (plant, machinery, etc.) and the 'software' (management systems, etc.). Such enactments are also in part themselves discursive/semiotic: discourses become enacted as genres. So new management discourses become as new genres, for instance, genres for team meetings. Discourses as imaginaries may also come to be inculcated as new ways of being, new identities. The dialectical process does not end with enactment and inculcation. Social life is reflexive. That is, people not only act and interact within networks of social practices, they also interpret and represent to themselves and each other what they do, and these interpretations and representations shape and reshape what they do.

There is nothing inevitable about the dialectics of discourse. A new discourse may come into an institution or organization without being enacted or inculcated. It may be enacted, yet never be fully inculcated. For instance, managerial discourses have been quite extensively enacted within British universities (for instance, as procedures of staff appraisal, including a new genre of 'appraisal interview'), yet arguably the extent of inculcation is very limited – most academics do not 'own' these management discourses. This has a bearing on theories of 'social constructionism' (Sayer, 2000). It is a commonplace in contemporary social science that social entities (institutions, organizations, social agents, etc.) are or have been constituted through social processes, and a common understanding of these processes highlights the effectivity of discourses: social entities are in some sense effects of discourses. Where social constructionism becomes

problematic is where it disregards the relative solidity and permanence of social entities, and their resistance to change. In using a dialectical theory of discourse in social research, one needs to take account, case by case, of the circumstances which condition whether and to what degree social entities are resistant to new discourses.

The Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) argument can be formulated in these terms. A spirit of capitalism is an order of discourse in which discourses are dialectically enacted in 'action models' (e.g. 'tests') which are partially semiotic in character, i.e. it is partly a matter of discourses being enacted as genres; and dialectically inculcated in ways of being (identities) such as new manager identities, partly again a semiotic inculcation of discourses in styles, partly a matter of extra-semiotic embodiment. With the proviso that the dialectical movement continues as these enactments/inculcations of the discourse are themselves ongoingly and diversely represented in new discourses. This reformulation seems to us to clarify the position of discourse (semiosis) in the Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) model, while avoiding any reductive discourse idealism, which is a shared concern for both CDA and new sociology of capitalism.

3. Analysis of the sample text

We have chosen a recent text of one of the best known management 'gurus'. Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) point out that this type of literature, aimed at informing managers about the latest innovations in managing enterprises and people, is one of the main places of inscription of the spirit of capitalism. Although, as dominant ideology, it has a general capacity to penetrate the mental representations of the epoch – political and trade union discourses, journalism, research and so forth – as the articles collected in this special issue illustrate. Like the spirit of capitalism, which is oriented both to capital accumulation and to principles of legitimation, management literature contains both new methods of running enterprises and making profit, and justification for the way these are done – arguments which managers can use to respond to criticisms and to demands for them to justify themselves.

The sample text is thus a good example of the many texts which contribute to the constitution and inculcation of the new 'spirit of capitalism', in terms of the dimensions of stimulation, security and justice and in terms of the *Cités* which are drawn upon to ground legitimation in terms of justice, and those which are conversely devalued. We shall look at it in terms of the three interconnected, but analytically separable, aspects of genre, style and discourses. That is: what sort of activity is this a part of, what sort of interaction characterized by what sort of social relations (genre)? What sort of authorial identity is constituted here (style)? What sort of representations do we find here of work and organizations and their members in the new economy (discourses)?

GENRE

The blurb on the book cover can give us an initial sense of genre. The book 'provides a hands-on blueprint for adopting the core principles of e-culture', 'identifies and analyses the emergence of e-culture – and provides a lively roll-up-your-sleeves guide to profiting from tomorrow'. So, in addition to being an 'analysis', it is a 'guide', a 'blueprint'.

The chapter we focus on is the ninth of ten chapters, which are divided into three parts. Part One ('Searching, Searching: The Challenge of Change') sets forth 'a variety of challenges' – centrally, the challenge of the Internet. Part Two analyses 'the implications for business of the advent of the Internet and identifies best practices in implementing e-culture principles'. Part Three (which Chapter 9 is in) 'offers a practical guide to change – how to move fast to transform a whole organization, how to lead change, and how to cultivate the human skills required for an Internet-enabled world'. Chapter 9 focuses on 'how to lead change'.

Chapter 9 is made up of an introduction, which identifies seven 'classic skills involved in innovation and change', a section on each 'skill', and a concluding section entitled 'The Rhythm of Change'. The dominant genre is a form of self-help guide, embedded in an actional sequence which potentially moves from acquiring knowledge to applying knowledge, from learning to doing. Its social relations are those of expert advice, between an expert and would-be learners and users. One might see presentation of research results as a subsidiary genre, though its relationship to the dominant genre is complex as we show below, and it is only marginally present. Shifts in genre imply shifts in social relations – for instance, there is a brief levelling of the ground between writer and readers at the beginning of the chapter as the genre shifts to dialogue ('Wait a minute. Haven't we heard this before? Of course we have.') In accordance with the genre, targeted readers are 'managers' and 'executives', as indicated by appreciative comments about the book quoted on the cover: they all come, with one exception, from Chief Executive Officers of companies, i.e. from those with whom ambitious managers identify. It is assumed that to succeed in one's professional life as they have done, one must apply Kanter's prescriptions.

Genres are realized in semantic and lexico-grammatical features of texts. Let us look at the dominant genre in these terms. Most of the sections on 'skills' begin with statements that make categorical claims. Some of these are explicitly normative statements with obligational modalities ('A raw idea that emerges from the kaleidoscope *must* be shaped into a theme that makes the idea come alive', 'Sensing an opportunity on the horizon is only part of the picture; an additional mental act of imagination *is needed* to find a creative new response to it.'). Others are apparently statements of fact (e.g. 'Innovation begins with someone being smart enough to sense a new need') but with an implicitly normative force ('To be innovative, leaders *must* be smart enough . . .'). There are many such ostensible descriptions which are implicit prescriptions in the chapter (e.g. 'Changemasters find many ways to monitor external reality', 'Changemasters sense problems and weaknesses before they represent full-blown threats'), and they are more frequent

than explicit prescriptions. This gives the sense that 'analysis' predominates over prescription. Yet although the book is said to be based upon responses from 785 organizations, 300 original interviews in nearly 80 companies, and detailed case studies of over two dozen companies, this is not a scientific analysis, and neither the claims made nor the examples given are documented with evidence from the data. Nor is there a methodological section explaining how the collection and analysis of the data ground the claims made in the book, though there is a summary of 'selected survey findings' in an Appendix. All that is said about the relationship of the research and the book is that the results 'are reflected in the lessons of this book'.

There is an oscillation between explicit or implicit normative claims or prescriptions, and examples that are summarized anecdotally in a sentence or two, or just a quotation from a Chief Executive Officer. An example of this oscillation from the section on Skill 3:

Extract 1

Changemasters have to focus people's eyes on the prize – to get them to see the value beyond the hardship of change to the prize waiting at the end. When honking.com changed its business model and set a new theme, director Rudy Chan reported 'We needed to go through quite a lot of explaining. We had to tell them why. And what's in it for them in terms of career opportunities. And we needed to do that several times. It was a lot of communication.

The anecdotal examples often presuppose a knowledge of the case or the company as this does – 'When honkong.com changed its business model and set a new theme' presupposes that (assumes reader knowledge that) honkong.com did change its business model and set a new theme.

In terms of taxis, or the way in which clauses and sentences are related to each other, the syntax is predominantly paratactic, one clause or sentence constituting an addition to others, so that meanings (e.g. the meaning of 'leadership') are cumulatively built up. This is most obvious in the predilection for lists. There are seven lists in the chapter which are set off in the text, either numbered or with bullet points (for instance: 'The customer avoidance trap, The competitor avoidance trap, The challenger avoidance trap'), and other lists embedded in the text (e.g. 'preselling, making deals, getting a sanity check' as the 'actions' which constitute 'coalition-building'). Such lists are easily memorized, and facilitate the transition from prescription to action (think of shopping lists, or 'to do' lists). In contrast, a paratactic additive relationship is inimical to complexity, analysis and argumentation. But the paratactic relationship is not by any means limited to lists. It predominates in the way sentences are related to each other in paragraphs, the way paragraphs are related to each other, the way clauses and phrases are related to each other in sentences. Take for instance, the extract on 'skill 2'.

Extract 2

Skill 2: Kaleidoscopic Thinking: Stimulating Breakthrough Ideas

Sensing an opportunity on the horizon is only part of the picture; an additional mental act of imagination is needed to find a creative response to it. Changemasters take all the input about needs and opportunities and use it to shake up reality a little, to get an exciting new idea of what's possible, to break through the old pattern and invent a new one.

Creativity is a lot like looking at the world through a kaleidoscope. You look at a set of elements, the same ones that everyone else sees, but then reassemble those floating bits and pieces into an exciting new possibility. Innovators shake up their thinking as though their brains are kaleidoscopes, permitting an array of different patterns out of the same bits of reality. Changemasters challenge prevailing wisdom. They start from the premise that there are many solutions to a problem and that by changing the angle on the kaleidoscope, new possibilities will emerge. Where other people would say 'That's impossible. We've always done it this way,' they see another approach. Where others see only problems, they see possibilities.

There are additive paratactic relations between the two paragraphs; between all the sentences in each paragraph; between clauses within sentences (e.g. the first and second sentences). There are also some hypotactic relations within sentences (e.g. the purpose clauses in sentence 2, 'to shake up . . . invent a new one' – notice that they themselves constitute three paratactically related clauses). In addition to additive paratactical relations, there are contrastive paratactical relations marked by 'but' and 'whereas'. A portrait of the kaleidoscopic thinking of 'changemasters' is cumulatively built up by adding one statement to others, and contrasting the 'changemaster' with 'others'.

The contrastive or adversative element is itself a significant feature of the syntax of the text, and it can be related to the Boltanski–Chiapello view of the 'grammar' of justificatory regimes (or *Cités*): they incorporate a contrast and a relation between 'the great ones' and 'the small ones', those who strongly embody the *Cité's* values and those who do not. This is a defining characteristic of this genre of 'popular management discourse' as opposed to 'academic, practical and political' management discourses (Furusten, 1999). The 'great one' is an example to readers, the 'small one', always described in unfavourable terms, serves as a foil. It is obvious that a text which aims at action and implementation will represent prescribed behaviour in its best light and devalue alternatives, especially when the latter are not (in contrast to criminal behaviour, for instance) inherently negative. The 'great ones' are also systematically associated with the future, the 'small ones' with the past, on the basis of a banal ideology of progress.

STYLE

The issue here is the sort of identity which is projected in the text for its author. We can see this in terms of what the author is implicitly committed to by the way the text is written – being a particular sort of person, claims about what is the case, value claims about what is good and desirable. The author is clearly projected as an expert through the explicit prescriptions and implicit prescriptions (apparent descriptions) that are pervasive through the text. Overwhelmingly, their modality is 'strong' – that is, the prescriptions of what should be done and

the descriptions of what is the case are categorical, unmitigated, not hedged. Take for example 'Changemasters sense problems and weaknesses before they represent full-blown threats' and 'Leaders must wake people out of inertia'. There are various ways in which the claim of the former and the prescription of the latter might be mitigated and made less categorical: replacing 'sense' with 'often sense' or 'tend to sense' or 'may sense' in the former, replacing 'must wake' with 'ought to wake' or 'should try to wake' in the latter. There are exceptions in the chapter, cases in which modality is mitigated, for example: '*. . . changemasters are often more effective when they are insiders bringing a revolutionary new perspective. A foundation of community and a base of strong relationships inside large organizations can speed the change process*'. These are the (relatively rare) points in the text in which we hear at least a trace of the more circumspect voice of the academic researcher reporting on the results of research, and they can be seen as contributing to a hybrid style – the author is projected primarily as an expert guide (and all-knowing 'guru') but with marginal traces of the academic researcher. There are also other relatively marginal diversities, including the brief shift to dialogue alluded to above ('Wait a minute. Haven't we heard this before? Of course we have.'), in which the author is projected as a co-participant with the reader in an event such as a seminar or meeting.

Style is also linked to values – the value commitments made in the text are part of the constitution of an authorial identity. Values can be made explicit through evaluations, e.g. 'These pieces of the picture are *important* because sometimes people just don't understand what the change leader is talking about'. But for the most part values are implicit – they are value assumptions. For instance: 'an additional mental act of imagination is needed to *find a creative new response*'. 'Finding a creative new response' is assumed to be a good thing to do, though it is not explicitly said to be desirable. Such assumed values are pervasive through this text – and the assumption is that they are shared values, shared within the reading community of the text. These values emanate in Boltanski and Chiapello's terms from the 'equivalency principles' of the *cités* (the Discourses) which are present in the text, in particular the 'inspirational' (e.g. 'find a creative response') and 'connectionist' (e.g. 'coalition building') *cités*, as in the majority of popular management texts of the 1990s. The values associated with other *cités* are present in the adversative relations of the text – as rejected values.

The author, Rosabeth Kanter, is what is normally called a management 'guru'. Being a guru is partly a matter of credentials and standing (e.g. being a professor at the prestigious Harvard Business School), and partly a matter of book sales and the attractiveness and the cost of the seminars one leads (Huczynski, 1993; Jackson, 2001). It is centrally a matter of having the authority to project, predict and interpret the future (Kanter 'predicts how the Internet will alter the way we work in the future', according to the description of her book on Amazon.com), prescribe what people need to succeed in the future, and have people act on those prescriptions. The slippage from description to prescription which we have described above is a central feature of guru style: the performative power of

statements which aim to bring about what they represent as actual. Bourdieu (1992) has described this prescriptive power of descriptions in political discourse. Visionaries, gurus, traditionally belonged to the domains of religion and politics, they have now extended their domain into management. Kanter constructs herself as 'changemaster' in this text, as an incarnation of the new business hero she presents to readers. Her creativity is foregrounded in the opening words of the book: 'Evolve! – The song. Lyrics by Rosabeth Moss Kanter'. And the text itself can be seen as enacting the 'kaleidoscope thinking' it attributes to leaders: 'You look at a set of elements . . . but then reassemble those floating bits and pieces into an enticing new possibility'. There is an enticing, seductive character to Kanter's text. The sheer semantic heterogeneity of the text is striking – the diversity of the discourses, metaphors and similes which are articulated together in the construal of leadership.

DISCOURSE

To win conviction and enhance the prospects for action, texts in this genre must address the three dimensions of legitimation distinguished by Boltanski and Chiapello (1999): stimulation, security and justice. It is the first of these dimensions (the promise of stimulation) that is most prominent, whereas the others (security and justice) are relatively underdeveloped in Kanter's book as in the texts studied by Boltanski and Chiapello. For instance, there is nothing about what happens to 'laggards' or to leaders ('changemasters') who fail. Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) predict this for the early stages of a new spirit of capitalism before its novelty wears off. As the element of stimulation diminishes, people begin to see the limits of the new order in terms of security and justice, and the spirit of capitalism must strengthen these dimensions to stand up to critique.

The promise of stimulation evokes a world of change, innovation, creativity ('to offer a dream', 'to stretch their horizons', 'to create the future'), liberty ('the free-expression atmosphere'), personal development ('a call to become something more'). The promise of security can be seen in the representation of a team as a protected cocoon (in which one is 'nurtured', 'fed' by a leader who is also the 'advocate' of the team and ensures sufficient 'flexibility' for it to surmount obstacles). The promise of fairness can be seen in giving people 'recognition', 'a warm glow', 'making everyone a Hero'. One feature of the ideal new world depicted in management literature is that security is seen as emanating from people's capacity to adapt. Either they are flexible and adaptable, open to change, capable of finding new projects, and live in relative personal security, or they are not and will be put aside when the current project finishes. Security in mobility is the reward, which is why new management can be seen as introducing a new conception of justice (a new *cit  *). Someone who contributes well to a project will be helped to find another – his/her reputation will be built up as a reward for his/her merits. In Kanter's words: 'Recognition is important not only for its motivational pat on the back but also for publicity value. The whole world now knows (. . .) who has done it, and what talents reside in the community gene pool'.

The main Discourses (*Cités*) are the Inspirational and Connectionist, though others are also less saliently present. In particular, there is a protagonist–antagonistic relation (textured as contrastive/adversative relations, see below) between these two Discourses, and the Industrial and Domestic Discourses, which are contested ('challenging prevailing wisdom', challenging 'stifling bureaucracy').

Each Discourse can be specified in terms of what Boltanski and Thévenot call its basic 'grammar', which includes: which 'subjects' or participants are represented as involved in the processes of the capitalist organization, which are 'great ones', which are 'small ones'; what sort of actions (material, mental, verbal) and attributions are characteristic for each type of subject; what relations there are between 'great ones' and 'small ones'; what 'objects' (e.g. technologies) are represented as involved in the processes of the organization; what values are assumed (which we have discussed above). The text can be analysed in terms of how it textures together the subjects, actions, relations, objects and values of different Discourses.

The 'subjects' represented in the text are: the 'great one' (the leader), the 'small one' (the 'laggards', 'skeptics', etc.) and the leader's helpers (his/her 'people', 'stakeholders', etc.). The 'great ones' are represented as: 'changemasters, leaders, pacesetters, idea scouts, innovators, lead actors, producers-directors', and so forth, the two most frequent representations being 'leaders' and 'changemasters' ('change leaders' also occurs). These representations of 'great ones' articulate together different discourses, including discourses of entertainment ('ideas scouts', cf. 'talent scouts') and theatre ('lead actors', 'producer-directors'). The 'small ones' are represented primarily as 'laggards' (also 'skeptics', 'resisters'); 'laggard' is drawn from the moral discourse of everyday life.

It is the 'great ones' who are the predominant actors or agents in the text – it is their actions as well as attributes that are in focus. The range of actions and attributions includes elements from two main *Cités* – the 'Inspirational' and 'Connectionist'. With respect to the former, the 'great ones' 'sense problems and weaknesses', exhibit 'curiosity', 'create', 'imagine', 'improvise', 'dream', have 'visions', 'shake up' reality and their own thinking, and so forth. Like all artists they are a little mad – 'neurotic', 'paranoid'. They are charismatic: they 'inspire' others, and 'raise aspirations' with their visions, they 'wake people out of inertia', and so forth. With respect to the latter, the 'great ones' 'reassemble', 'combine', form 'alliances' and build and 'widen' 'coalitions', 'build' and 'nurture teams', have a 'network of contacts', etc. There are traces of other *Cités* – the 'Industrial' ('delivering on deadline') and the 'Merchant' ('making deals'), but the 'deals' have a 'connectionist' character which points to a merger of *Cités*. In these 'deals', exchange is not balanced to the point that parties are 'quits' and can therefore sever connection, as it is in the 'merchant' world when one pays the price of the object purchased. Here there always remains a debt to pay, which allows for relations to be built on a long-term basis ('this can involve some creative exchange of benefits, so that supporters get something of value right away. Some

changemasters seek contributions beyond the amount they actually need because investment builds the commitment of other people to help them').

TEXTURING

The diverse Discourses that constitute *cités*, and the diverse discourses that constitute each *cit  *, are articulated, 'textured', together in the text in accordance with its genre and the syntactic features which we have identified above as realizing the genre (most saliently, additive and adversative paratactic relations).

On the one hand, leadership is constructed through relations of equivalence between different discourses (and Discourses) emanating from (the orders of discourse of) different areas of social life and social experience, and so between these areas. On the other hand, relations of difference are set up between the Inspirational/Connectionist and Industrial/Domestic Discourses (and constituent discourses). The text builds a protagonist (Inspirational/Connectionist) – antagonist (Industrial/Domestic) relation between them.

Let us begin with relations of difference. In Extract 3, a relationship of difference is textured between 'pacesetters' and 'laggards', in terms of, on the one hand, the Inspirational and Connectionist Discourses (with a particular appropriation of the Domestic Discourse which we come to shortly), and, on the other hand, the Industrial Discourse. This relationship is textured as a protagonist–antagonist relation (Martin, 1992).

Extract 3

Companies that are successful on the web operate differently from their laggard counterparts. On my global e-culture survey, those reporting that they are much better than their competitors in the use of the Internet tend to have flexible, empowering, collaborative organizations. The 'best' are more likely than the 'worst' to indicate, at statistically significant levels, that

- Departments collaborate (instead of sticking to themselves).
- Conflict is seen as creative (instead of disruptive).
- People can do anything not explicitly prohibited (instead of doing only what is explicitly permitted).
- Decisions are made by the people with the most knowledge (instead of the ones with the highest rank).

Pacesetters and laggards describe no difference in how hard they work (in response to a question about whether work was confined to traditional hours or spilled over into personal time), but they are very different in how collaboratively they work.

Working in e-culture mode requires organizations to be communities of purpose. Recall the elements of community sketched in Chapter 1. A community makes people feel like members, not just employees – members with privileges but also responsibilities beyond the immediate job, extending to colleagues in other areas. Community means having things in common, a range of shared understandings transcending specific fields. Shared understandings permit relatively seamless processes, interchangeability among people,

smooth formation of teams that know how to work together even if they have never previously met, and rapid transmission of information. In this chapter we will see how the principles of community apply inside organizations and workplaces, sometimes facilitated by technology but also independent of it. And I will examine the challenges that have to be overcome to create organizational communities.

The greater integration that is integral to e-culture is different from the centralization of earlier eras. Integration must be accompanied by flexibility and empowerment in order to achieve fast response, creativity, and innovation through improvisation. Web success involves operating more like a community than a bureaucracy. It is a subtle but important distinction. Bureaucracy implies rigid job descriptions, command-and-control hierarchies, and hoarding of information, which is doled out top-down on a need-to-know basis. Community implies a willingness to abide by standardized procedures governing the whole organization, yes, but also voluntary collaboration that is much richer and less programmed. Communities can be mapped in formal ways, but they also have an emotional meaning, a feeling of connection. Communities have both a structure and a soul.

The texturing of the relationship of difference is effected through a range of contrastive or antithetical relational structures and expressions: *x instead of y*, *x not just y*, *x but also y*, *x is different from y*, *more like x than y*. The clearest case is in the list in the centre of the extract, where protagonist practices represented before the brackets are set off against antagonist practices within the brackets.

This extract illustrates how the meanings of words drawn from the vocabulary of the Domestic Discourse are changed through their recontextualization within a largely Connectionist–Inspirational context. The new world has nothing in common with the original Domestic *cité* one finds for example in texts from the 1930s, where ‘the great ones’ are old, carriers of tradition, etc. in a hierarchical world where one should respect one’s elders. This world accorded with the bourgeois capitalism of the time, but does not accord with the contemporary elevation of rupture and innovation into supreme values. This particular appropriation of the Domestic Discourse is clear in the final paragraph, where ‘communities’ are attributed with Inspirationist attributes – notably ‘a soul’ – and the two Discourses are worked into a relation of equivalence. A relationship of difference is textured between this Domestic–Inspirational hybrid and the ‘bureaucracy’ of the Industrial *Cité*.

Turning to relations of equivalence, this extract also textures relations of equivalence between different discourses within each Discourse. First, vocabulary items which are in equivalent positions in contrastive relations are thereby textured as equivalent, e.g. *integration* and *community*, on the one hand, *centralization* and *bureaucracy*, on the other hand. Second, such relations of equivalence are textured through additive paratactic structures, sometimes with the conjunction ‘and’ (e.g. ‘flexible, empowering, collaborative’, where the three elements belong to different discourses). There are also contrastive relations within the ‘protagonist’ conjunction of Discourses: ‘members, *not just* employees’; ‘privileges *but also* responsibilities’; ‘a willingness to abide by standardized procedures governing the whole organization, yes, *but also* voluntary collaboration that is much richer and less programmed’; ‘Communities can be mapped in formal ways, *but*

they *also* have an emotional meaning, a feeling of connection . . . both a structure and a soul'. These contrastive relations do double duty: they both register contrastive features on the protagonist side, and the contrast between the complexity of the latter (x but also y) and the simplicity of the antagonistic Industrial Discourse (x).

There is also a combination of relations of equivalence and difference in Extract 4:

Extract 4

Skill 1: Sensing Needs and Opportunities: Tuning into the Environment

Changemasters sense problems and weaknesses before they represent full-blown threats. They see the opportunities when external forces change – new technological capabilities, industrial upheavals, regulatory shifts – and then they identify gaps between what is and what could be. Recall the divergent paths to e-business success taken by pacesetter companies compared with the laggards in Chapter 3. Whereas laggards respond to hints of new developments on the horizon with denial and anger, pacesetters exhibit curiosity.

Changemasters find many ways to monitor external reality. They become idea scouts, attentive to early signs of discontinuity, disruption, threat, or opportunity. They can establish their own listening posts, such as a satellite office in an up-and-coming location, an alliance with an innovative partner, or investments in organizations that are creating the future.

Through additive paratactic relations, equivalences are again textured between elements of Inspirational ('sensing', 'tuning in', being 'idea scouts') and Connectionist ('establishing listening posts', 'an alliance') Discourses; between discourses of intuition ('sensing') and, through a metaphorical extension of radio electronic discourse, a discourse of self-reflexivity ('tuning in'), an entertainment discourse ('idea scouts' – cf. 'talent scouts') or a discourse of military intelligence or espionage ('establish listening posts').

Through a contrastive paratactic relation, a relation of difference is textured between a psychoanalytical discourse ('denial or anger') and perhaps a discourse of child psychology, which is a part of the 'Inspirational' Discourse ('exhibit curiosity'). The texturing work here is both the texturing of these equivalence relations through additive and contrastive paratactic constructions, and through collocations: the collocation of 'scouts' with 'idea' is the most obviously creative collocation; 'identify gaps' (conventional strategic management discourse) is collocated with '(between) what is and what could be' – religion/charismatic politics, even revolutionary politics. Note also, collocations of 'sense' (discourse of intuition) and 'needs and opportunities'/'problems and weaknesses' (conventional strategic management discourse).

Extract 5 is the list of the seven 'skills'.

Extract 5

Seven classic skills are involved in innovation and change: tuning into the environment, kaleidoscopic thinking, an inspiring vision, coalition building, nurturing a working team,

persisting through difficulties, and spreading credit and recognition. These are more than discrete skills; they reflect a perspective, a style, that is basic to e-culture.

The list textures together in a relation of equivalence elements of the Inspirational Discourse ('tuning in to the environment', 'an inspiring vision') and the Connectionist Discourse ('coalition building', 'nurturing a working team', 'spreading credit and recognition'). 'Persisting through difficulties' is more difficult to place, but perhaps evokes an Inspirational world and the unrecognized genius able to carry on alone in the face of opposition for the sake of recognition in posterity. 'Kaleidoscopic thinking' evokes both Inspirational and Connectionist Discourses, creativity taking a connectionist form, the form of a new relation rather than an invention *ex-nihilo*. The list textures together elements of discourses of charismatic politics or perhaps religion ('inspiring vision'), self-reflexivity/counselling ('tuning in'), cognitive theory and perhaps play (and childhood) ('kaleidoscopic thinking') within the Inspirational Discourse, politics ('coalition building') and parenting ('nurturing') within the Connectionist Discourse.

Conclusion

We shall conclude with some thoughts on this collaboration as an exercise in transdisciplinarity, returning to the theme we raised in the Introduction. We suggested there that 'transdisciplinary' research is a particular form of interdisciplinary research which does not simply bring together different disciplines and theoretical-analytical frameworks. It also initiates a dialogue between two disciplines and frameworks, which may lead to a development of both through a process of each internally appropriating the logic of the other as a resource for its own development. We consider what we have achieved first from the perspective of CDA, second from the perspective of new sociology of capitalism.

From the perspective of CDA, our collaborative analysis has appropriated the logic of the new sociology of capitalism in ways which point to the development of the theoretical concepts of 'order of discourse', 'discourse' and 'style'. We have suggested that a substantive change in the form of capitalism entails a change in the 'spirit of capitalism', and we have seen the latter both as an ideology and as an order of discourse – a particular configuration of discourses enacted as genres and inculcated as styles. We have also suggested that the *cités*, which are configured within the constitution of the 'spirit of capitalism', are Discourses, which are in turn analysable as configurations of discourses. We have also associated styles with values, and especially implicit values, which we have suggested can be seen as emanating from the 'equivalency principles' of particular *cités*. In suggesting these connections between the categories of the two theories, we are opening up various directions of theoretical elaboration for CDA by 'putting to work' within it the logic of new sociology of capitalism: the relationship between capitalist formations, ideologies and orders of discourse; the various levels of abstraction or generality at which discourses (and 'Discourses') need to be identified; the relationship between D/discourses, styles and legitimation.

From the perspective of 'New Sociology of Capitalism', collaborating with CDA allows an elaboration and deepening of a text analysis which was mainly thematic and centred upon pre-established analytical categories (the *cités*, dimensions of legitimation of a spirit of capitalism). The linguistic tools of CDA have encouraged us to look more closely at how texts are structured, how ways of writing construct, for example, equivalences and differences, how the author of a text constructs him/herself through the discourse, and so forth.

More generally, we believe that the study we have carried out is not merely of interest in terms of collaboration between disciplines. It also provides a relatively in-depth analysis of an influential management 'guru' text, allowing its codes to be exposed, which is one of a variety of ways in which social researchers can de-sacrilize the words of these new prophets. De-sacrilization seems to us an important undertaking, for such texts have a real influence on the maintenance of dominant ideologies and on the actions of the managers who read them. Yet the lack of a scientific apparatus and a relatively unsophisticated style lead social scientists to treat them with disinterest or contempt, as is more generally the case with popular literature and television. Consequently, such texts are rarely subjected to critique, leaving the field free for them to do their doctrinal work. It seems to us, by contrast, that studying such texts is one of the tasks of social science as we conceive it – to subject to debate what presents itself as given and obvious, and to expose to critique all the social agencies which impose themselves on people, in order to enhance democratic debate.

REFERENCES

- Bernstein, B. (1990) *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, E. (1999) *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Boltanski, L. and Thévenot, L. (1991) *De la justification*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999) *Discourse in Late Modernity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Furusten, S. (1999) *Popular Management Books*. London: Routledge.
- Harvey, D. (1996) *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Huczynski, A. (1993) *Management Gurus: What Makes Them and How to Become One*. London: Routledge.
- Jackson, B. (2001) *Management Gurus and Management Fashions*. London: Routledge.
- Kanter, R.M. (2001) *Evolve!* Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London: Verso.
- Martin, J. (1992) *English Text*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ricoeur, P. (1997) *L'idéologie et l'utopie*. Paris: Seuil.
- Sayer, A. (2000) *Realism and Social Science*. London: Sage.



EVE CHIAPELLO, PhD in Management, is an associate professor at the HEC School of Management, near Paris, France. She teaches Organization Theory and Management Accounting and is responsible for the speciality 'Information, Control and Organisation' of the HEC PhD program. She has been researching in economic sociology and organizational sociology for 10 years. She is the author of several articles and books, including, in 1998 *Artistes versus Managers* (Paris: Métailié), a book about the conflict between management and artistic rationalities in the Arts field, and in 1999 *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme* (Paris: Gallimard) which she co-authored with the French sociologist Luc Boltanski. She is now doing some work in the sociology of accounting, considering accounting categories as objects that perform the 'economic reality'. ADDRESS: HEC School of Management, France. [email: chiapello@hec.fr]

NORMAN FAIRCLOUGH is Professor of Language in Social Life at Lancaster University and the author of numerous books and articles in critical discourse analysis. His recent work has focused upon language in new capitalism. ADDRESS: Department of Linguistics, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YT, UK. [email: n.fairclough@lancaster.ac.uk]