KATHOLIEKE
UNIVERSITEIT
LEUVEN

DEPARTEMENT TOEGEPASTE ECONOMISCHE WETENSCHAPPEN

RESEARCH REPORT 0223

CONSTRUCTING THE OTHER: MANAGERIAL RHETORICS OF DIVERSITY

by
P. ZANONI
M. JANSSENS

D/2002/2376/23

Constructing the Other:

Managerial Rhetorics of Diversity

Patrizia Zanoni
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Organisation Studies
Naamsestraat 69
3000 Leuven, Belgium
Phone: 32-16-326867
Fax: 32-16-326732
E-mail: patrizia.zanoni@econ.kuleuven.ac.be

Maddy Janssens
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Organisation Studies
Naamsestraat 69
3000 Leuven, Belgium
Phone: 32-16-326874
Fax: 32-16-326732
E-mail: maddy.janssens@econ.kuleuven.ac.be

Constructing the Other:
Managerial Rhetorics of Diversity

Abstract

In this article, we examine how HR managers rhetorically construct diversity as discourses of Otherness. Our analysis relies on argument schemes developed by the classical rhetoric tradition. HR managers talk about diverse employees as visible, hearable and enjoyable Others, measure Otherness in terms of time, pace and rhythm, and evaluate the Other in terms of his/her compliance. While these discourses are varied and sometimes contradict the dominant (negative) Discourses of Otherness, they remain at the same time monolithic. The construction and valorisation of Otherness is predominantly deployed in function of reinforcing dominant managerial Discourses of discipline, compliance and control.

Introduction

While discourse analysis has been applied to several organizing discursive processes such as strategy (Barry and Elmes 1997), stakeholders' negotiations (Hamilton 1997) the client (Anderson-Gough et al. 2000), teamwork (Kamoche 1995), and identity (Phillips and Hardy 1997), it is not a prevalent way to study workforce diversity. Within this rather new research domain, one important strand of studies focuses on uncovering quantifiable evidence of discriminatory practices in the workplace leading to phenomena such as the glass-ceiling, wage differences, segregation, and exclusion from informal networks (Nkomo and Cox 1996). Another strand of diversity research investigates the relationships between workforce race and gender and traditional organizational behaviour topics such as leadership styles, job attitudes, job satisfaction, conflict and problem-solving capabilities (Nkomo and Cox 1996; Milliken and Martins 1996). Concerned about the theoretical development of this domain, Nkomo and Cox (1996: 350) formulate the need to move beyond traditional modes of thinking and suggest discourse analysis as a possible approach. One example of the use of this perspective is Litvin's study of the diversity discourse in organizational behaviour textbooks (1997). Her analysis reveals the essentialist assumptions behind the contemporary diversity Discourse as well as the construction of differences among individuals as primarily a group phenomenon.

Like Litvin, we draw attention to the insights that can be gained by approaching diversity from a discourse analysis perspective. However, we analyse texts produced in interview situations with Human Resource (HR) managers responsible for diversity management in their organization. We focus on the varied ways in which HR managers talk about diversity and diversity management addressing three main questions: What are the HR managers' discourses of diversity in the workplace? How do they rhetorically construct diversity? What grand Discourses do they refer to? In interpreting these discourses, we approach diversity as a construction of Otherness. We explore how HR managers talk about diverse employees as visible, 'hearable' and enjoyable Others, measure Otherness in terms of time, pace and rhythm, and evaluate the Other in terms of his/her compliance. First, however, we briefly describe our theoretical stance in discourse analysis, the rhetorical argument schemes used in our texts analysis and our research method.

Discourse Analysis and Rhetorics

Discourse analysis applied to organisation studies has been characterized by a wide variety of theoretical and methodological approaches (Grant et al. 1998: 4). Debated theoretical issues have been the importance of texts versus their context (Burman and Parker 1993; Fairclough 1995; van Dijk 1997), Discourse and discourse (Alvesson and Karreman 2000; Gee 2000), the text and the pre-linguistic (Chia 2000; Mattingly 1998), the monologic and the dialogic (Keenoy et al. 1997), discursive practice and social practice (Fairclough 1995; Keenoy et al. 1997), while methodologies have focused on different aspects of language such as story-telling (Boje 1995), conversation (Woodilla 1998), rhetoric (Hamilton 1997), slogans (Lu 1999), metaphor (Cazal and Inns 1998), and comparative text analysis (Ainsworth 2001). Underlying these issues, there are a set of fundamental theoretical and ethical/political issues stemming from the Foucauldian legacy and its postmodern interpretation: the roles of structure and agency, the relationship between discourse and the material, and the nature of power (Carr and Zanetti 2001; Hall 1988; Heracleous and Hendry 2000; Newton 1998; Oswick et al. 2000; Reed 2000; Spicer and Fleming 2001). While a full account of this debate would go beyond the scope of this paper, we deem necessary to briefly delineate our position within this diverse landscape.

Our approach is characterised by the primacy of the (verbal) text as locus where the subject rhetorically produces contextual and dialogical discourses by drawing from grand Discourses. Methodologically, this means that 1) the point of departure of our analysis is the text produced dialogically in a specific interview situation; 2) we identify some of the 'local' discourses in that text; 3) we show how the subject rhetorically constructs those discourses, 4) by drawing from culturally and historically situated, broader Discourses (Fairclough 1995; Gee 2000; Parker 1992). To analyse the ways in which the subject constructs his/her discourses of diversity by referring to larger Discourses, we draw on the classical rhetoric tradition (Aristotle and Kennedy 1991). Differently from those studies in which 'rhetoric' indicates a managerial discourse as opposed to the 'reality' of management practices (Legge 1996; Poole and Mansfield 1992; Keenoy 1990), we go back to the early meaning of the term. Rhetoric, as a pre-modern discipline, exhibits especially attractive features for discourse analysis. First, it looks at language holistically: form and content shape each other (Hamilton 1997; Robrieux 1993). Second, it sheds light onto the dialogical and situational nature of language through stressing the audience's role and the historical and cultural embeddedness of language (Warnick 2000). Finally, as the art of persuasion by argumentation, rhetoric illuminates the discursive devices through which power relations are established, reproduced, or challenged (Hamilton 1997).

The notion of 'invention,' which designates the first two books of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, is particularly useful when looking at the text as locus of articulation between discourses and Discourses. As the first of the five parts of rhetoric (invention, disposition, elocution, action and memory), 'invention' refers to 'the search for ideas and arguments' (Robrieux 1993: 17; Hamilton 1997). It subsumes the (symbolically structured) arguments available to the speaker as well as his/her capacity as agent to select and combine them to persuade the audience. The subject's discursive agency is expressed through his/her capacity to draw from grand Discourses, using rhetorical arguments in order to create new and unique local discourses. The ambiguity of the subject/structure relationship in language is well illustrated by Robrieux's reflection on the notion of invention: 'the term 'invention' was better translated by 'discovery' (to indicate 'heuresis'), because it seems less an issue of 'creating' than of 'finding' arguments, which exist independently from the speaker' (1993: 17, own translation).

Our analysis of the subject's articulation between discourses and Discourses relies on the rhetorical devices, called 'argument schemes' or 'topical schemes,' as devised by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's in *The New Rhetoric* (*NR* 1969) and classified by Warnick (2000) (see Figure 1). These schemes enable the speaker '*to induce or increase the mind's adherence to the theses presented for its assent*' (*NR* 1969: 4, stress in original). Argument schemes are of four main types: quasi-logical schemes, schemes based on the structure of reality, schemes establishing the structure of reality, and the dissociation scheme. In what follows, we illustrate the four types and describe the argument schemes which are most commonly used by HR managers when talking about diversity. For the definitions of all thirteen schemes, we refer to the list included in appendix.

I. Quasi-logical	contradiction, incompatibility	01
	identity, definition, analyticity, tautology	02
	reciprocity, rule of justice	03
	transitivity, inclusion, division	04
	measures and probabilities	05
II. Based on the Structure of Reality	liaison of succession	06
	liaison of coexistence	07
	symbolic liaisons	08
	double hierarchies	
	differences of degree and order	
III. Establishing the Structure of Reality	example	09
	illustration	10
	model and anti-model	11
	analogy and metaphor	12
IV. Dissociation		13

Figure 1: Argument Schemes (adapted from Warnick 2000: 109)

Quasi-logical arguments claim validity through their rational appearance and their similarity to logical formulae (*NR* 1969). Rational and logical validity can be established through the schemes of *contradiction* and *incompatibility* showing the conflict between different alternatives and obliging the audience to make a choice (Warnick, 2000). The argument schemes of *reciprocity* and the *rule of justice* are also quasi-logical. Their aim is to show the same treatment to two situations which are counterparts of each other (*NR* 1969: 221), and argue for identical treatment to beings or situations of the same kind (*NR* 1969: 218). Still another way of establishing logical validity is by relating and comparing different terms with each other. A specific example is *transitivity*, a scheme through which one aims at establishing a relation between a and c by indicating that a relation between a and b and between b and c holds. Other schemes of logical comparing are the arguments of *measures and probabilities*. Here, one uses stable standards of judgement so several objects can be evaluated which brings them closer to each other but, by denying their uniqueness, discredits them (Warnick, 2000).

Arguments schemes based on the structure of reality aim at establishing solidarity between accepted judgements and others which one wants to promote (*NR* 1969: 261). *Liaisons of succession* are such arguments because they unite a phenomenon to its causes or consequences. An example is the relationship between means and end, where the former is always subordinated to the latter. *Liaisons of coexistence* fall also in this category because they seek to establish a relationship between an observable fact and what is not observable (Warnick 2000). Prototypical liaisons of coexistence are connecting a person and his/her actions or connecting a group and its members. Both arguments indicate the essence and its manifestations. Other arguments that structure reality are *symbolic liaisons* which unite a symbol and what it symbolises in a way that transcends rationality, and *double hierarchies* which correlate a contested hierarchy with an accepted one. Finally, one can structure different terms by making them *differences of degree* (intensity) versus *differences of order* (nature) which brings the compared terms closer to each other or sets them further apart.

A third group of argument schemes establishes the structure of reality through particular cases such as in examples, illustrations or models, or through an analogy, as in analogies and metaphors. Argumentation by *example* implies disagreement with a particular rule and is designed to establish another principle, while an *illustration* strengthens adherence to a known and accepted rule by providing clarifying particular instances (Warnick, 2000). *Models* and *anti-models* not only exemplify or illustrate, but also intend to respectively encourage and discourage behaviour. The argumentative value of *analogies* and *metaphors* lies in the resemblance of structures.

Finally, *dissociation* distinguishes between two terms and aims at setting up a hierarchy between them where one is valued and the other devalued. This argument scheme arises from widely accepted hierarchies like appearance/reality, creates distance, and re-organises conceptions of reality (Warnick 2000).

Research Method

Our text analysis is based on 25 interviews with Flemish HR managers carried out in collaboration with the Vlaams Economisch Verbond (VEV), the largest regional employers' organization in Belgium. All interviewees are members of the diversity management workgroup of this organization, one of the main local venues for sharing information on and experiences of diversity and diversity management. The interviews were conducted in Dutch and guided by a questionnaire of twenty wide-ranging open questions. Topics included the definition of 'diversity,' the organizational policies and activities relevant to diversity, the goals of the diversity policies and activities, and the role of diversity in attaining specific organizational goals.

Interviews were conducted jointly by employees of the research unit of the VEV and one of the co-authors at the interviewees' workplace. We believe that the interviewers' relatively young age as well as their affiliation to well-known institutions (the VEV and the Faculty of Economics and Applied Economics) facilitated the production of a certain dialogic texts with respondents. In particular, it should be noted that, in general, these institutions do not convey a confrontational position because they do not openly challenge the D/discourses of profit at the core of many organizational identities (Keenoy et al. 1997: 151).

Seeing the Other, Hearing the Other, Enjoying the Other

Difference is in the first place a bodily experience. In Western culture, where sight and hearing dominate over the other senses (Classen 1999), the Other is initially perceived as such because of his/her complexion and the sound of his/her voice. Because these differences are experienced through the senses, they 'speak for themselves,' are discursively constructed as 'facts,' and do not need argumentation. The embodied difference between Self and Other is a difference of order and, as such, it stresses both the symbolic and the physical distance between the two (*NR* 1969: 345). Conversely, we shall notice how physical closeness and shared pleasure are rhetorically used to represent equality and integration among diverse workers (Canetti 1960).

Seeing the Other

Employees' 'visible differences' are particularly significant when they come in contact with clients. In these liminal situations, through the proximity of the non-organizational Other per antonomasia –the client– they come to personify the company and are identified with it as parts are with the whole (Gherardi 1995; Anderson-Gough et al. 2000; du Gay 1996). First-line employees have to fulfil certain visual requirements such as being 'young, having a reasonable appearance and no disability,' as one interviewee stated. They perform 'aesthetic labour' (Hancock and Tyler 2000), a form of labour rhetorically based on the universal value of the Beautiful claiming implicit agreement (*NR* 1969: 76). In the following excerpt, the HR manager of a food company mostly employing disable people arguments her decision to remove a disable worker from a first-line job:

> 'Once we had to take somebody out of the sandwich production. It's somebody who does not have a light mental handicap but rather a moderate mental handicap and also a visible handicap, which is often crucial towards customers. And this is someone with limited capacities, so it was in facts so that he could not carry out the job or the required tasks every day in a qualitative manner.'

The argumentation is built on an example that intends to establish the legitimacy of the action. This action could be labelled as 'unfair' and questioned by the interviewer by the argument scheme of the rule of justice. To avoid this allegation, she constructs the disability not only as a difference of degree –a 'light' or 'medium' mental handicap– but also as one of order –a 'visible' handicap– which stresses distance. Moreover, this difference of order refers to the sphere of the senses, highlighting presence. Once the worker is defined, she makes an additional argument that converges towards the same conclusion: not only does this worker appear badly, but also could s/he not work qualitatively (*NR* 1969: 471). Finally, to rhetorically support her decision, she integrates the arguments through a double hierarchy: if it is morally questionable that a person be removed from a job because of his/her appearance, it is more acceptable that s/he be removed because s/he is unable to properly carry out the tasks. Through the latter argument, the former is made acceptable.

The above case illustrates well how the universal value of the Beautiful can be a deployed in management discourses. This is however not always the case, as we show through the next excerpt from the interview with the HR manager of a zoo.

> 'For instance, I have people here that look really good and other that are really ugly, thin and fat, small and tall. And if they are women, then they [the workers] are even stricter. I noticed it myself. There was one lady, who was quite overweight and she came in contact with a lot of visitors. And then they said 'it cannot be that that lady gets that job'. 'Oh no, I say, but then we have to give the overweight men who come in contact with visitors also another job.' And then they said 'all right, we are wrong.' Really...'

The speaker is self-reflectively analysing how the (gendered) value of the Beautiful enters the discourses about appropriate appearance in the workplace. Prior to this statement, she described and justified her 'flexible' general policy. For instance, her personnel are principally allowed to have tattoos, rasta hair and piercing. These issues are rhetorically made negotiable resorting to a difference of degree: not too many tattoos, rasta hair should be tied when employees are giving tours to visitors, and piercing is allowed as long as it is safe. While her purpose is to challenge the common sense equation between the Beautiful and the Normal, in this case, her arguments failed to persuade her employees. They held especially strict 'aesthetic' standards for women coming in contact with visitors. In her response, the HR manager first brings men and women, originally constructed as two different categories, back into the same category 'employees,' and then applies the rule of justice. She further structures her reasoning transitively: if visitors can be guided by overweight men, and overweight men are equal to overweight women, then visitors can be guided by overweight women. By doing so she makes aesthetic standards gender-neutral.

While the above examples illustrate discourses of *aesthetic* standards, our interviews with HR managers also indicate discourses of *physical* ones. The two are of course not independent from one another, but in the latter the accent typically lies on the physical heaviness of the tasks to be carried out. Once this (technically informed) 'fact' is established, it is rhetorically used to justify the absence or the segregation of women or other 'different' (categories of) employees. In this type of discourse, the female body is always constructed in opposition to the male one, as weaker and/or smaller. The comparison further strengthens the impression of 'factuality' of the statements. The HR manager of an automotive factory explains:

> 'Coachwork is a physical problem because the parts are heavier, because women are a bit smaller than men and a heavy hood cannot be lifted by everybody, you already have to be one of the bigger... In that sense, the resistance is above all for the coachwork. Because there you have physical reasons, we work with max. 10% women on the line. [...] When we started to have women in the night shift, two years ago, there was a lot of protest from the men, because they thought that the women

would get the best jobs. They [the men] had worked so long without women and didn't want them because they [women] would get the positions that they would have to give up, and would take the work of 'limited' men. Well, then it turned out that the women could do much more than the men thought. The resistance has gradually disappeared.'

The interviewee considers the arrival of women in the factory and later in night shifts as problematic because it questions the *status quo* in the physical division of labour among the staff. Starting from the 'concreteness' of the tasks, he builds his interpretation on a series of cause-effect relationships. The incompatibility between 'women' and 'heavy work' is rhetorically solved by the dissociation between the appearance (what the men thought) and the reality (what the women could actually do). At the same time, abstract elements in the situation are silenced. The workers' resistance could alternatively have been interpreted, among others, as an attempt to protect the existing liaison of coexistence between the group 'factory workers' and its members, strong men working at night. Through their presence and physical work, women make these qualities of the group 'factory workers,' as embodied by its male members, irrelevant. Women clearly threatened the group's identity: they are not men, they are small and weak, and, until a couple of years ago, were legally forbidden to work night shifts (Gherardi 1995).

Hearing the Other

Language is the 'hearable difference' per antonomasia, and as such it holds a privileged place in HR managers' discourses of diversity. The role of language in the construction of diversity must be interpreted in light of its strong symbolic connotation and its centrality in the construction of Belgian individual and group identities. We point to a cluster of interrelated and deeply rooted political, social and economic Discourses to sketch this symbolic context. In Belgium, there are two main ethnic groups who each speak their own language. The Flemish population living in the northern part of the country, Flanders, speaks Dutch, while the Walloon population in the south, Wallonia, speaks French. Brussels, the capital, is bilingual (French and Dutch). In contemporary Flanders, the Walloon/Flemish and French/Dutch dichotomies have strong symbolical ties with respectively nobility/peasantry, industry/agriculture, rich/poor, Socialism/ Catholicism, republic/monarchy and, more generally oppressor/oppressed. Although Flanders is today economically wealthier than Wallonia, French remains dominant in all spheres of public life.

In this context, the degree to which non-Dutch native-speakers, such as foreigners and Walloons, need to known Dutch becomes a particularly important and sensitive issue. While some HR managers set only minimal language requirements and are open to alternatives, others stress the importance of language fluency. The HR manager of a large, international automotive company in Flanders reports his experience with Moroccan workers commuting from a nearby city in Wallonia:

> 'Regarding the knowledge of the language, we have hurt ourselves a bit. We have hired quite some people who didn't really have a basic knowledge of Dutch. What does it mean? Our organisation is more and more based on teamwork. The division of tasks doesn't exist any more, so in other words, one is more and more dependent on one another. And if one depends on one another, one needs to be able to communicate. And if one doesn't know the language, one cannot communicate and does not know what the boss or the colleague wants. This is thus a handicap. Everybody has seen it. Without Dutch, the migrant workers cannot make it happen. They are mostly people that come from behind Liege [a Walloon city] and who don't know Dutch. With French you can often solve the problem. In the worst case, we have to put somebody who knows Moroccan next to the person. It's also part of teamwork. We have solved it like this, but it stays difficult if one doesn't master the language.'

This HR manager approaches language mainly as a communication tool and adopts practical solutions to address the language problem. As a rhetorical device, he gives Dutch the argumentative subordinate status of means rather than the superordinate status of end. The end is good teamwork, which is achieved through interaction depending on a basic knowledge of the spoken language. In the relationship between language and teamwork as one of a means to an end, Dutch becomes only one of the possible languages to achieve teamwork. This framing allows the adoption of flexible solutions to the language problem such as an informal interpreter who knows Moroccan Arabic or the use of another shared language like French. The stress is on the relational aspects of work, which can be facilitated in different ways. This argument is constructed in two phases. First, teamwork is established as a fact: 'the division of tasks doesn't exist any more.' Second, the relationship of succession between means/end, language/teamwork is rhetorically supported by the statement 'everybody has seen it,' a locus of quantity based on the superiority of what is accepted by a greater number of people (*NR* 1969: 86). Here, the verb 'to see' further conveys the impression that the relationship of succession is a fact.

The excerpt hereunder constructs a completely different discourse of language through other rhetorical devices. In this case, strict language requirements are argued for:

> 'We require explicitly that they have to know Dutch. Why? Because everything happens in Dutch: work instructions, safety instructions, those are all in Dutch. That's why we use strict norms: one has to speak Dutch relatively well. Also, all our safety booklets, everything that is in the factory, what has to do with instructions... is all written in Dutch, too. We sure are ready to make our Dutch more understandable, but we keep requiring that people know Dutch.'

This HR manager presents language as an essential competence of factory workers. He connects the knowledge of Dutch to different types of instructions. This liaison of coexistence buttresses the argument of strict language requirements and excludes alternatives. To convey the impression of 'factuality' of his statements, and thus deter opposition from the interlocutor, the interviewee uses different rhetorical devices. He solely refers to technical aspects of work rather than the relational ones, stresses his answers by listing them and through 'why? because..., that's why, also, and too,' and amplifies his answers through the seven-fold repetition of the word 'Dutch' (*NR* 1969: 474-477). The concession in the last sentence 'we sure are ready to make our Dutch more understandable,' actually rhetorically foregrounds the required standards as subordination clauses often do (*NR* 1969: 157; Gee 2000: 3).

Flemish HR managers' discourses and their rhetorical devices radically change when they talk about Walloon workers:

> 'There is not much interest in learning Dutch, neither among the regular, nor among the temporary. In the group of the permanent, most can make themselves understood. The hard core of French-speaking from Liege, that's a hard core. Those are Belgians, too... Those we recruited years ago in the region of Liege, but they still speak French.'

This quotation comes from the interview with the HR manager of the automotive company mentioned above. Here, the Walloon 'hard core' is clearly constructed as the anti-model, a rhetorical scheme aiming at discouraging the imitation of behaviour. The use of the term 'hard core' qualifies this subgroup within the larger group of the ones that have to learn Dutch as unreachable and unchangeable. The time dimension in the words 'years ago' alludes to a locus of the irreparable, while the qualifier 'hard' in the expression 'hard core' further concretises the statement (*NR* 1969: 92).

Another interviewee makes explicit the comparison between migrant workers and Walloon or Flemish workers having to learn the other national language. While for the former group, language is primarily an economic issue, for the latter, it is a highly emotional one. This is an argument based on sacrifice: by speaking the language of the Other, Walloons or Flemish not only give up their own language but also a piece of the identity embodied by it (*NR* 1969: 248).

The HR manager of the Belgian office of an international consulting company resolves the Flemish/Walloon incompatibility by resorting to English. This practical solution to a domestic incompatibility has however also negative repercussions:

> 'That's something that... maybe it's our fault as Flemish, I've seen Americans at our branch in Eindhoven [in The Netherlands], and they spoke Dutch perfectly. We had there a meeting at an American company, but the meeting was in Dutch. If an American comes here, he never learns Dutch. We have partners here who have been with us for some years, who know little French and no Dutch. So maybe it's our approach, both for the intellectual and the less skilled jobs, maybe we should give more attention to the issue.'

In this case, it is through a comparison between the branch offices in The Netherlands and in Belgium, that the speaker shows how the Flemish flexible language policy has the long-term adverse effect that English-speaking foreigners do not learn Dutch. This same effect has also been illustrated in the fragment on the French-speaking 'hard core' from Liege. There, however, it was interpreted as the workers' resistance to learning Dutch, while here it is interpreted as a consequence of a 'lack of attention' in the company's language policy. These opposite interpretations are symbolically connected to the Discourse constructing managers as co-operative and workers as resistant. Moreover, the symbolically dominant position of English in the business world further contributes to silencing the possible interpretation that American managers be actually *unwilling* to learn Dutch.

Finally, another discourse of the 'hearable' difference constructs language as the manifestation of a cultural group's identity (its essence) and as a relay between that group and its members. The HR manager of a temporary employment agency states:

> 'But it [the problems] starts here, if you have a group of five or six [migrant workers] and you send five or six people together... most experiences are indeed negative. Why? Either indeed because of language, indeed the four or five start to speak their own language and immediately, the others think that they want to be left alone and automatically there is the possibility of a conflict. Or, in the second place, the bad attitudes can indeed come back very quickly.'

In the proximity of other members of one's cultural group, one's individual membership is 'activated' through language. It is through the liaison of coexistence group/member, that the employee discursively becomes in the first place a member of that group; his/her individuality disappears from the discursive scene. The speaker uses the group as a personification of the Other's visible and hearable difference. It is numerical presence and the sound of the foreign language that make the difference concrete and therefore threatening (Canetti 1960). As a manifestation of the group's identity, language and attitude are differences of order which tend to maximise distance between the group and what lies outside it (*NR* 1969: 345). At the same time, the copious use of adverbs 'indeed,' 'automatically' and 'immediately' throughout the excerpt rhetorically attempts to enhance the degree of factuality of the statement.

Enjoying the Other

Because bodies are the primary loci of personification and symbolisation of difference, their (spontaneous) proximity is often used to represent the transcendence of the difference into equality (Canetti 1960). Employees' behaviour in toilets and cafeterias becomes the symbol and the measure of the degree of integration of diverse personnel members: the concrete shows the abstract. Presence speaks for itself and acquires the status of undeniable fact. Toilets are often the place of resistance to the Other: in their ambiguous status between the very private and the public eye, they encourage anonymous actions (Collinson 1994). As places where meals are consumed together, cafeterias present a potential of sharing not only food but also the sensory and social pleasure that can go with it. Statements such as the following illustrate: 'They were completely integrated, they sat together at the table' and 'It can work, you have to invest in it. You also see it at personnel parties. They don't go and sit on their own.' One manager actively uses the symbolic power of the body in his diversity policy:

> 'We want to learn about the cultures. How does a Belgian best learn about a culture? By eating. I'm serious. Either travelling or eating. So we have here, and that is one of the strategies, we consciously chose to give all staff training in the afternoon about Morocco and Turkey. They get to know the culture through nice activities. We had the henna hand painting, clothing rituals, and the position of the woman. They could also ask all kinds of questions and the Moroccan staff answered them. The afternoon was also organised by the Moroccan staff, the Turkish afternoon by the Turkish staff, who had spread the news in their network to get it done. It was a success! Really! That's one of the strategies.'

Rituals and food are seen as manifestations of the essence of the group. In displaying them, their uniqueness increases the value of the group (*NR* 1969: 77) While on the one hand, they are symbols of (cultural) difference, on the other hand, their being grounded onto the body reminds us of the universality of the human condition. Whereas abstract values, when carried to the extreme, cannot be reconciled, concrete ones can always be harmonised (*NR* 1969: 79).

Time, Pace and Rhythm

A second large cluster of discourses of the embodied Other revolves around his/her availability for production and his/her capacity to contribute to it. The Other is rhetorically constructed in terms of his/her flexible availability for 'production time,' where production typically competes with the employee's family and leisure time. Once the employee is available, his/her organizational value is discursively rendered in terms of his/her pace and rhythm.

Time

In diversity D/discourses, adult women are often constructed in terms of their double, at times conflicting, roles as employees and mothers. In those organizations where employees' full availability and flexibility are the norm, a large majority of the women systematically leave or, in the best case, remain in the lower jobs (Benschop and Doorewaard 1998). The words of the HR manager of the Brussels branch of a large international consulting company are emblematic:

> 'Well, ladies, gentlemen... On the one hand, it's here a non-issue, on the other, it maybe is. When we recruit young people, and we recruit some 200 a year, I think they are fifty-fifty, more or less, but indeed... it's a non-issue in the recruitment whether it's a man or a woman. But we do indeed see that fewer women climb up the ladder. Why? Not because somebody keeps them behind, but rather 'cause they leave themselves. Proportionally, women leave more. One aspect is maybe the work pressure. But there I say: it's not a problem man/woman, but rather the family, the division of roles in the family. Sorry, but it's the family that chooses that the woman stays at home and the man goes on working, not the company. And we have a number of female senior managers and a number of female partners. And I even think that two, it's not many, but two are divorced and both have the children with them. So, actually... maybe it [their job] was the cause [of their divorce], I don't know, but the combination is possible. Even to go on working as a single mother ...'

In this excerpt, the interviewee arguments his interpretation of the fact that much more women than men leave the company. He does so by dissociating this effect from a possible cause, namely, a discriminating policy, and by linking it with another cause, individual choice. To buttress his interpretation of this liaison of succession, he lets the rule of justice, dissociation, and an exemplum in contrarium converge to it. The argumentation departs from the statement that men and women are hired in equal numbers. This 'fact' functions as a symbol of equal opportunities, which is based on the rule of justice (both men and women are members of the same group of employees) and is in contradiction with discrimination (Benschop and Doorewaard 1998; Gherardi 1995). The fact that women leave more than men, incompatible with the first fact, is then added. The incompatibility is resolved by dissociating the work and family spheres, and locating 'women's decision to leave' outside the influence sphere of the company. Another HR manager plainly affirms that 'if one stays and the other leaves, then you cannot say that it's our fault.' At this stage, women are clearly no longer members of the group 'employees' but rather members of the group 'working mothers.' The dissociation between work and family spheres is further reinforced through the use of an example in contrarium: divorced female senior managers with children are the living proof that the incompatibility between memberships in the groups 'working mothers' and 'employees' is only apparent and that women actually have the choice in their hands (a liaison of coexistence appearance/reality). They become not only a model for all women, but also the standard against which all women are evaluated. This discourse evidently largely replicates well-established Discourses of women at work (Benschop and Doorewaard 1998; Gherardi 1995). The close convergence of the local discourse with wider Discourses has a very strong symbolic argumentative power.

While adult women are central to the construction of the incompatibility between production and family time, younger and older workers are central in the one between production and leisure time. This is well illustrated in the fragment hereunder describing a project a Flemish brewery carried out in collaboration with a vocational school. Sixteen-year-old students went to school and worked in the factory at alternate weeks. They were given 'real' tasks on the line and experienced social pressure to work well, with the purpose of gaining respect for the blue-collars' work. The ones that would successfully complete this training would be offered a job. But...

> '[School] didn't interest them any more. [...] during the weeks they weren't here, they came in contact with all sort of... catchy joboffers hanging in the windows of the temporary work agencies. They went in and sometimes when they were supposed to study, they did temporary jobs after school to make money to go party in the weekend. They flew to Barcelona to a disco and then flew back. That kind of people they are. And in January, the second semester, we had to start and we only had two left out of ten. The others had quit school, judging they made enough money and investing in their future was not an issue. You think, they will see it later, but there is the fluctuating labour market and many temporary work agencies need that kind of target groups who want short-term cash and 'what's the problem'. Those youngsters have a certain consumption pattern and only think short-term, they are a bit socially

> marginalized, also at home and no real family ties...well, they spend their money, and when it's spent, it's spent, and then you cannot expect anything. No problem 'cause there is work enough. Is it interesting work? I don't think so.'

In this case, the interviewee narrates the events in a story. This format can be classified as an argumentative scheme establishing the structure of reality: a well-developed example or illustration with a beginning, a middle and an ending (Riessman 1993: 17). The persuasive power of a story lies in that the morale is literally embodied in the narrated 'facts' (Riessman 1993: 20). Within this story, the young workers are primarily constructed as unavailable, and their unavailability is interpreted as lack of discipline and work ethic. Their non-compliance is incompatible with the school and the factory systems, which both require them to be present at specific times. Worse, their insubordination disrupts work and studies not only materially but also symbolically. These youngsters consider work as a mere means to make money (the end), thereby valuing money and devaluating work (*NR* 1969: 276); in turn, money becomes the means to buy leisure and commodities further devaluating both work *and* money. By preferring the ephemeral, they contest the HR manager's locus of quantity of durability (*NR* 1969: 86-91).

Interestingly, as in the previous excerpt, the 'family' plays an important role. However, here 'family' is constructed in a totally different way and contributes to a quite different discourse. While, for women, 'family' is constructed as incompatible with work, for youngsters, it becomes a symbol of stability and responsibility ultimately promoting discipline, stability and commitment to work. Here family, as opposed to partying, makes of work a 'worthy' sacrifice (*NR* 1969: 248). Conversely, 'useless sacrifice [to party] leads to the disrepute of those who have made it' (*NR* 1969: 251). In another interview of the same tone, young workers' lack of discipline and compliance makes them not only an organisational problem but also a wider, social one. They are constructed as potential delinquents and have the rhetorical function of the anti-model.

While these excerpts negatively construct the Other by focusing on his/her lack of availability, other HR managers do show more understanding for employees' extra-professional lives: as one of them puts it 'there is more to life than doing the dishes.' Flexible working hours and part-time are the most common measures to allow the combination of different activities. However, because they are limited to non-managerial jobs and it is mostly women who take advantage of them, they often reinforce traditional gender roles not only for adult women but also for adult men, who are constructed as fully available workers.

Pace and Rhythm

Once the embodied worker is present in the workplace and available to the organization, s/he is deployed in the productive process where his/her performance is measured in terms of work rhythm and pace. The body's movements synchronised with the machine and other living bodies rhetorically make the abstract notion of performance concrete. In this section we illustrate how pace and rhythm can be utilized to create a variety of discourses about the Other. We first analyse two excerpts from the same interview in which difference is primarily constructed as lack of pace:

> 'Another concern is ... it has to do with their culture. We are moving people. We keep high tempos. We are enthusiastic workers ... But there are a lot of people who are calmer and less moving, who have a totally different rhythm. It wouldn't surprise me that in our selection tests, these people give, let's say, 4 or 8 answers while a candidate from our culture answers 25 questions. This changes the score. Because if we hire somebody, the person should already know what he needs to know when joining us.
> [...] We should better diversify, companies should try to be creative in the improvement of work rhythms so that people over the age of 53 or 54 no longer... they should be creative and let people work at another pace when they get 45 or 50 years. If you do so, they will not gasp when they are 40 or 50, in order to go on early retirement at 50. This I call diversifying. Then it's towards a certain group of people with experience.'

The two discourses about the migrant Other and the elderly Other are axed around two strictly connected liaisons of coexistence: one between essence and manifestation and one between group and member. Pace is seen as a manifestation of culture and of age. By framing the migrant and the elderly workers primarily as members of their reference group, the HR manager places the cause of the slower work pace at a structural level rather than at an individual one: the subject is stripped of his/her agency. The use of a double liaison of coexistence essentialises these groups and their members: the Flemish work at a high pace, the migrants at a low one; the young work fast, the elderly work slow. Through the comparison, the Other is constructed as lacking.

The referral to different essences, however, has important consequences. The elderly employee is constructed holistically, a worker going through different life phases to which different performance standards should apply: there is no incompatibility between former and present performance rates (*NR* 1969: 201). His/her lack is framed as temporary and is therefore more tolerable (*NR* 1969: 91) in the light of the pace s/he kept previously: merit is attributed in a timeless way (*NR* 1969: 294,299). On the contrary, the migrant worker is stuck with his/her culture, which is discursively fixed and made stable: his/her position is irreparable (*NR* 1969: 91).

Another interviewee questions dominant Discourses about disability and femininity centred on lack of rhythm with the following words:

> 'In the past we set Petra to work, she came through school, an internship and afterwards she was hired with an open-ended contract. And there were already a few [disable persons] at work from the past, very loyal people. My experience is: they do not make mistakes easily, you have to restrict them, organise them well, very loyal, very good workers. In the beginning, their rhythm is somewhat lower, but once they know their job well, it goes very well.
> [...] Lucienne was hired last year and Lucienne is 52 or 53 years old. She does a perfect job. She is also respected as the motherly type among all those snot-nosed, - we have several snot-nosed of between 18 and 20-, but otherwise, she does line work... I mean filling pots like everybody, but reaching a rhythm that is sometimes more consistent and higher than the one of the youngsters.'

In both cases, the HR manager uses an example to argument his opinion. In the first, Petra is solely constructed as a member of the larger group of the disable. Through the use of her proper name, she is made more concrete, the disable per antonomasia (*NR* 1969: 174; Lanham 1991). Her initial lower tempo is temporary and thus less negative. It is compensated by positive qualities of disable workers such as loyalty and accuracy, listed one after the other to create an amplifying effect by aggregation (*NR* 1969: 236). Pace, a locus of quantity, is opposed to various loci of quality stressing the unique and therefore stimulating the approval of the majority (*NR* 1969: 89-90). In the second example, Lucienne is constructed both as elderly and as motherly. These two qualifiers together with the use of her proper name have the effect of making her more of an individual and less of a member of a group. The adjective 'perfect,' having a superlative value, challenges the implicit dominant Discourse of lack (*NR* 1969: 246). The comparison between her and the young employees in the company is made vivid by combining it with an analogy between the *theme* Lucienne/youngsters and the *phoros* mother/'snot-nosed' infant. Her age and loyalty to the company mean experience and better performance.

In a few cases, the Other is not only not seen as lacking but even presented as a more productive worker, setting higher working rhythms:

> 'Fifteen years ago there were no women working in our electronic unit. And then the first arrived after Philips closed down. And then we thought, look, they did assembly there, they will probably be able to do the assembly here, even though we have no large series. And it was clear that they brought speed along. They were used to a high tempo because of the large series they had to do at Philips. And they have shown here that it was possible and they have actually given an extra stimulus; I think they even influenced our way of working.'

In this illustration, women, and their embodied experience, are the cause of an increase in the production rhythms. By showing that a higher tempo is possible, they confronted the male workers with a 'fact' and imposed a new standard. The argumentation is based on a series of 'facts' linked by causal relationships and the comparison between men and women, before and after the arrival of the women in the electronic unit. In the comparison however, the lower rhythm of the men on the shopfloor remains nonetheless implicit. The model function of the female workers is also downplayed because their superior productivity is ascribed to their previous working situation rather than to their own motivation and/or capacities as women. The positive relationship between gender and rhythm is symbolically closely connected with the theme of the next section, where the Other is discursively constructed in terms of his/her compliance.

The Compliant Other

If discourses of the Other often revolve around his/her unavailability and his/her lack of pace and rhythm, the Other can occasionally be positively constructed according to his/her degree of compliance with organisational practices and demands. By symbolically drawing from Discourses of culture, disability and gender, we show how the Other is constructed as more or less compliant.

The very fact of accepting the jobs that pay the least and are socially devalued can already be seen as a structural form of compliance (Wright 2001). This argument is mainly used for migrant workers, as illustrated by the following excerpt:

> '[We] have seen that we need people right now. [...] Although there were problems. But they [migrant workers] are also the only people who still wanted to do the job, and then we said: 'look, then we will solve the problem. [...] Some of the drivers complained about their Flemish but they regularly say that the Turks and the Moroccans, well, they are called by name, you can ask them what you cannot ask our Flemish workers. So about the small group of migrants, there are 10 or 12,[...] we have absolutely no complaints. On the contrary, in some jobs, or working irregular hours and in the rain, they are actually the ones who give the example to the Flemish rather than vice versa.'

This HR manager argues the value of migrant workers by comparing them with Flemish ones. In the comparison, the former have a model function. Individuals are constructed solely as member of the cultural group they belong to and attitude towards work is ascribed to the group as a whole, with an essentializing effect. Farther in the interview, an argument of reciprocity is introduced: workers' flexibility is compensated with flexible arrangements for extra-long holidays when they visit their countries of origin.

In the excerpt hereunder, the HR manager of the earlier mentioned beer factory richly illustrates how compliant disable workers can be better than insubordinate temporary workers:

> 'In '95-'96 we had a problem with a production task, which was very stupid and simple, the binding of four bottles with carton board. Because of the variety of our bottles and crates that we have, we could not standardize and automate it, so we had to do it manually. And even worse, stacking of the storage racks also happened manually. This work was outsourced to temporary workers, temporary workers who year by year became a more awry population. The good temporary workers were regularly picked out by us and also by other companies who contracted them. We therefore got more and more a concentration of negativists, who had a problem with the fact that a company is an organisation. Back then the company was downsizing. A negative climate reigned back, we also had strikes, and the productivity of the temporary workers, around ten people, went down. And we became less and less competitive. Either we had to stop, but the market was asking the contrary, or we had to do something with those temporary workers, who were so negative and relatively low educated, and that was a mess. And then I came in contact with a sheltered workshop, and they said that they really needed jobs for people who are only slightly disable and who could perfectly function in a family or private company. 'We actually have too many people here that could work in the private sector. Can you help us to set them to work?' And then we started a partnership with this sheltered workshop [...], so some of their people came to work here. It was actually no problem for the social acceptance. All problems we had with temporary workers like vandalism in the toilets and smoking where it was forbidden were gone.'

In this story, persuasion is mainly entrusted to the selection of facts (*NR* 1969: 116). The speaker fully relies on his authoritative position (*NR* 1969: 181) to make the interlocutor accept the long descriptions of situations, context, and causal relationships as facts rather than as his mere opinion (*NR* 1969: 67-70). To promote a series of values, he structures the illustration in a story format. The discourses that emerge are based on the two connected comparisons between temporary and regular workers on one side and able and disable workers on the other. Temporary workers and regular workers are compared to the advantage of the latter. The comparison draws from the locus of quantity for which stability is more valued than temporariness (*NR* 1969: 86).

The preference for stability also symbolically connects to the broader Discourse of work ethics still embedded in Belgian culture in spite of the increased flexibilisation of the labour market. In particular, the fact that the best temporary workers become regular ones points to the opportunity the others have lost, an argument of waste (*NR* 1969: 279). At the same time, the disable are compared to the able and are valorised as less troublesome workers. The two comparisons establish an (implicit) heterogeneous hierarchy where compliance is superior to skill (*NR* 1969: 81) and thus temporary workers are substituted by disable ones.

The compliant worker per antonomasia is however the female factory worker: not only is she easier to manage, but she also exerts social pressure on the male worker to self-discipline himself:

> 'In general I've noticed that you have more problems with men. *If they are alone?* Yes, I have more problems… I cannot speak in percentages, but you notice that men come to the HR unit with small complaints more often than women. Men come ask for other shifts more often… And they do this less when there are some women in their environment. If you have a totally male environment, then men behave like… let me say, in a bit a sexist way, they behave more 'feminine.' And they do, as we stereotypically think of women, they make big problems out of small things. They feel sick and then you say sometimes, say, are you a man or not? When a number of women are around, then they let that come out much less, 'cause if that woman should ask 'Are you a…?' It happens. You see that the men are somewhat calmer because there are a few women. They want to behave more as machos. And this can be positive 'cause they come less with small problems. On the other hand, we have to be honest and say that every now and then we have a problem with a man or a woman and that you say, there is something going on there, above all in the sense of sexual harassment. We recently had two cases.'

In this excerpt, we can see a complex play of symbols and personifications, hierarchies, and liaisons of coexistence arranged in a chain of liaisons of succession. Individuals are exclusively constructed as members of the sex group they belong to. Nonetheless, the sex of the group (its essence) and its behaviour (the manifestation) are dissociated and their relation inverted, so that men become 'feminine' while women become 'masculine.' This is achieved through a symbolic clustering of different hierarchically ordered dichotomies: management/workers, men/women, and strength/weakness. When male workers are alone, managers label their behaviour 'feminine,' where 'feminine' is used as synonym for 'complaining about small things.' This label alludes to the subordinated position of workers vis-à-vis managers. The arrival of women (who, paradoxically, are not at all 'feminine') activates the male workers symbolically dominant position in the gender relationship, shifting the primary identity axe of the male workers from class (workers/managers) to gender (men/women). This enhances their self-discipline and compliance but also stimulates more 'masculine' behaviour, which then turns into excessively male behaviour per antonomasia: sexual harassment.

In this illustration, the liaisons of coexistence -person/acts as essence/manifestation- are put in a relational context. The effect is quite paradoxical. Because the employees are solely seen as group members, this discourse tends to reinforce an essentialised notion of gender as sex. The two cases of sexual harassment are constructed as the consequence of the situation and the group characteristics rather than individual acts; also, women's 'weakness' implied in the adjective 'feminine' is first contested and later recuperated as they become victims of sexual harassment. However, this essentialising effect is undermined by the structure of the discourse, which is precisely based on the non-correspondence between sex and corresponding appropriate gendered behaviour.

Although this interpretation is particularly developed, other texts also construct diversity based on gender, organisational culture and self-discipline. The excerpt hereunder links dichotomies such as macho culture/teamwork, male/mixed group, no control/self and social control. In this factory, too, the arrival of women promotes male self-control and enforces a more active social control:

> 'I think that we have moved from a very macho culture, 'cause this is a men's world, for sure in the first years, an organization that made you think of the army, such strategies. The one that cannot keep up was a wimp. We have gone from that culture to a teamwork culture with communication, which can be improved, but still, it's open. This gradually bears its fruits. In which we have involved quite some women instead of only men, with lots of advantages. One of the major advantages – and I have seen it well in production – is for example that when you are in a meeting with men and a few women, the meeting will be very different. Men shout much less and listen more to each other. There is much more self-control, what fits the more open culture that we are trying to build.'

Conclusion

In this paper, we have researched diversity, today still largely studied as an objective, 'demographic' group phenomenon, by means of discourse analysis. This is an attempt to reframe the notion of diversity as the discursive construction of Otherness. Starting from interview texts, we have illustrated how HR managers rhetorically build discourses of diversity by drawing from a variety of broader, shared Discourses. Through this articulation between discourses and Discourses, an act of invention and retrieval, these subjects become agents. They select, reproduce and reaffirm or silence, contest, tear apart and rearrange dominant Discourses to persuade us of their ideas, policies and actions. The analysis of this negotiation of meaning allows us to gain insight in the specific context in which these diversity discourses are embedded, the larger social and cultural symbolic context that surrounds them, as well as the power they embody.

HR managers' discourses of personnel diversity are extremely heterogeneous while also remaining monolithic. They are heterogeneous in that they construct the Other in a variety of ways, both reproducing and challenging larger dominant Discourses of Otherness. For instance, the Other is not always represented as lacking but is sometimes portrayed as adding, is not always disruptive of order but can contribute to creating order, it is not always less manageable but can be precisely more manageable. Nevertheless, the contradiction of dominant (negative) Discourses of Otherness –and the resulting valorisation of the Other– is predominantly deployed in function of reaffirming and reinforcing dominant managerial Discourses of discipline, compliance and control. The Other is a positive Other only on condition that s/he is available and accommodating to organisational needs. In this way, the different meanings of diversity are mainstreamed into the HR managerial discourses, whereby the notions of HR and management remain unquestioned and diversity is re-configured as subaltern to them.

A rhetorical approach to the interview texts has also helped us shed light onto key linguistic and symbolic mechanisms though which discourses are built. We have approached these 'argumentative schemes' as devices, as linguistic tools of the articulation between discourses and Discourses. The stress on their 'technical' function should however not obscure their symbolic nature: as our analysis shows, argumentative schemes are the expression of deeply rooted culture-specific values. These minimal units of D/discourse, 'grid[s] minimally connecting ideas or terms in a sketchy, to-be-filled-in manner' (Warnick 2000: 110) are often structured in hierarchical dichotomies; for instance, small/big, temporary/stable, member/group and appearance/reality. 'Once a topical pattern has developed into common use, it will be used over and over in various manifestations and will be effective by virtue of its recognizability' (Warnick 2000: 110). This double approach to language is precisely what has intrigued us of rhetoric and what we hope will intrigue more scholars doing discourse analysis in the future.

Finally, classical rhetoric has proven to be a fruitful approach to look at diversity holistically. In particular, a rhetorical interpretation of these texts has allowed us to relate discursively produced meaning to images of sensorial experience. Diversity as the construction of Otherness is a process in which we make sense of the embodied Other as distant or close. Physical distance/proximity is the recurrent experiential language in which symbolic distance/proximity is constructed. On the one hand, the Other has to be close enough to be recognised as Other, on the other hand, the distance between the Self and the Other is precisely what is being negotiated and constructed through these discourses. The Other is in the first place the embodied Other as-experienced-through-the-Self's-senses: seen, heard and enjoyed. It is the Other with whom the productive space and tempo are shared and negotiated through simultaneous presence and co-ordinated movements. Presence, concreteness and materiality sure are characteristics of a number of rhetorical devices and fundamental features of the dominant managerial Discourse. Nonetheless, our analysis suggests that we cannot allow ourselves to solely confine them to the world of discourses: they point right to our bodies and experience as human beings.

References

Ainsworth, Susan
2001 'Discourse analysis as social construction: Towards greater integration of approaches and methods'. Paper presented at the Critical Management Studies Conference, UMIST, Manchester, 11-13 July.

Alvesson, Mats, and Dan Karreman
2000 'Varieties of discourse: On the study of organizations through discourse analysis'. *Human Relations* 53/9: 1125-1149.

Anderson-Gough, Fiona, Christopher Grey, and Keith Robson
2000 ' In the name of the client: The service ethic in two professional service firms'. *Human Relations* 53/9: 1151-1174

Aristotle, and George A. Kennedy
1991 *On rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barry, David, and Michael Elmes
1997 'Strategy retold: Toward a narrative view of strategic discourse'. *Academy of Management Review* 22/2: 429-452.

Benschop, Yvonne, and Hans Doorewaard
1998 'Covered by equality: The gender subtext of organizations'. *Organization Studies* 19/5: 787-805.

Boje, David M.
1995 'Stories of the story-telling organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney as Tamara-land'. *Academy of Management Journal* 38/4: 997-1035

Burman, Erica, and Ian Parker
1993 'Introduction—discourse analysis: The turn to the text' in *Discourse analytic research.* Erica Burman and Ian Parker (eds.), 1-13. London: Routledge.

Canetti, Elias
1960 [1980] *Masse und Macht.* Frankfurt am Mainz: Fischer

Carr, Adrian N., and Lisa Zanetti
2001 'Textuality and the postmodern neglect of the politics of representation'. *Tamara* 1/3: 14-29.

Cazal, Didier, and Dawn Inns
1998 'Metaphor, language and meaning' in *Discourse and organization.* David Grant, Tom Keenoy and Cliff Oswick. (eds.), 177-192. London: Sage.

Chia, Robert
2000 'Discourse analysis as organizational analysis'. *Organization* 7/3: 513-518.

Classen, Constance

1999 *The color of angels: Cosmology, gender and the aesthetic imagination*. London: Routledge

Collinson, David
1994 'Strategies of resistance: Power, knowledge and subjectivity in the workplace' in *Resistance and Power*. John M. Jermier, David Knights and Walter R. Nord (eds.), 25-68. London: Routledge.

du Gay, Paul
1996 *Consumption and identity at work*. London: Sage.

Fairclough, Norman
1995 *Critical discourse analysis*. Harlow: Longman.

Gee, James Paul
2000 *An introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Gherardi, Silvia
1995 *Gender, symbolism and organizational cultures*. London: Sage.

Grant, David, Tom Keenoy and Cliff Oswick
1998 'Introduction: Organizational discourse: Of diversity, dichotomy and multi-disciplinarity' in *Discourse and organization*. David Grant, Tom Keenoy and Cliff Oswick. (eds.), 1-13. London: Sage.

Hall, Stuart
1988 'Toad in the garden: Tatcherism among the theorists' in *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Gross (eds.), 35-73. London: MacMillan.

Hamilton, Peter M.
1997 'Rhetorical discourse of local pay'. *Organization* 4/2: 229-254.

Hancock, Philip and Melissa Tyler
2000 ''The look of love': Gender and the organization of aesthetics' in *Body and organization*. John Hassard, Ruth Holliday and Hugh Wilmot (eds.), 108-129. London: Sage.

Heracleous, Loizos, and John Hendry
2000 'Discourse and the study of organization: Toward a structurational perspective'. *Human Relations* 53/10: 1251-1286.

Kamoche, Ken
1995 'Rhetoric, ritualism and totemism in human resource management'. *Human Relations* 48/4: 367-385.

Keenoy, Tom
1990 'Human resource management: Rhetoric, reality and contradiction'. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 1:363-384.

Keenoy, Tom, Cliff Oswick, and David Grant
1997 'Organizational discourses: Text and context'. *Organization* 4/2: 147-157

Lanham, Richard A.
1991 *A list of rhetorial terms* Berkley: University of California Press.

Legge, Karen
1996 *Human resource management: Rhetorics and realities* London: Macmillan.

Litvin, Deborah R.
1997 'The discourse of diversity: From biology to management'. *Organization* 4/2: 187-209.

Lu, Xing
1999 'An ideological/cultural analysis of political slogans in Communist China'. *Discourse & Society* 10/4: 487-508.

Mattingly, Cheryl
1998 *Healing dramas and clinical pots: The narrative structure of experience.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Milliken, Frances J. and Luis L. Martins
1996 'Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups'. *Academy of Management Review* 21/2: 402-433.

Newton, Tim
1998 'Theorizing subjectivity in organizations: The failure of Foucauldian studies?'. *Organization Studies* 19/3: 415-447.

Nkomo, Stella M., and Taylor Cox
1996 'Diverse identities in organizations'. In *Handbook of organization studies.* S.R. Clegg, Cynthia Hardy and W.R. Nord (eds.), 338-356. London: Sage.

Oswick, Cliff, Tom W. Keenoy, and David Grant
2000 'Discourse, organizations and organizing: Concepts, objects and subjects'. *Human Relations* 53/9: 1115-1123

Parker, Ian
1992 *Discourse dynamics.* London: Routledge

Phillips, Nelson, and Cynthia Hardy
1997 'Managing multiple identities: Discourse, legitimacy and resources in the UK refugee system'. *Organization* 4/2: 159-185.

Perelman, Charles, and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca
The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation. London: University of Notre Dame Press.

Poole, Michael, and Roger Mansfield

1992 'Manager's attitudes to human resource management: Rhetoric and reality' in *Reassessing human resource management.* Paul Blyton and Peter Turnbull (eds.), 200-214. London: Sage.

Reed, Mike
2000 'The limits of discourse analysis in organizational analysis'. *Organization* 7/3: 524-530.

Riessman, Catherine Kohler
1993 *Narrative analysis.* London: Sage.

Robrieux, Jean-Jacques
1993 *Éléments de rhétorique e d'argumentation* Paris: Dunod.

Spicer, André and Peter Fleming
2001 'Making constructivism critical: Structure, text and contestation'. Paper presented at the Critical Management Studies Conference, UMIST, Manchester, 11-13 July.

van Dijk, Teun
1997 'Discourse as interaction in society' in *Discourse as social interaction.* Teun A. van Dijk (ed.), 1-37. London: Sage.

Warnick, Barbara
2000 'Two systems of invention: The topics in the *Rhetoric* and in *The New Rhetoric*' in *Rereading Aristotle's rhetoric.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Woodilla, Jill
1998 'Workplace conversations: The text of organizing' in *Discourse and organization.* David Grant, Tom Keenoy and Cliff Oswick (eds.), 31-50. London: Sage.

Wright, Melissa W.
2001 'Desire and the prosthetics of supervision: A case of maquiladora flexibility'. *Cultural Anthropology* 16/3:354-373.

Appendix: Definitions of Thirteen Argument Schemes

01. Contradiction and Incompatibility. 'While contradiction between two propositions implies a formal system, or at least a system of univocal concepts; incompatibility is always relative to contingent circumstances, whether the latter be determined by natural laws, particular events, or human decisions' (*NR* 1969: 196-197).

02. Identity, Definition, and Tautology. Identification is 'any use of concepts, any application of a classification, any recourse to induction [which] involves a reduction of certain elements to what they have in them that is identical or interchangeable' (*NR* 1969: 210). In definitions, the reduction of the definiendum into the definiens is complete. Any complete identity runs the risk of becoming a tautology, 'a purely linguistic convention, which tells us nothing about the empirical relations which one phenomenon might have with another' (*NR* 1969: 216).

03. Reciprocity and Rule of Justice. 'Arguments of reciprocity aim at giving the same treatment to two situations which are counterparts of each other' (*NR* 1969: 221). 'The rule of justice requires giving identical treatment to beings or situations of the same kind' (*NR* 1969: 218).

04. Transitivity, Inclusion, and Division. 'Transitivity is a formal property of certain relations for which if one relation holds between *a* and *b* and between *b* and *c*, it therefore holds between *a* and *c*; the relations of equality, superiority, inclusion, and ancestry are transitive' (*NR* 1969: 227). In inclusion 'the whole is treated as similar to each one of its parts' and transference is made from parts to whole. Usually the value of the whole is greater than the parts it contains (Warnick 2000: 122). Division assumes that the parts are equal to the whole and that they are exhaustively enumerable (Warnick 2000: 123).

05. Weights, Measures and Probabilities. The ideas of weights and measures underlie arguments by comparison. 'The absolute value of the term used as standard influences the value of the [compared] terms' (*NR* 1969: 243). 'In argumentation by sacrifice, the sacrifice is a measure of the value attributed to the thing for which the sacrifice is made'

(*NR* 1969: 248). Probabilities move from the past to the future. They start from a noteworthy fact and use its argumentative value (*NR* 1969: 256).

06. Liaison of Succession. Relations of succession unite a phenomenon to its causes or consequences. They connect phenomena at the same level of reality (Warnick 2000: 123). The relationship between means and end is one of succession. In this pair, the former is always subordinated to the latter (*NR* 1969: 276).

07. Liaison of Coexistence. Liaisons of coexistence seek to establish a relationship between an observable fact and what is not observable. They connect phenomena not at the same level of reality, one being more explanatory than the other. 'The fundamental connection of coexistence in philosophy is the one which connects the essence and its manifestations' and the person to his acts (*NR* 1969: 293).

08. Symbolic Liaisons, Double Hierarchies, and Differences of Degree and Order. The representational value of the symbol derives from its relation of 'participation' to what is symbolised. Symbols are concrete and recognizable (Warnick 2000: 125). Double hierarchies correlate a contested hierarchy with an accepted one and by so doing make the former more acceptable (Warnick 2000: 125). When a difference between two terms is presented as a difference of degree, the two terms are brought closer to each other. When a difference is presented as a difference of order, what separates the two terms is accentuated (*NR* 1969: 345).

09. Example. Examples are designed to establish a rule or principle. They are actual, concrete and succinct (Warnick 2000: 126). Particular forms of example are the example in contrarium and the exception (*NR* 1969: 355).

10. Illustration. An illustration strengthens adherence to a known and accepted rule by providing clarifying particular instances (*NR* 1969: 357).

11. Model and anti-model. Models and anti-models not only exemplify or illustrate, but are also intended to respectively encourage and discourage the imitation of behaviour (Warnick 2000: 126).

12. Analogy and metaphor. An analogy is a resemblance of structures. It is established between the relation between *a* and *b* and the one between *c* and *d*. The terms *a* and *b*, to which the conclusion relates, constitute the *theme*, while the terms *c* and *d* that buttress the argument are the *phoros* (*NR* 1969: 373). A metaphor is a condensed analogy resulting from the fusion of an element of the *phoros* with an element of the *theme* (*NR* 1969: 399).

13. Dissociation. Dissociation distinguishes one term from another and sets up a hierarchy where one term is valued and the other devalued (Warnick 2000: 128). In philosophy, the prototypical dissociation is the one between appearance and reality (*NR* 1969: 415).