

Discourse, language and work in the hotel sector

Débora de Carvalho Figueiredo

Universidade do Sul de Santa Catarina, Tubarão, SC, Brasil

Abstract: In this paper, following the theoretical approaches proposed by Critical Discourse Analysis and Economic Sociology, I investigate the relationship between language and work in the hotel sector, analysing two institutional texts retrieved from the website of a large executive hotel in Florianópolis, SC, which belongs to a Brazilian chain with similar hotels throughout the country. More specifically, I carry out a short discussion and analysis of the representations of work and workers within this particular organization, against the backdrop of the new economic and managerial configurations of late capitalist society.

Keywords: discourse; new spirit of capitalism; new management ideology.

Resumo: Neste trabalho, seguindo as abordagens teóricas propostas pela Análise Crítica do Discurso e pela Sociologia Econômica, investigo a relação entre a linguagem e o trabalho no setor hoteleiro, analisando dois textos coletados do website de um hotel executivo de Florianópolis, SC, pertencente a uma rede nacional de hotéis similares. Mais especificamente, desenvolvo uma pequena discussão e análise das representações do trabalho e dos trabalhadores dentro dessa organização em particular, tendo como pano de fundo as novas configurações econômicas e administrativas das sociedades capitalistas tardias.

Palavras-chave: discurso; novo espírito do capitalismo; nova ideologia gerencial.

INTRODUCTION

Débora de
Carvalho
Figueiredo

28

In the last decade or so there has been an increased interest in the intersection between language and work. Many books, articles and research studies have been produced from transdisciplinary perspectives, focusing on the role played by processes of symbolization and representation in work relations and in the performance of work itself (SARANGI; SLEMBROUCK, 1996; BHATIA, 1993, 2004; BODEN, 1994; GUNNARSSON et al., 1997; SARANGI, 1998; DUARTE; FEITOSA, 1998; SHUY, 1998; SARANGI; ROBERTS, 1999; CANDLIN, 2002; SOUZA-E-SILVA; FAÏTA; 2002; SARANGI; VAN LEEUWEN, 2003; etc). From the perspective of applied linguistics, language is one of the basic means of establishing, maintaining and changing symbolic systems.

One of these works (NOUROUDINE, 2002), following Johnson and Caplan (1979, in NOUROUDINE, 2002), classifies the relation between work and language into three types: *language as work*, *language at work*, and *language about work*. In the first type, *language as work*, language is itself part of the work activities, including speech and gestures that a worker uses to communicate with other workers involved in the work activity, and speech that the worker directs to herself to accompany and guide her gestures and procedures during the work activity. The second type, *language at work*, involves all the linguistic exchanges that take place at the work environment outside of the work activities themselves (at the cafeteria, in corridors, in the common room, in the rest rooms, etc.), about all kinds of topics, and which facilitate exchanges in the work situation. The last type, *language about work*, corresponds to the processes of evaluation of work situations through the distancing and the representational potential offered by language, that is, we talk about work in order to, among other things, convey information, evaluate, justify, correct. In short, the three types of relations between language and work can be summarized as the language of work performance (*language as work*), the language that surrounds the work situation (*language at work*), and the language that interprets work (*language about work*).

In this paper I will concentrate on the last type, *language about work*, that is, linguistic resources used to represent and signify work. My area of interest is the hotel sector, and the data analysed are two institutional texts retrieved from the website of a large executive hotel in Florianópolis, SC, which belongs to a Brazilian chain with similar hotels throughout the country (henceforward referred to as Hotel X). Here, following the theoretical approaches proposed by Critical Discourse Analysis and Economic

Sociology (CHIAPELLO; FAIRCLOUGH, 2002), I carry out a short discussion and analysis of the representations of work and workers within a particular organization, against the backdrop of the new economic and managerial configurations of late capitalist society.

For organizational purposes, the article is divided into the following parts: Introduction, 1. Critical Discourse Analysis, 2. The new spirit of capitalism, 3. Analytical section, 4. Concluding remarks.

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Works in the area of CDA explore the dialectical relationships between discourses (including language as well as other forms of semiosis, such as visual images, colours, textual lay-out, etc.) and other elements of social practices. The focus of attention of such works are the radical changes that are taking place in contemporary society, and the role discourse plays in processes of social reproduction and social change. In modern social sciences it is commonly accepted that social entities (institutions, organizations, corporations, social agents, etc.) are constituted through social processes, and one very effective aspect of most social processes is discourse/semiosis. Thus, we could say that social entities are, to a great extent, effects of discourse (CHIAPELLO; FAIRCLOUGH, 2002).

In his latest writings (CHOULIARAKI; FAIRCLOUGH, 1999; CHIAPELLO; FAIRCLOUGH 2002; FAIRCLOUGH, 2003a, 2003b; FAIRCLOUGH, 2006), Norman Fairclough has better defined the theoretical location of CDA. From his new perspective, discourse is seen as a moment of social practices, and semiosis (be it linguistic or visual, body language, etc.) is an intrinsic part of material social processes. Fairclough (2003) understands social life as a series of interconnected chains of social practices of diverse types (economic, political, cultural, etc.), and each one of these practices has a semiotic element.

Social practices, on the other hand, are more or less stable forms of social activities, for instance a class, a TV news programme, a family meal, a doctor consultation. Social practices are composed of the following elements: activities, subjects and their social relations, instruments, objects, time and place, forms of consciousness, values, discourse (or semiosis) (CHIAPELLO; FAIRCLOUGH, 2002, p.193). These elements are different but not discrete or completely separated from each other. Therefore, CDA is the analysis of the dialectical relations between the semiosis (which includes verbal language) and other elements of social practices.

In general terms, semiosis figures in three ways in social practices.

First, as part of the social activity within a practice, since it is difficult to think of any social practice which does not include at least one semi-otic element, especially in the form of discourse. Discourses, as part of the social activity, constitute *genres*, that is, different forms of acting, of producing social life in a semiotic form. Second, semiosis figures in representations. As social actors in a given practice we reproduce representations of other practices, as well as representations of the practice we are engaged with. According to Fairclough (2003b, p.182), “la representación es un proceso de construcción social de prácticas, incluyendo la auto-construcción reflexiva – las representaciones participan en los procesos y en las prácticas sociales e los configuran”. Discourse in the representation and self-representation of social practices constitutes *discourses*¹. Third, semiosis figures in the “realizations” of particular subject positions that exist within a given social practice. The identities of the social actors involved in a given practice are partially determined by the practice itself. Individual variables (gender, ethnicity, social class, age, etc.), when part of a specific social practice, will give rise to different realizations of concrete subject positions. Discourse as part of ways of being constitutes *styles* (CHIAPELLO; FAIRCLOUGH, 2002, p.194).

Semiosis, as part of social activities, constitute discourse varieties, which can be seen as different forms of acting, of producing social life, from a semiotic perspective. Discourse is constituted by the representations and self-representations of social practices via semiosis. In this sense, Fairclough (2003b, p.182) defines discourse as “diferentes representaciones de la vida social cuya posición se halla intrínsecamente determinada; los actores sociales de distinta posición ‘ven’ y representan la vida social de maneras distintas, con discursos diferentes”.

Discourses include imageries – representations of how things are or how they ought to be. These imageries may be expressed as actual practices, that is, imagined activities, subjects, social relations, etc. can become real activities, subjects, social relations. Discourse is enacted both in *hardware* (plant, machinery, technology, etc.) and in *software* (management systems, instructional/training materials, ways of establishing and maintaining relationships, social identities, etc.). These enactments are in part discursive/semiotic: discourses are enacted as genres (FAIRCLOUGH, 2003a).

1 Chiapello and Fairclough (2002, p.194) distinguish between “discourse” as an abstract noun (representation and self-representation of social practices by social agents through language) and “discourse(s)” as a countable noun (specific forms of representing social practices, which vary according to the institutional and individual positions occupied by social agents).

Styles, on the other hand, are constituted in the realization of different social positions. Each position is realized by different styles which depend on aspects of identity which surpass the construction of subject positions in social practices. Styles, hence, constitute the semiotic aspect of social identities. To sum up, discourses are dialectically enacted in social practices as *genres*, and dialectically inculcated as ways of being/identities (*styles*).

THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE “NEW SPIRIT OF CAPITALISM”

*Discourse,
language
and work in
the hotel sector*

In an article published in 2002, Chiapello and Fairclough focus upon what they call the “new management ideology”, arguing that this trend in management is part of the broader ideological system of “the new spirit of capitalism”. This new management ideology is addressed at people who occupy intermediate levels in big corporations, such as managers, and its main objective is to explain and justify the ways corporations are organized or should be organized in late capitalist societies.

31

According to the authors (2002, p.186), the new spirit of capitalism is an ideological framework that “justifies people’s commitment to capitalism, and which renders this commitment attractive”. Any capitalist endeavour is organized around an endless and insatiable profit-searching process that requires a vast number of willing participants. In order for capitalism to achieve its accumulation aims, many people have to be committed to its ideology, even though not many of them will make a direct substantial profit as a result of their commitment.

Chiapello and Fairclough (2002, p.187) define ideology as:

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 is dominated, why one person gives orders in a particular enterprise while another takes orders.

The concept of ideology is closely linked to the notion of domination, in the sense that domination and acquiescence require that the dominated believe in the legitimacy of the dominant. Ideology is a key factor in

achieving this legitimacy.

The spirit of capitalism is an ideology that does double duty: at the same time that it helps capitalist institutions and societies to achieve their accumulation goals, it is in synchronization with the historically specific and varied forms that capitalism takes over time. For instance, in late modernity, in spite of the patterned, highly structured and over-powering discourses adopted by large corporations, they are able to construct a self-image of transparency, fair-dealing, opportunities, friendliness, social concern, and to align employees with this image, turning them into co-partners in the capitalist project.

Three dimensions help legitimize the spirit of capitalism:

- 1) *Stimulation*: the different forms of “liberation” that capitalism offers (e.g. “opportunities for those who work hard”, private property, private enterprise, the possibility of profit, “freedom of speech”).
- 2) *Forms of security* offered for those involved in a capitalist project, both for themselves and for their children.
- 3) *The notion of justice (fairness)*: it explains how the spirit of capitalism manages to seem coherent with a sense of justice and with the notion of common good.

From the perspective of CDA, the spirit of capitalism corresponds to an *order of discourse*, in the sense that it represents a configuration of discourses articulated together in a particular way, which is enacted as *ways of acting* (and discursively as *genres*), and inculcated as *ways of being or identities* (and discursively in *styles*) (CHIAPELLO; FAIRCLOUGH, 2002).

Chiapello and Fairclough (2002) identified three spirits of capitalism that have appeared at least in Western Europe: the first, from the nineteenth century on; the second, between the 1930s and the 1970s; and the third, since the 1980s. For the purposes of this article I will concentrate on the third spirit of capitalism, whose main characteristics are listed in Table 1.

According to the authors, several justificatory regimes can co-exist in complex late modernity societies. One of the new and influential justificatory logics that help organize the new management ideology is that which emphasizes mobility, availability and variety of individual contacts. This logic belongs to what Chiapello and Fairclough call “a Projects-oriented or Connectionist *Cité* [or discourse]” (2002, p. 191). Table 2 presents part of the grammar of this *cité* (CHIAPELLO; FAIRCLOUGH, *ibid*).

As we can see in Table 2, in the Project-oriented *cité* “great” workers must be adaptable and flexible. A “great” one also generates a feeling of trust. For instance, this means a manager who does not lead in an authori-

tarian way but manages the team by listening to others with tolerance, and by respecting personal differences. This new and apparently fair managerial style is part of a general trend in late modernity: relations, not only in the work environment, but also at home, between friends, at church, at school, etc., are constantly negotiated, and have to keep an appearance of being open to discussion, flexible and democratic (FAIRCLOUGH, 2001).

Table 1: Characteristics of the third spirit of capitalism
(adapted from CHIAPELLO; FAIRCLOUGH, 2002, p.189)

Some characteristics of the third spirit of capitalism

Forms of the capital accumulation process	Network firms Internet Global finance
Stimulation	No more authoritarian chiefs Fuzzy organizations Innovation and creativity Permanent change
Security	For the mobile and the adaptable, the ones who know how to manage themselves, companies will provide self-help resources.
Fairness	New forms of meritocracy valuing mobility, ability to nourish a network. Each project is an opportunity to develop individual <i>employability</i> .

*Discourse,
language
and work in
the hotel sector*

33

Table 2: The grammar of the Connectionist Cité
(adapted from CHIAPELLO; FAIRCLOUGH, 2002, p. 191)

Grammar of the Project-oriented or Connectionist cité

Equivalency principle (general standard)	Activity; project initiation; remote links between people
A state of greatness	Adaptability, flexibility, polyvalence, ability to spread the benefits of social connections, to generate enthusiasm and to increase team members employability
Standard (paradigmatic) test	Ability to move from one project to another.

ANALYTICAL SECTION

Following Chiapello and Fairclough's (2002) model, three questions organize the analysis of new management texts:

- a) What sort of representations do we find here of work and organizations and their members in the new economy (*discourse*)?
- b) What sort of activity is this a part of, what sort of interaction characterized by what sort of social relations (*genre*)?
- c) What sort of authorial identity is constituted here (*style*)?

In this section, due to time and space constraints, I will limit myself to a discussion of the first and the third questions.

Débora de
Carvalho
Figueiredo

Discourse

34

To investigate the sort of representations of hotel work and hotel organizations and their members in the new economy (*discourse*), I analysed two texts taken from the Hotel X's website. The texts are: Text 1 - *Who we are: mission and commitment* and Text 2 - *Ms. M - President of Hotel X*.

Text 1, "mission and commitment", expresses a full alignment with the "new spirit of capitalism" ideology in the sense that it presents the hotel's goals as working towards capital accumulation, coupled with social legitimacy. Below are some examples of these two major guidelines of modern capitalism:

Example 1 - Capital/Value accumulation:

- Our Mission: Provide guesting services with high quality and a unique style, achieving feedback and **improving the value of the enterprises**. [Text 1 - *Who we are: mission and commitment*]
- Our Commitment towards the Investor: **Total commitment focused on the maximization of the profitability over investments [...]**[Text 1 - *Who we are: mission and commitment*]
- [...] **operating and continually updating products and services** [Text 1 - *Who we are: mission and commitment*]
- **Our goal is to obtain results that exceed market expectations, as well as to anticipate future trends, increasing the product's opportunities and those of new ventures**. [Text 1 - *Who we are: mission and commitment*]

Example 2 - Social legitimacy:

- Our Commitment towards Society: **To boost the economy with**

investment profitability, increasing work opportunities, and improve technical and professional levels of expertise within the hotel services and food and beverage segment. [Text 1 - *Who we are: mission and commitment*]

- **Our Commitment towards the Environment: To always preserve and value Nature, seeking to develop enterprises that always respect the environment and create a synergy with local culture and its characteristics.** [Text 1 - *Who we are: mission and commitment*]

The text invests the corporation with social legitimacy by fulfilling the three dimensions that justify the new spirit of capitalism: *stimulation*, *security* and *justice*. In terms of *stimulation*, as we have seen in the examples above, investors are pictured as gaining by the goals of Hotel X with capital accumulation (“improving the value of the enterprises”, “Total commitment focused on the maximization of the profitability over investments”, “Our goal is to obtain results that exceed market expectations”).

Regarding the staff, Text 1 represents both *stimulation* and *security* by portraying employees as profiting from the hotel management style in terms of training, motivation and updating, all of which leads to professional improvement and consequently to increased employability²:

Example 3:

- **Our Commitment towards the Staff: To maintain them always motivated, updated** and committed to the client, by means of **constant training and professional improvement**, with the authority and responsibility to always exceed client expectations and achieve the operational, financial and service quality results we pursue. [Text 1 - *Who we are: mission and commitment*]

Chiapello and Fairclough (2002) point out that one feature of the security provided by the new trend in capitalism is that it is depicted as resulting from the individual’s ability to adapt. To live in relative security, individual workers must be flexible and adaptable, open to change, and capable of constantly finding new projects. For those who are able to ac-

² During a meeting, the manager of the local branch of Hotel X told us that, after having worked at their chain of hotels, and having been trained in the new management style adopted by the corporation, individual workers increase their employability as their work experience with the company becomes almost an asset, so much so that former workers are sought after by competing hotels.

quire these attributes, “security in mobility is the reward” (CHIAPELLO; FAIRCLOUGH, 2002, p.201). In Text 1 the need for worker flexibility and adaptability is implied in the hotel’s commitments to its staff: they will be given opportunities to “update” and to “improve professionally” through “constant training”, which requires flexibility and the ability to participate in new projects.

In terms of the sense of *justice* which helps to justify the new spirit of capitalism, Text 1 depicts the corporation as socially engaged: the hotel chain is supposedly committed to providing good services, giving a boost to the economy, creating new jobs, enabling professional improvement, and acting with respect for the environment.

Example 4:

- Our commitment towards our Guests: **To offer them a superb and unequalled experience in hosting**, within all segments of this market, **delighting the client** with the comfort of our installations, the high level of competency and our top quality services. [Text 1 - *Who we are: mission and commitment*]
- Our Commitment towards Society: **To boost the economy with investment profitability, increasing work opportunities, and improve technical and professional levels of expertise** within the hotel services and food and beverage segment. [Text 1 - *Who we are: mission and commitment*]
- Our Commitment towards the Environment: **To always preserve and value Nature**, seeking to develop enterprises that always respect the environment and create a synergy with local culture and its characteristics. [Text 1 - *Who we are: mission and commitment*]

As I said in the theoretical framework section, in the new management ideology “great” workers/managers must be adaptable and flexible, capable of changing with times, of establishing contacts and connections, and of embarking in new and profitable projects. Text 2, *Ms. M - President of Hotel X -*, builds a picture of a manager who fits this profile of a “great” executive. First of all, she is presented as an over-achiever capable of tapping into new areas, starting new ventures, developing new products and, thus, climbing the corporate ladder:

Example 5:

- [Ms. M] began her **successful trajectory** in the hotel business in 1982, as **Sales & Marketing Director** for Hotel B Chain. The follow-

ing year, [she] took over the Vice Presidency: “our goal was to expand the Hotel B brand name in the international market, motivated by the enormous success achieved in the country”, she recalls. In 1986, she reached the Presidency of B Chain Hotels & Resorts, at that time with 12 units, a synthesis of highly qualified luxury hotels - where she exercised her talent, conceiving an incomparable brand of hotel services. [Text 2 - Ms. M - President of Hotel X]

- In December 1997, she left the Presidency of the Z Park Group to dedicate herself exclusively to take command of Hotel B Towers Administration, a brand name she created in 1992 for hotels of the 4-Star category which was undergoing a significant boom in the country at that time. [Text 2 - Ms. M - President of Hotel X]
- Aside from this, two of her hotels snatched up three Caio 2002 awards as the best of the year for events and conventions and Hotel D was elected the best resort of the year by the nationwide tourist guide xxx. [Text 2 - Ms. M - President of Hotel X]

From the perspective of the new management ideology, *rupture* and *innovation* are seen as supreme values (CHIAPELLO; FAIRCLOUGH, 2002). Ms. M is also characterized as an innovative leader. Her flexibility and adaptability are emphasised by her skills, her constant updating and her ability to deal with new and difficult situations in innovative ways and to solve corporate problems:

Example 6:

- She constantly recycles and improves this know-how through extensive travelling throughout the world, which enabled her to devise her own unique and always innovative management style. [Text 2 - Ms. M - President of Hotel X]
- Majored in Law by the University of ... and with a post-graduation in Administration by the University ..., took courses in Hotel Administration, in the U.S. She speaks fluent Portuguese, English, Japanese and Spanish. [Text 2 - Ms. M - President of Hotel X]
- In 2002, she was included in the very exclusive list by the economy and business magazine xxx, which selected 44 large corporation leaders in Latin America, considered the most efficient “fire extinguishers” in their countries. [Text 2 - Ms. M - President of Hotel X]
- Whoever asks about Ms. M in Brazil, will certainly hear the best references for this outstanding businesswoman. Here, Ms. M is known as the great lady of the Brazilian hotel industry, for

her innovations and talent, which make her a reference when it comes to benchmarking quality and services in this segment. [Text 2 - Ms. M - President of Hotel X]

Her managerial profile fits the Project-oriented or Connectionist *cit * (see Table 2), that is, Ms. M is successful not only in corporate and individual terms but also in social terms, that is, she is capable of spreading the benefits of her social connections, as the extract below indicates:

D bora de
Carvalho
Figueiredo

Example 7:

- **[Ms. M] takes part in several private and government organizations for the development of tourism and the national hotel industry. She also contributes towards the development of economic, entrepreneurial, social and cultural relations in Brazil and abroad.** [Text 2 - Ms. M - President of Hotel X]

38

Styles

The second question which guided my analysis concerns the sort of authorial identity (*style*) constituted by the texts investigated. What sort of identity is projected in the text for its author? This can be checked in terms of what the author is implicitly committed to – the sort of person she/he presents himself to be, claims about what is the case, value claims about what is good and desirable.

As I pointed out in the previous section, Text 1 (*Who we are: mission and commitment*) reveals what the hotel as a corporation is committed to, and indirectly points out what is good and desirable in terms of the new hotel management ideology. As previously discussed, the institutional identity of Hotel X is aligned with the goals of capital accumulation coupled with social legitimacy, that is, the corporation seeks profits for its investors but also security for its staff and benefits for guests and for society (see analysis in the previous section). In terms of the profile of the “great” manager, the identity constructed for Ms. M, the company president, also tallies with the new management ideology: she is depicted as a flexible, adaptable, innovative and project-oriented manager.

Styles are linked to values – the value commitments made by the author in a text help to build an authorial identity. Values can be made explicit through evaluations, but for the most part they are implicit, and figure in the text in the form of value assumptions (CHIAPELLO; FAIRCLOUGH, 2002, p.200). One of the assumptions is that the implicit values are shared with

the reading community of the text.

Thus, it remains to discuss the identities which are projected for readers of the texts analysed, and who is the intended readership. The hotel website constructs basically four types of readers: *prospective guests* (who browse the site for information on rates, reservation, facilities, etc.), *former guests* (who can leave comments in a section called “Guest comments”), *prospective investors* (the site provides information for those who want to invest in the company), and *potential employees* (the site allows people to register and to leave a copy of their CVs). An indication that all these different readers are supposed to share the values and goals of the new spirit of capitalism and the new management ideology that guide the Hotel X administration is the “Guest comments” section, which lists comments from former guests apparently totally satisfied with the company’s services and style. Some examples are:

Example 8:

- Dear Mr. xxx, I thank you and your staff for your gracious hospitality during my stay at the Hotel X. Your staff’s support, flexibility and professionalism were exemplary and ensured that my visit was a success. Thank you for the warm welcome to Brasília”. (*Colin L. Powell – Former US General Secretary*)
- Dear Mr. xxx. Thank you for making my stay at the Hotel X an enjoyable one. I applaud you and your staff for your efforts to make my delegation’s visit comfortable. Best wishes for your continued success. (*Condoleezza Rice – US General Secretary*)
- Enjoyed my stay very much and will let my travel agent know. Restaurant very good and staff very attentive. Thanks. (*Ronnie Myles*)

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this article, from the theoretical perspectives of critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism, I set out to analyse two texts collected from a hotel website as a way of probing into the representations of the managerial style and ideology of a late capitalist corporation, and the identity positions which correspond to new trends in management ideology. My analysis indicates that Hotel X, as other late capitalist corporations, follows the spirit of capitalism to justify the way the corporation is managed, to establish representations of how things are or should be, what is the profile of the “great” one within this ideology, and consequently what model the rest of the staff should follow.

The institutional discourse of Hotel X legitimates the accumulation goals pursued by the corporation by promising profitability to investors, at the same time that it entices workers with security and society with social benefits. The profile of the “great one”, by fitting the Project-oriented or Connectionist *cité*, also helps to legitimize corporative goals: her profile includes the attributes of flexibility, adaptability and innovation, but also the ability to spread benefits and to involve others in her projects.

According to Chiapello and Fairclough (2002), the de-sacrilization of the new management discourse, which is endemic in late modernity enterprises, is an important endeavour because it has a real influence on the maintenance of dominant ideologies. The authors (2002, p. 207) believe that the study of new management discourse and 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”.

However, it has to be kept in mind that this is just a short and preliminary study. Further investigation is needed in order for this type of analysis to effectively contribute to the understanding, criticism and possible changes in discourses, genres and styles, semiotic elements of the social practices of the hotel industry which help to enact social relations and inculcate social identities in this particular environment. In spite of its preliminary nature, this article hopes to contribute to the understanding of processes of social construction, identity formation and social relations that mark the discourse of hotel corporations, so as to offer hotel staff theoretical tools which may enable them to be more critical of their work environments, and to conceptually equip them to engage in more democratic negotiations with hotel management and guests.

REFERENCES

BHATIA, V. K. **Analysing genre**: language use in professional settings. London and New York: Longman, 1993.

_____. **Worlds of written discourse**: a genre-based view. London: Continuum, 2004.

BODEN, D. **The business of talk**: organizations in action. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.

CANDLIN, C. N. (Ed.). **Research and practice in professional discourse**. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press, 2002.

CHIAPELLO, E.; FAIRCLOUGH, N. Understanding the new management ideology: a transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism. **Discourse & Society**, v. 13, n. 2, p. 185-208, 2002.

CHOULIARAKI, L.; FAIRCLOUGH, N. **Discourse in late modernity**. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999.

*Discourse,
language
and work in
the hotel sector*

DUARTE, F.; FEITOSA, V. (Orgs.). **Linguagem e trabalho**. Rio de Janeiro: Lucerna, 1998.

41

FAIRCLOUGH, N. A análise crítica do discurso e a mercantilização do discurso público: as universidades. In: MAGALHÃES, C. (Org.). **Reflexões sobre a análise crítica do discurso**. Belo Horizonte: FALE – UFMG, 2001. p. 31-82.

_____. **Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research**. London: Routledge, 2003a.

_____. El análisis crítico del discurso como método para la investigación en ciencias sociales. In: WODAK, R.; MEYER, M. (Eds.). **Métodos de análisis crítico del discurso**. Barcelona: Gedisa, 2003b. p. 179-204.

_____. **Language and globalization**. London: Routledge, 2006.

GUNNARSSON, B-L; LINNELL, P; NORDGERG, B. (Eds.). **The construction of professional discourse**. London: Longman, 1997.

NOUROUDINE, A. A linguagem: dispositivo revelador da complexidade do trabalho. In: SOUZA-E-SILVA, M. C. P.; FAÏTA, D. (Orgs.). **Linguagem e trabalho: construção de objetos de análise no Brasil e na França**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2002. p. 17-31.

SARANGI, K. Rethinking recontextualisation in professional discourse studies. Special issue of **Text**, v. 18, n. 2, p. 301-318, 1998.

SARANGI, K.; ROBERTS, C. (Eds.). **Talk, work and institutional order**:

discourse in medical, mediation and management settings. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999.

SARANGI, K.; SLEMBROUCK, S. (Eds.). **Language, bureaucracy and social control**. London: Longman, 1996.

SARANGI, K.; VAN LEEUWEN, T. (Eds.). **Applied linguistics and communities of practice**. London: Continuum, 2003.

*Débora de
Carvalho
Figueiredo*

SHUY, R. **Bureaucratic language in government and business**. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1998.

SOUZA-E-SILVA, M. C. P.; FAÍTA, D. (Orgs.). **Linguagem e trabalho: construção de objetos de análise no Brasil e na França**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2002.

42

Recebido em 31 mar. 2010 / Aprovado em 30 ago. 2010