Chapter 2

Exercise 1

Compare the use of reporting in Passages 1 and 2 below. Who do they report? How do they do it? And why does each writer report others? How would your understanding change if the reporting expressions were removed? What do the patterns of reporting suggest to you about the differences between the two academic disciplines the passages represent?

PASSAGE 1

Many people think buzzwords are bad. Even though they are used regularly in organizations involved in advertising, art, politics, policing, medicine, psychiatry, international development and education, they are seen as tools for obfuscation, mendacity and mastery rather than genuine communication (Bauman, 2007; Cornwall and Brock, 2005; Lutz, 1999, 1996, 1981; Miles, 1969). As a result, a diverse group made up of organization theorists, linguists and philosophers, not to mention the 12,000 people who have signed up to the Plain English Campaign on a 'dogged quest for perfect legibility', argue that the world would work better without buzzwords (Jay, 2004, p. 55).

The use of buzzwords in organizations is most closely associated with managers (Arnaud, 2003; Collins, 2000; Gabriel, 1998; Glaser, 1997; Mueller, 1974). Buzzwords have become the vocabulary of *management speak*. The result is that when managers use potentially precise terms people often hear nothing but meaningless buzzwords (Prasad, Prasad & Mir, 2011; Feek, 2007; Reading, 1996). Indeed, this association between managers and buzzwords is so strong that when we see managers in cultural texts, it makes perfect sense for them to use buzzwords (Svendsen, 2008; Knights & Willmott, 1999). The hope for a world free from buzzwords is, therefore, also a hope for organizations in which managers do not use buzzwords.

PASSAGE 2

For most critics, Ann Radcliffe stands, in the words of W.L. Renwick's contribution to the *Oxford History of English Literature*, "for the legitimate irresponsibility of the free imagination and for sensibility."[1] Yet Mrs. Radcliffe as the high priestess of sensibility is surely a modern concept; none of her contemporaries—including Coleridge, Scott, Mrs. Barbauld, and the anonymous reviewers of her works—saw her as such; nor do they mention the term. In fact, her best novel, *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, stands as an attack on the cult of sensibility. Near the end of *Udolpho*, when the servant Ludovico has mysteriously disappeared from a locked room, Mrs. Radcliffe writes, "it was difficult to discover what connection there could possibly be between [the disappearance and the existence of ghosts], or to account for this effect otherwise than by supposing that the mystery attending Ludovico, by exciting awe and curiousity, reduced the mind to a state of sensibility, which rendered it more liable to the influence of superstition in general."[2]

[1]   W.L. Renwick, *English Literature, 1798-1815* (Oxford, 1963), p. 80. Edward Wagenknecht, in his *Cavalcade of the English Novel* (New York, 1954), suggests that "her extreme sensibility does not help her with the modern reader" (p. 120), and Devendra P. Varma, in *The Gothic Flame* (London, 1957), asserts, "Every page of Mrs. Radcliffe's work is bedewed with the tear of sensibility, every volume is damp with it" (p. 121). Even *Time Magazine*, though it lacks the critical jargon, makes the same point in a review of the newest edition of *Udolpho*: "the dear lady is one of the ickiest prigs who ever put quill to scented paper" ("Extricating Emily," April 22. 1966, p. 88).

[2]   Ann Radcliffe, *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, ed. Bonamy Dobree (London, 1966), p. 562. All citations refer to this edition. Quotations from *The Italian* are from the edition ed. by Frederick Garber (London, 1968), and those from the minor novels—*The Castles of Athlin and Dunbayne* (A&D), *A Sicilian Romance* (SR), and *The Romance of the Forest* (RF)—are from volume X of Ballantyne's Novelists' Library (Edinburgh, 1824).