A Declaration on Learning – A Commentary Discourse.

John S. Walton
London Metropolitan University

This paper subjects A Declaration on Learning published in the UK in 2000 to a critical review. A brief synopsis of the text is followed by a commentary discourse drawing upon critical discourse analysis (Fairclough 2001) and incorporating meta content analysis, rhetorical analysis and genre analysis. Conclusions are drawn related to the functionality of the declaration in particular and the value of such textual analysis as a research technique for HRD in general.

Keywords: Learning Declaration; Critical Discourse; Genre Analysis

"Learning is at the heart of what people do" was a foundation belief underpinning HRD shared by all of the ten scholarly leaders from the US community interviewed by Ruona (2000). Holmes (2000) from a UK perspective comments that the term "learning" is being presented as the route to success for individuals, organisations and nations in the discourse in which education and training policy is being advocated, theorised and debated. "Individuals must become lifelong learners, firms must become learning organisations, the nation must become a learning society" (Holmes 2000, p.1). Compared to two decades ago there has been a *learning turn* (Holmes, in press). The overall aim of the paper is to demonstrate how critical commentary discourse analysis can contribute to deepening our understanding of how HRD texts can be judged. Given the foregoing context, the much publicised *A Declaration on Learning* emanating from an informed UK constituency would seem to be a fruitful and appropriate source. The first version was launched in September 1998 with eight signatories, referred to (by one of them) as "some of the UK's leading authorities on learning in organisations" (Honey 1998). The second version was published in 2000 (Learning Declaration Group 2000) with 13 signatories – twelve men and one woman - still all from the UK, and it is this version that constitutes the subject of analysis for this paper.

Problem statement

Fairclough and Hardy (1997) argue that the study of management learning can be significantly enhanced by discourse analyses of its language and texts. The same claim can be made for the broader HRD, where little work has been done despite a number of comments on the lack of clarity of words and meaning structures. The paper provides a practical example through the Declaration on Learning of how a commentary discourse analysis, that goes beyond merely paraphrasing and explicating the surface meaning of a text, might be undertaken. Barton (2002) comments that such discourse analysis studies are important in reaching an enriched understanding of the conventions of written language employed by practising members of a disciplinary community. Berckenkotter and Huckin (1995) suggest that individual writers within a specific discipline are privy to *insider* knowledge of that discipline's conventions, and can learn and manipulate its values and ideology by familiarity with the genres of its discourse. For them, acquiring the rhetorical skills of the insider "has similarities to second language acquisition" (p.13), a point reinforced by Garvey and Williamson (2002). They contend that management and supporting HRD literature confronts practitioners with a canon of terms such as *learning organisation* and *employability* that take on the form of a liturgy, a rhetoric that is constantly re-iterated, not always intelligently to sustain a prevailing orthodoxy. Understanding how HRD language and texts contribute to the outsider-insider relationship is a key issue for the field. To take but one example, Darling, Darling and Elliot (1999) found that Training and Development practitioners in the UK were negatively "affected by the confusion of meanings and boundaries between such terms as HRM, HRD, training, learning and development" (p. xii).

Introduction to *A Declaration on Learning*

The Declaration on Learning takes the form of a four-page pamphlet. It has six sections entitled "Origins of the Declaration"; "The Challenge"; "Our Assertions about the Nature of Learning"; "The benefits of effective Learning"; "What certain key terms should – and should not – mean"; and "The signatories".

The "origins of the declaration" section explains that the group came together to see whether they could unite on statements that would in particular help policy-makers and others in leadership roles. The overall value orientation is expressed in statements such as: "We are united in the belief that learning is the core process for the positive development of individuals, organisations and society as we enter the 21st century". "The Challenge" section is divided into four components. Since "learning reinforces the informed, conscious and discriminating choices that underpin democracy" a number of injunctions are demanded of national policy makers. These include reducing the current "excessive focus on knowledge and skills that can quickly become obsolete" and "support and invest in uncertificated learning as much as certificated learning". In order to support the contention that "learning is the only source of sustainable development" leaders in organisations should engage in actions that include proclaiming and celebrating continual learning as one of the organisation's most valuable capabilities. Since "learning to learn is the most fundamental learning of all", teachers, trainers and developers must undertake actions that include being role models for effective learning, and supporting various forms of experiential learning.

There are a number of additional requirements placed on individual learners given that "learning is the key to developing your identity and your potential". The first that is listed is for each of us to take responsibility for ourselves as a learner in terms of goal setting and experience seeking.

Sixteen "assertions about the nature of learning" are then made. They are prefaced by statements such as: "Most learning takes place outside controlled classroom environments and this needs to be recognised especially by educators and governments. It is unhelpful to link learning solely to the achievement of qualifications".

"The benefits of effective learning" are then enumerated under the headings: "For society"; "For organisations" and "For individuals". Definitions of the terms "lifelong learning"; "open learning"; "learning society"; "learning organisation"; and "self and personal development" are provided both in terms of what they should mean and should not mean. The tract ends by listing the thirteen signatories with an introduction initiated by the following statement: "We never set out to say all there is to say on the subject of learning or to impose our views on others"

Genre of Declarations

Modern discourse analysis entails going beyond the confines of a given text, and establishing the conventions, traditions and genres that have helped to make it the way it is. Historically, the purpose of Declarations was to *convince* a readership of the legitimacy of a claim. Many authorities refer back to the American Declaration of Independence, although that was in a historical context inspired by the UK Bill of Rights of 1689 that was formally passed through parliament after the coronation of King William III and Queen Mary. The preamble referred to it as "a certain declaration in writing…in the words following". Both took the form of an argument, presenting *claims* of what was wrong, grievances that needed to be redressed. The 1689 Bill of Rights made reference to all the acts undertaken by James 11 that were "utterly and directly contrary to the known laws and statutes, and freedom of the realm". Even earlier was the Declaration of Arbroath 1320, which took the form not of a proclamation but of a letter to the Pope expressing grievances. Its purpose was 'diplomatic propaganda' – intended to convince the Pope of Scotland's legitimate and ancient existence as a kingdom and a determination to "fight for freedom which no good man surrenders but with his life". It presented a series of claims to support the case as well as grievances against the English (Ascherson 2003). Some authorities see the roots of declarations in St Paul's epistles.

Commenting on the American Declaration of Independence, Lucas (1990) argues that 'it sustains an almost perfect synthesis of style, form and content. Its solemn and dignified tone, its graceful and unhurried cadence, its symmetry, energy and confidence, its combination of logical structure and dramatic appeal, its adroit use of nuance and implication – all contribute to its rhetorical power'.

Declarations in the field of learning are not that uncommon. Of particular interest is "The Declaration of Dar es Salaam – Development is for Man and of Man" produced in 1978 by Julius Nyerere, then President of Tanzania (cited in Hall and Kidd, 1978). The following extract gives a flavour.

> There is another aspect to this. A Man learns because he wants to do something. And once he has started along this road of developing his capacity he also learns because he wants to be: a more conscious and understanding person. Learning has not liberated a man at all if all he learns to want is a certificate on his wall, and the reputation of being a "learned person" – a possessor of knowledge. For such a desire is merely another aspect of the disease of the acquisitive society - the accumulation of goods for the sake of accumulating them. The accumulation of knowledge or, worse still, the accumulation of pieces of paper, which represent a kind of legal tender for such knowledge has nothing to do with development.

More recent declarations in the field include the 1997 UNESCO *Hamburg Declaration on Adult Learning*; the 2001 Halifax *Declaration for the Recognition of Prior Learning*, 2001; and. the 2001 *Ocho Rios Declaration - Adult Learning: A Key to Democratic Citizenship and Global Action*. This latter was produced by the World Assembly of the International Council for Adult Education.

Theoretical Framework

There has been much discussion in recent years of how discourse is both constructed and subsequently interpreted within texts. Attention has been given to sense making and the relationship between reader and author, following Barthes's landmark essay of 1968. In *The Death of the Author* he went so far as to argue that only the reader can provide a text with its meaning, and that consequently it is upon readers that analysis should be focused (Barthes, 1977). Fairclough (2001, p.67) takes the position that text interpretation is the interpretation of an interpretation. The producer of the text constructs it as an interpretation of those facets of the world that are then in focus; the text provides *traces* of that interpretation that constitute *cues* for the text interpreter. In *A Declaration on Learning* cues include assumptions about the audience being from the UK, and that government is over-committed to certificated learning.

There are two basic questions of discourse analysis. Why is this text the way it is? Why is it no other way? (Johnstone, 2002). She goes on to contend that these questions can be divided into six categories. 1. Discourse is shaped by the world and discourse shapes the world. 2. Discourse is shaped by linguistics and linguistics shaped language. 3. Participants shape discourse, and discourse shapes participants. 4. Discourse is shaped by previous discourse and discourse shapes the possibilities for future discourse. 5. Discourse is shaped by its medium and discourse shapes the possibilities of its medium. 6. Discourse is shaped by purpose and discourse shapes possible purposes.

A conventional approach is to undertake a content analysis, of which, as Prior (2003) points out, there are many variants. Carley (1990) differentiates between conceptual content analysis in which both the existence and frequency of terms and associated constructs are elicited, coded and compared; and relational content analysis, in which the context in which terms are used and their concordance or relationship vis-à-vis each other are established. This position can be taken even further, moving away from a positivistic orientation towards *what* and *how many* to questions around *why* and the socio-cultural context. At a meta-level, content analysis can be used to establish individual and collective ideational representations of reality within a social construction of reality paradigm. As Fairclough (2001) points out, the vocabulary of a language consists not of an unordered list of isolated words each with its own meaning, but of clusters of words linked together that form *meaning systems* (pp.78-9). In each field of study meaning systems are sustained by the power of relevant experts who act as guarantors of this as of other elements of the codified standard language. In consequence they can privilege certain world-views whilst silencing others (Fiol, 1994).

Fairclough and Hardy (1997) have suggested that the texts of a number of fields of study can be subjected to *critical discourse analysis'* and apply the technique to the promotional literature of an organisation advertising outdoor training and development courses. The word *critical* is used to emphasise the search for the prevailing power and ideological structures that underpin a text. Walton (2001) used the technique to subject the *University Forum for HRD 1995 Position Statement* to critical scrutiny. The approach sees written texts as forms of discourse, and draws upon a combination of three different types of analysis*:* analysis of *sociocultural practice*; analysis of the *text* itself and analysis of *discourse (*or *discursive) practice*. Fairclough (1992) describes the method as combining social-theoretical and linguistically oriented perspectives on discourse. *Sociocultural practice* entails establishing the immediate situational context, the wider institutional context of the event, and the widest cultural and social context within which the event is framed. According to the 'systemic' linguistic theory of Halliday (1985), any part of a *text* will be simultaneously doing three things. It will be representing and constructing reality (the *ideational* function). It will be projecting and negotiating social relationships and social identities (the *interpersonal* function); and it will be setting up links with other parts of the text and with the context so that the whole is a text rather than a jumble of sentences (the *textual* function). *Discourse practice* is central since it constitutes the link between text and sociocultural practice. As a concept it originates from the work of Michel Foucault (1972), who made reference to the "discursive practices" of different professions and disciplines. These incorporate the distinctive language employed and in particular the objects of knowledge and concepts that furnish the reality they construct as being within their field of interest. It covers the tacit rules governing who speaks with authority and under what circumstances; and the latent intentions and ideologies which determine specific thrusts, biases and power orientations.

Rhetorical analysis – sometimes called rhetorical criticism - is concerned with linguistic and structural devices around persuasion. "As method, rhetorical criticism comes into focus primarily on *one* issue: The text's potential to persuade, to engage the imagination and will, or the text's symbolic inducement" (Wuellner 1991:178). Rhetoric draws upon the so-called three musketeers of persuasion termed logos, ethos and pathos by Aristotle in the fourth century BC. "Logos refers to the logic of pure argument, and the kinds of arguments used. Pathos refers to the kinds of appeal and concession made to the audience, taking into account the social psychology of emotions. Ethos involves the implicit and explicit references made to the status of the speaker, which establish his or her legitimacy for saying what is being said". (Bauer et al, 2000, p.11). Aristotle further differentiated between three persuasive genres or *stases.* Deliberative rhetoric was concerned with convincing an audience of legislators or voters about the merits or otherwise of engaging in a given course of action in the policy making arena. Forensic or judicial rhetoric was the preserve of the law courts, concerned with convincing people of the truth of a particular claim about what happened in the past and rebutting counter arguments. Epideictic or ceremonial rhetoric is centred on contemporary issues, and on whether a certain individual deserves praise, blame or censure. The classical forms of epideictic rhetoric are funeral orations and award ceremonies. Aristotle does not consider what might be termed "technical rhetoric" or the ability of a text to persuade an audience or readership of the validity of claims relating to scientific or other forms of research and the nature of the proofs that might be brought to bear.

After a persuasive discourse has been categorised by *stasis* it is possible to take into account the five "canons" of rhetoric used by Cicero in classical Roman times. These canons, in what were held to be order of importance, are 1.Invention – how arguments are "invented" in relation to particular purposes. From a practical point of view it is the generation of effective material for use in a particular rhetorical situation or argument. Crowley (1990) sees a theoretical aspect – "invention becomes the study of all the possible means by which arguments or proofs can be discovered and developed". .2.Disposition/arrangement – by what logic does the text - or speech - support its ultimate aims. It is the art of ordering the material in a text in a way that most appropriately and smoothly delivers the intended information (Covino and Jolliffe, 1995 p.30). 3. Style - the relationship between the form of the discourse and the content. It is the art of producing sentences and words in ways that will make a favourable impression on readers or listeners (Covino and Jolliffe 1995). 4. Memory – how particular discourses call upon cultural memories shared by authors and their audiences. 5. Delivery - the relationship between the presentation of a text and its content. For a written text, it addresses visual impact, paragraphs, and usage of headings, sub headings and tables to enhance readability. Rhetorical criticism today uses its resources to additionally explore texts in their social, cultural, aesthetic, historical, political, ideological and psychological contexts (Robbins 1995)

Genre analysis entails identifying the genre of the text, the discourse community that constitutes its readership, and the conventions that make up the construction of the genre. Genres are typically associated with conventions of content, positioning and form (Swales, 1990, p.62.). Swales (ibid.) following Miller (1984) defines genres rhetorically and functionally as communicative events that serve communicative purposes recognised by members of the discourse community (p. 58.). Berckenkotter and Huckin (1995) argue for a "sociocognitive theory of genre" that acknowledges both contextual and individual units of analysis and "goes beyond the text" (Wuellner 1991). The traditional approach to studying genres assumed that they were fixed in form and based upon historical conventions and classifications. "The new genre theory focuses primarily on symbolic action – what texts *do* – and only secondarily on what they *say*" [emphasis in original] (Kennedy, 1998, p.138).

Research questions

Why is the declaration on learning constructed the way that it is?
What gives it its authority?
How is language used and what awareness is there of the ambiguities of language?
How effective is it in its persuasive power?
How and why are this text and its internal patterns of interest to the field?

Methodology

What I have termed *critical commentary discourse analysis* is the overarching methodology. As used in this paper it functions as an amalgamation of content analysis, rhetorical analysis, genre analysis and critical discourse analysis, described above. Commentary discourse is a term coined but not elaborated by Robbins (1995) to differentiate it from traditional rhetorical criticism which as method is almost exclusively concerned with making interpretations based upon the textual constraints and persuasive power perceived while reading. It goes beyond mere textual

commentary to draw out "a pragmatically guided reading of the coherence of the practices of the society" (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1983: 124) or discourse community. The key methodological challenge relates to providing the *missing links* that exist between explicit propositions and implicit assumptions (Fairclough, 2001, p.69).

Results and findings

1. *Sociocultural practice – context*

For a number of years, respective UK governments have been concerned with upgrading the skills level of the UK workforce in order to increase global competitiveness. The 1996 objectives of the UK Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) included the encouragement of *lifetime learning* so that people can use their skills and knowledge to compete effectively in a changing labour market. The 1998 Green Paper *The Learning Age* commented that "the government has put learning at the heart of its ambition" since "investment in human capital will be the foundation of success in the knowledge-based economy of the 21st century" (DfEE 1998). More recently (April 2001) Learning and Skills Councils have replaced Training and Enterprise Councils. This move was announced in the 1999 *Learning to Succeed* White Paper, in which was espoused "a nation in which creativity, enterprise and a regard for learning can flourish". (DfEE 1999). League tables are annually produced on UK performance compared to other nations. "People are our greatest source of competitive advantage" has become embedded in national rhetoric. One of the primary interventions to enhance the skills level within the UK has been through emphasising qualifications. A significant driver since 1986 has been through the introduction of a network of National Vocational Qualifications, which has focused on assessing the competences that people can demonstrate at the workplace as opposed to "underpinning knowledge and understanding"

2. *Textual analysis*

Content analysis.

A simple content analysis revealed some 100 instances of the word *learning*. Further analysis revealed that many of these instances had different meanings, connotations and linguistic forms. Learning was used both as a noun, sometimes prefaced by a descriptive adjective, and as an adjective. References were made throughout to *transformational* learning, *certificated* and *uncertificated* learning, *individual* and *collective* learning, *continual* learning, *effective* learning. As an adjective reference was made to learning *goals*, learning *organisation* and learning *society*. The authors themselves differentiated between learning as a *process* (or learning processes) or as an *outcome* (or learning outcomes). A number of these terms required advance technical knowledge of the field to fully understand. For this interpreter, the sheer volume of references to learning with their various meanings and connotations became confusing.

As one reads through the text one sees that the signatories establish qualitative differences about the nature of learning, distinguishing in effect between good and less good learning. Learning One (L1)= Good learning, L2 = Less good learning, L3 = Even less good learning. Experiential self-managed learning, lifelong learning is good, L1, becoming "a liberating and emancipating process for individuals, as employees as citizens". On the other hand (L3) individuals should be "using formal education and training as a last resort". Both learning processes and outcomes can be "good" (effective, moral etc) and "less good" (subject to obstacles that can result in social exclusion etc.). "Learning" is better than say "education". It is interesting to use the technique of *not-ing* the claims made in the text. Thus: "Learning is the core process" excludes other possibilities such as, for example "Democracy is the core process".

Ideational function and terms

This refers to the processes through which an experience of reality is invented or represented and constructed. What is the evidence of and interplay between cognitive processes prefaced by terms such as "We *believe*"; possession, indicated by terms such as "learning *has*", relational processes such as "learning *is*", and action oriented processes, introduced by doing verbs such as *make* or *use*. The predominance of certain types of processes can reveal taken for granted assumptions and implicit power orientations. Since the declaration is "A call for Action" it is not surprising to find a range of action oriented statements. Examples are: "National policy makers must create schemes that remove financial obstacles to learning for individuals and socially disadvantaged groups". "Leaders in organisations should encourage people to challenge, innovate and experiment". "Teachers, trainers and developers must support learning from live problems and experience, as a central activity of work" Since there is a section listing assertions about the nature of learning it is also no surprise to note a series of relational processes. There are a number of *attributive* sentences that make a claim about the nature of learning. This is done by establishing a "member of a class' relationship" in terms of the relationship of "learning" to other things. Examples are: "Learning is not just about knowledge. It is also about skills, insights, beliefs, values, attitudes, habits, feelings, wisdom, shared understandings and self-awareness"

Interpersonal function – Grammatical mood and modality

The *grammatical mood* represents the extent to which a text uses stylistic devices such as declarative sentences – typically statements – or makes commands. The *modality* reflects the degree of commitment to propositions made. The predominant mood as one would expect of this type of genre, is declarative, exhortative and normative, with statements, many of them of an *ought to* and *should* nature used more than any other form. 50% of the text is made up of "musts" and "should" statements, A whole section was devoted to contrasting what "should be" with what "should not" be. There are a number of enjoinders such as "commit to" and "proclaim and celebrate. There is a preponderance of categorical statements with few uses of modal markers like perhaps that indicate a weakening of the assertions. Where terms such as *may be* or *can be* are used – "transformational learning may be a struggle", "learning processes can be conscious"- these are presented as facts.

Textual function

This refers to the higher level structure of the text – its overall shape or pattern or arrangement, the logic by which it supports its ultimate aim. There is an unresolved conflict in the text between its function as a *declaration* and what is referred to as a "basis for dialogue". They entail a different set of conventions (Fairclough, 2001, p.16).

3. Discursive practice

Fairclough (2001) provides a three-fold discursive practice classification system. For our purposes the *actual* discourse is *A Declaration on Learning*. The discourse *type* or *stasis* is a declaration that can be classified as a piece of deliberative rhetoric designed to inform policy-making. The *order of discourse* is a rhetorical device for social persuasion, and it is its rhetorical power to which attention is now drawn.

Logos: One of the most interesting aspects of the declaration is that it provides assertions and makes claims without accompanying rationales. In other words it doesn't take the form of an argument, nor is it evidence based. The assumption is that the 'discourse community' will sympathise, drawing upon their *member resources* (Fairclough 2001). The textual form adopted is a way of presenting ideas and beliefs as facts, with an expectation of agreement or shared taken for granted assumptions. There is an implicit argument, drawing upon the analysis by Berger (2004) of the American Declaration of Independence, which relies on an us-them dichotomy. The traditional purpose of Declarations was to rectify injustices, overthrow an established order. In the Declaration of Independence the 'they' was the British, in the Declaration of Arbroath the 'they' was the English. In the Declaration on Learning 'they' are the UK Government, operating under what the authors hold to be a false model of learning, a model that holds that the only true model of learning is certificated learning. 'We' the audience will be persuaded that this is the case. But no evidence is presented that this is the government's position; and that even if it were, it is a mistaken position.

Ethos: In the absence of argument there is a heavy reliance on ethos. The opening sentence of the declaration emphasises the authority of the contributors: "As people who have researched and written extensively about effective learning we came together". By listing the thirteen contributors as signatories the authority that underpins the text is reinforced.

Pathos: There are a number of direct and indirect attempts to draw upon emotional support. The audience is drawn into the text by statements such as: "We were excited by the common ground we discovered" and "We are united in the belief that". Throughout the text there is a grandiosity about the claims for learning – some of which are very fundamental - that could be construed as seductive in their attempt to persuade. "Learning is the core process for the positive development of individuals, organisations and society as we enter the twenty first century". "Learning is the only source of sustainable development". "Learning reinforces…democracy". "Learning is the key to developing your identity and your potential". In particular it draws upon emotive and overstated language to present alternative perspectives. For example the statement that self and personal development should not be: "Self-subjugation, discipline and enforcement of conformity to corporate and state norms"

Conclusions and recommendations

Harrison and Kessels (2004) comment that learning and development practitioners want certainties. "Academic debate is valuable in stimulating challenge and enquiry. Where, however, the debate becomes protracted and spreads inconclusively into the organisation arena it can be damaging. Ambiguity about HRD's meaning and focus has surrounded the function for many years and has become increasingly unproductive at the practical level". (p.89). "A Declaration on Learning" with its emphasis on assertions provides the certainties that practitioners are seeking. However it is not evidence based. It makes claims without grounding them. It only recognises competing discourses to criticise them – and to present them in a form that uses negative emotive language. As a document it is on the surface the antithesis of the scholarly publications within the HRD field that seek to develop understanding through research. It is grounded in ethos and pathos, as opposed to logos. However its ostensible purpose is to influence, to

persuade policy makers, leaders in organisations and individuals of the importance of engaging in certain courses of action. As a document to persuade it also fails to convince this interpreter – there are too many taken for granted assumptions accompanying an overwhelming array of statements about the nature of learning. The knowledge and research base that underpin the claims about the nature of learning, indeed the grasp of the terminology used assumes that people have been socialised into the technical vocabulary of the HRD discourse community. "We never set out to impose our views on others" is an empty claim – the whole purpose of a declaration is to persuade. The overriding conclusion is that if one is going to use a literary form, it is important to recognise the implications of that form, and the impact it will have upon the readership.

There are a number of future possibilities for this research. Interviewing the authors to establish their perspective, their meaning structures and intentionality was deliberately eschewed for this paper, since it was designed purely as an exercise in textual analysis and interpretation. However a number of questions for the authors present themselves. Why did you construct it as a Declaration? How aware were you of the formal conventions of declarations (as used in the past). To what extent was the finished product a negotiated outcome? What contribution did you make to the finished product? In retrospect, would you do it again/differently? Why?

How this research contributes to new knowledge in HRD

This paper is both a piece of basic and applied research. It uses knowledge from other fields that contribute to decision-making in the sense of showing how a text in the HRD field can be judged. It demonstrates the technical use of a commentary discourse by a non-professional linguist to interpret published texts in the HRD field, and the insights that can be gained. In particular it demonstrates how hidden assumptions, and dominant discourses surrounding themes such as learning can be surfaced and evaluated. It shows the value of going beneath the content of a text, and establishing how effectively a text does what it sets out to do, and the sociocultural context in which it operates. If HRD is concerned with learning then it is also concerned with communication and the means by which messages are sent and received. It follows that the more we understand and can evaluate our communication modes both within and outside our community of practice, the more effective we will become in using them.

References.

Ascherson, N. (2003) *Stone Voices – The Search for Scotland* (Rev. ed.), London: Granta Books,

Barthes, R. (1977), The Death of the Author, In *Image-Music-Text* Tr. S. Heath, London: Fontana.

Barton, E. (2002) Resources for discourse analysis in composition studies, *Style*, Winter

Bauer, M.W. Gaskell G & Allum N.C. (2000), Quality, Quantity and Knowledge Interests: Avoiding Confusions. In M.W.Bauer & G. Gaskell. (Eds.) *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*, London: Sage: 3-17.

Berger, D., Separation or Co-operation, http://www.screwschool.com/term/phi21.htm, downloaded 04/08/04).

Berkenkotter, C. and Huckin, T.N. (1995**)**, *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication*, Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum.

Carley, K., (1990), Content analysis. In R. E. Asher (Ed.), *The Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, Edinburgh: Pergamon Press

Covino, W.A. & Jolliffe, D.A. (1995) *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Crowley, S. (1990) *The Methodical Memory: Invention in Current-Traditional Rhetoric*, USA, Southern Illinois University Press

Darling, J., Darling, P., and Elliot, J. (1999) *The Changing Role of the Trainer*, London: Institute of Personnel and Development

Department for Education and Employment (1999) *Learning to Succeed*, White Paper London: HMSO

Department for Education and Employment (1998) *The Learning Age*, Green Paper London: HMSO

Dreyfus, H.L. and Rabinow, P. (1983) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press

Fairclough N.L. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*, Polity Press

Fairclough N.L. and Hardy G (1997) Management Learning as Discourse in J.Burgoyne & M.Reynolds (Eds.), *Management Learning – Integrating Perspectives in Theory and Practice* (pp144-160), London: Sage

Fairclough, N. (2001) *Language and Power*, (2nd Ed.) Harlow: Pearson Education.

Fiol, C.M. (1994) Consensus, Diversity and learning in Organizations, *Organization Science, 5, 3.*, reprinted in

James R. Meindl, Charles Stubbart & Joseph F. Porac (Eds.) (1996) *Cognition within and between Organizations*, pp173-206

Foucault M (1972) *The Archeology of Knowledge*, London: Tavistock publications

Garvey, B. & Williamson, B. (2002) *Beyond Knowledge Management – Dialogue, creativity and the corporate curriculum* Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall;

Halifax Declaration for the Recognition of Prior Learning, (2001), from the *Recognizing Learning – Building Canada's Future Prosperity. A Call to Action Conference*. Halifax, Nova Scotia

Halliday M (1985) *An introduction to Functional Grammar*, Edward Arnold Harrison R. and Kessels, J. (2004*) Human Resource Development in a Knowledge Economy - An Organisational View*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Holmes, L. (2000) *Reframing Learning: Performance, Identity and Practice*, Paper Presented at Critical

Contributions to Managing and Learning: 2nd Connecting Learning and Critique Conference, Lancaster University, July 2000

Holmes, L. (in press) Challenging the learning turn in education and training, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, (forthcoming).

Honey, P (1998) The Debate Starts Here, *People Management*, October 1, 28-29

Johnstone, B. (2002) *Discourse analysis*, Malden, MA. Blackwell

Kennedy, M.L. (1998) *Theorising Composition: A Critical Sourcebook of Theory and Scholarship in Contemporary Composition Studies*, Westport CT.: Greenwood Press

Learning Declaration Group (2000) *A Declaration on Learning – A Call to Action*, available on www.peterhoneylearning.com.

Lucas, S.E. (1990) The stylistic artistry of the declaration of independence, *Prologue*, Vol.22 (Spring) pp 25-43

Nyerere, J.K. (1978) "Development is for Man, by Man, and of Man": The declaration of Dar es Salaam in B. L.

Hall and J. R. Kidd (Eds.) *Adult Education: A design for action*, Oxford: Pergamon

Miller, C., (1984), Genre as Social Action, *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 151-67.

Ocho Rios Declaration (2001), Adult Learning: A Key to Democratic Citizenship and Global Action, 6th *World Assembly of the International Council for Adult Education*, Ocho Rios, Jamaica, 9-12 August.

Prior, L. (2003) *Using Documents in Social Research*, London: Sage

Robbins, V.K. (1995) "The Present and future of rhetorical analysis, *The rhetorical Analysis of Scripture, Essays from the 1995 London Conference*, pp24-52

Ruona, W.E.A. (2000) Core Beliefs in Human Resource Development – A Journey for the Profession and its

Professionals, in W. E. A. Ruona and G.Roth (Eds.) *Philosophical Foundations of Human Resource Development Practice* (pp 1-27) *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, No.7.

Swales, J. (1990), Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings, NY, Cambridge UP

UNESCO (1997) The Hamburg Declaration on Adult Learning, *5th International Conference on Adult Education*, 14-18 July.

Walton, J.S. (2001), HRD – The power of definitions, in O. A. Aliaga (Ed.) AHRD 2001 Conference Proceedings

Wuellner, W.H. (1991) Rhetorical criticism: Rhetorical Criticism and its Theory in Culture-Critical Perspective: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11 in P.J. Martin & J.H. Petzer (Eds.) *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS, 15, Leiden: Brill): 171-85