



Changes in McDonald's Discourse and Ideology: Intertextual Analysis of McDonald's vs. Criticisms

Copyright © 2008
Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines
<http://cadaad.org/ejournal>
ISSN: 1752-3079
Vol 1 (2): 76 – 101

JOANNE JUNG-WOOK HONG

Macquarie University

hongjungwook@gmail.com

Abstract

The study is concerned with revealing some changes in the discourse of the multinational fast food company McDonald's in responding to the criticisms against its business practice, particularly through investigating two ideologically competing communicative voices: the criticisms of McDonald's business practice (e.g. the London Greenpeace leaflet 'What's Wrong with McDonald's?') and letters from the McDonald's CEO (Chief Executive Officer) to shareholders titled 'Dear Fellow Shareholders' in the annual reports published in 1997, 2003 and 2006. The study also discusses what caused those changes through looking at changes in consumer behaviour, culture and life style in society.

These changes are investigated by an analytical framework, Discourse Formations (DFs) (McAndrew, 2001, 2004), which provides a chance to witness the ideological struggles and changes in intratextual and intertextual relations. The intertextual analysis is based on analysing the consistently foregrounded intratextual meanings around core participants. In this study, the core participants are from the key terms in the criticism leaflet 'What's Wrong with McDonald's?' which brought the most crucial impact on damaging McDonald's brand image through McDonald's business history. The meanings of core participants are investigated and compared intratextually and intertextually in McDonald's 1997, 2003 and 2006 CEO's letters, which relates the meanings of the corresponding core participants with using the terms, Alliance or Opposition. Through the intertextual analysis and using Critical Discourse Analysis perspectives, the study will find how McDonald's changes the construction of its social relationships, identities and beliefs in dealing with the criticisms.

Keywords: *Ideology, Discourse Formations (DFs), Core Participants, Intertextual relations, Intratextual relations*

1. Introduction

The study is concerned with investigating ideological changes in McDonald's discourse over time, in responding to criticisms, considering the changes in meanings and social relations found in its discourse.

McDonald's, with its powerful global icons and its symbolic 'M' (the golden arch), has come to represent the image of a leading new cultural lifestyle and business practice. Ritzer (2002: 1), who coined and defined the concept 'McDonaldization' as 'the process by which the principles of the fast-food restaurant are coming to dominate more and more sectors of American society

as well as of the rest of the world', argues that 'McDonald's is the basis of one of the most influential developments in contemporary society' with bringing more rational modes of thinking with giving up traditional ways in some social practice (ibid.). With McDonald's huge success in business, there have also been a number of criticisms from selling unhealthy food to exploiting children and labour and destroying environment, such as the documentary film 'Super Size Me' (Spurlock 2004), *Fast Food Nation* (Schlosser 2001) and the London Greenpeace's leaflet '*What's Wrong with McDonald's?*' (1986). These have to a large extent created a negative image, connected with its bringing a variety of dysfunctions to modern lifestyle. Since 1980s, these criticisms and the resultant negative image have led McDonald's to endeavour to construct a new social image and consumer relations, to win over consumers.

Fairclough (1992) insists that 'discourse' is not only shaped and constrained by social structure, but also socially constitutive of 'social identities', 'social relationships' and 'systems of knowledge and belief'. In this regard, the study hypothesizes that McDonald's attempts to recover its damaged brand image and to assume its hegemony again in the fast-food business world through manipulating the key terms of the criticisms. Based on the hypothesis, the study expects that McDonald's may intertextually oppose or agree with the meanings found in the criticisms and it also may happen to change or reconstruct the meanings in responding to the changes in consumer culture, needs or beliefs, especially in food.

Exploring ideological changes in meanings and relations in responding to the criticisms, the study will investigate three CEO's letters from McDonald's annual reports published in 1997, 2003 and 2007. Although CEO's letters to shareholders may not directly respond to the criticisms, the letters, according to Hyland (1998: 224), can be seen as 'a promotional genre, designed to construct and convey a corporate image' to the readers. The letters are widely read not only by shareholders but also by its other potential readers such as consumers, suppliers, employees, competitors, pressure groups (e.g. consumer union), and the press. Thus, the letters may have a major impact on a firm's competitive position (Hyland 1998). The intertextual relations between McDonald's discourse and criticisms will be examined by comparing or contrasting with the London Greenpeace leaflet '*What's Wrong with McDonald's?*'. In the leaflet, McDonald's is accused of "wrongdoing" in its business practice, which caused the 'McLibel' case. The case has brought the most crucial impact on damaging McDonald's brand image through McDonald's business history.

In this study, Discourse Formations (DFs) (McAndrew 2001, 2004) provides a powerful analytical framework, in that the analysis of DFs provides a chance to witness the ideological struggles and changes in intratextual and intertextual relations. The intertextual analysis is based on analysing consistently foregrounded intratextual meanings around the core participants, the key terms of the criticism leaflet '*What's Wrong with McDonald's?*', in both texts. The intratextual and intertextual relationships are described in terms of Alliance or Opposition which is again scaled by 'Strong', 'Medium' or 'Weak'. Through the intertextual analysis, the research will find McDonald's ideological changes in dealing with the criticisms. The terms Discourse

Formations (DFs) and core participants will be further discussed and defined later in section 3.2.

2. McDonald's vs. the London Greenpeace: The McLibel Case (1990 – 1997)

The London Greenpeace published a leaflet 'What's Wrong with McDonald's?' (Figure 1) in 1986 to promote the International Day of Action Against McDonald's, and it has been distributed all over the world by environmental activists in front of McDonald's restaurants in Britain or through online. McDonald's filed a libel suit against the London Greenpeace's distribution of the leaflet in 1990, which was called 'McLibel case', and closed in 1997. This case became the longest-running court trial in British legal history. The judges found several charges in the leaflet are true: 'exploiting children with its advertising', 'cruelty to animals', 'low wages to workers', and 'false nutritional claims for food'. Also, during the trial, the case was spotlighted by the world's media and paid attention from the general public which supported the two defendants, Dave Morris and Helen Steel, a former postman and a gardener from London. Since then, despite the company's utmost efforts to escape from the focus of the criticisms, it has been the major target company of the criticisms against fast food industry and wrong doing business practice of multinational companies. Also, since 1997, its fast food market share has declined 3% points every year to 15.2% until 2003 (Day, 2003), and its brand image has been tumbled from that of the previous American cultural icon to that of a down-market and unhealthy brand. For instance, in June 2003, the 11th edition of Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary added the term 'McJob', describing as 'a low-paying job that requires little skill and provides little opportunity for advancement.'

Figure 1. London Greenpeace criticism leaflet: 'What's Wrong with McDonald's?'

What's Wrong With McDonald's?



McDonald's spend over \$1.8 billion every year worldwide on advertising and promotions, trying to cultivate an image of being a 'clean' and 'green' company that is also fun place to eat. Children are used in dragging their parents behind them with the promise of toys and other gimmicks. But behind the smiling face of Ronald McDonald lies the reality - McDonald's only interest is money, making profits from whoever and whatever they can, not the 31 million children. McDonald's Annual Report talks of 'Global Domination' - they aim to open more and more stores across the globe but they continue to operate expensive mega towns uniformly, less choice and the undermining of local communities.

PROMOTING UNHEALTHY FOOD
McDonald's promote their food as 'nutritious', but the reality is that it is junk food - high in fat, sugar and salt, and low in fibre and vitamins. A diet of this type is linked with a greater risk of heart disease, cancer, diabetes and other diseases. Their food also contains many chemical additives, some of which may cause health and hyperactivity in children. Don't forget too that most of the cause of the majority of food poisoning incidents in 1991 McDonald's were responsible for an outbreak of food poisoning in the UK, in which people suffered serious kidney failure. With modern intensive farming methods, other diseases - linked to chemical residues or antibiotic practices - have become a danger to people too (last 20 6582).

EXPLOITING WORKERS
Workers in the fast food industry are paid low wages. McDonald's do not pay quarter time even when employees work very long hours. Measures to keep profits high and wage costs low result in understaffing, so staff have to work harder and longer. As a consequence, accidents (particularly burns) are common. The majority of staff are people who

the use of farm and by-product waste and their suppliers force local people to move on to other areas and cut down further trees.

McDonald's are the world's largest user of beef. Methane emitted by cattle reared for the beef industry is a major contributor to the global warming crisis. Modern intensive agriculture is based on the heavy use of them cuts which are damaging to the environment.

Every year McDonald's use thousands of tons of unnecessary packaging, most of which ends up littering our streets or polluting the sea and buried in landfill sites.

MURDERING ANIMALS
The violence of the burger chains are based on the torture and murder of millions of animals. Most are intensively farmed, with no access to fresh air and sunlight, and no freedom of movement. Their deaths are barbaric - humans slaughter in a myth. We have the choice to eat meat or not, but the billions of animals sacrificed for food each year have no choice at all.

CENSORSHIP AND LIBEL
Censorship of McDonald's has come from a huge number of people and organisations over a wide range of issues. In the mid-1990s, London Greenpeace drew together many of these strands of criticism and called for an annual World Day of Action Against McDonald's. This takes place every year on 18th October, with pickets and demonstrations all over the world. McDonald's, who spend a fortune every year on advertising, are trying to silence

world-wide criticism by threatening legal action against those who speak out. Many have been forced to back down because they lacked the money to fight a case. But Helen Steel and Dave Morris, two supporters of London Greenpeace, defended themselves in a trial at the High Court in 1990. No legal aid is available so they represented themselves. McDonald's engaged in a huge cover up, refusing to disclose thousands of relevant documents. Also, the defendants were denied their right to a jury. Despite all the cover being stacked against them, Helen and Dave turned the tables and exposed the truth by turning McDonald's a business practice on trial. Protests against the \$20 million a year fast-food giant continue to grow. It's vital to stand up to intimidation and to defend free speech.

WHAT YOU CAN DO - Together we can fight back against the restrictions and the people in power who dominate our lives and our planet, and we can create a better society without exploitation. Workers can and do organise together to fight for their rights and dignity. People are increasingly aware of the need to think seriously about the food we eat and our children eat. People in your countries are organising themselves to stand up to multinationals and banks which dominate the world's economy. Environmental and animal rights protests and campaigns are growing everywhere. Why not join in the struggle for a better world. Talk to friends and family, neighbours and workmates about these issues. Please help and encourage the leaflet to widely as you can.

LEAFLET: **LOCAL MCDONALD'S** - leaflets 55p or A3 512.00 PDF 636, 616 PER 1000 from UC McLibel Support Campaign, see it below.

Please send the more information I enclose \$_____ donation to the campaign.

Name _____ Address _____

US McLibel Support Campaign, P.O. Box 62, Colchester, VT 05425-0062, USA
 Tel: 1-802-580-8028 Email: uslibel@earthlink.net
 Information: 5888888888 at http://www.uscspatigist.org

The leaflet, 'What's Wrong with McDonald's?', is crucial for intertextual analysis between the criticisms and McDonald's. Among the main criticisms in the leaflet, the study will focus on only three: '*exploiting children*', '*exploiting workers*' and '*false nutritional claims for food*'. In the study, these three points will be represented by key terms, 'core participants' as [CUSTOMERS], [WORKERS] and [FOOD].

3. Theoretical Statements

3.1 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)

From CDA perspective, Fairclough (1992) regards 'discourse' as language use, a form of social practice rather than an individual activity or a reflex of situational variables. This implies that discourse is a mode of social action and representation, and relates to social structure dialectically (Fairclough 1992: 63-64). From this view, discourse is not only shaped by social structure, but also socially constitutive of 'social identities', 'social relationships' and 'system of knowledge and belief'. According to Fairclough (1992: 64-65), this concept on social construction in discourse can be realized in Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), in which 'social identities' and 'system of knowledge and belief' correspond to 'ideational' function and 'social relation' to 'interpersonal' function.

Halliday (1994) agrees with the social aspects of discourse in Fairclough's CDA, mentioning that 'A text is *created* by its context, the semiotic environment of people and their activities that we have construed via the concepts of field, tenor and mode; it also *creates* that context' (ibid.: x). In more detail, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 24), from the SFL view, sees language as 'a complex semiotic system, having various levels, or strata', particularly, broadly three levels: context, content, and expression. Here, the content has two levels: semantics and lexicogrammar. In particular, in relation to the content level, language helps us make sense of our experience and carry out our interactions with other people: the experience and interpersonal relationships are transformed into meaning, then the meaning is transformed into wording – these could be the other way around from the point of view of a speaker (writer) or listener (reader) (ibid.). In this regard, a text is modelled as the simultaneous exchange of three types of meaning or metafunction – ideational meanings (meanings about construction and representation of the experience in the world), interpersonal meanings (meanings about the enactment of social relations and the construction of social identities) and textual meanings (meanings about the message, the specifically semiotic – textual – form of productive practice) (Eggins and Slade 1997; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999). The meanings are realized by clauses (or rather clauses as part of clause complexes), and every clause is displayed as constitution of grammatical systems, such as transitivity, mood and modality, and theme, corresponding to the three metafunctions above, respectively. As a consequence, according to Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999: 140), 'the social is built into the grammatical tissue of language so that

the semiotic constitution by the social and of the social is constantly at issue in language analysis.'

Among those three metafunctions, transitivity and appraisal which correspond to ideational and interpersonal metafunctions respectively will be used for analysis through the study. Transitivity is represented as a configuration of a process, participants, and circumstances (Halliday 1994; Martin et al. 1997). In particular, this is 'the grammar of processes' (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 11): the process types, which correspond to verbal groups in clauses, determine the experiential configuration in the systems of transitivity. Appraisal analysis examines attitudinal meanings, encoding feelings, attitudes and judgements through the lexical choices, such as verbal groups, nominal groups, adjectival and adverbial groups (Ravelli 2000; Martin and Rose 2003: 22).

3.2 Ideology in Discourse and Discourse Formations (DFs)

McAndrew (2004: 126) defines ideology as 'a system of symbolically articulated value-judgements which align to form a constellation of ways of meaning that are in a dialectical relationship with, and form a basis for, human action.' In more detail, from CDA perspective, placing discourse within a view of power and power relations, Fairclough (1992: 87) insists that ideologies are 'signification/constructions of reality (the physical world, social relations, social identities), which are built into various dimensions of the forms/meanings of discursive practices, and which contribute to the production, reproduction or transformation of relations of domination.' As a consequence, meanings and linguistically formal features of texts may be ideologically invested (ibid.).

In this regard, McAndrew (2001, 2004) provides a strong analytical tool and guide, Discourse Formations (DFs), to investigate ideological intratextual and intertextual relations, which also provides the present study with an analytical framework. In his study, McAndrew (2001, 2004) demonstrates the analysis of DFs through mapping significantly relevant elements of the context for a particular text, an Australian New South Wales Government advertisement for NSW Forest Agreements (NSWFA) which is the central text in the study. Corresponding to the central texts, two other competing Discourses of the timber industry and of conservationism are positioned for the analysis of intertextual DFs, investigating how the meanings in the NSWFA text are construed meanings in two competing Discourses.

Importantly, DFs are based on SFL, in that they are 'the configuration of lexicogrammatical semantic relations in which a particular participant in a text is enmeshed' (McAndrew 2004: 123). Here, the particular elements of the context are designated as 'core participants', which are foregrounded through the process of the lexicogrammar. The study assumes that the intratextual lexicogrammatical semantic relations between core participants in a text are constructed, and then they are compared with those in other text in terms of intertextual relations. So to speak, importantly, the intratextual and the intertextual semantic relations between the core participants are described as Alliance or Opposition. From this view, DFs provide a powerful framework for investigating the present research questions, in that the analysis of DFs

provides a chance to witness the ideological struggles or alliance in intratextual and intertextual relations.

4. Methodology

4.1 Texts

The research will explore four texts: three CEO's letters written in 1997, 2003 and 2006, and a criticism leaflet 'What's Wrong with McDonald's?'. From now on, the leaflet will be named as 'GD' which stands for 'Greenpeace Discourse' and the three CEO's letters as 'MD' for 'McDonald's Discourse': MD (1997), MD (2003) and MD (2006).

Both of GD and MD aim to persuade readers to share their opinions and ideologies. While the GD writers position themselves obviously as critics or accusers, to report and reveal the McDonald's "unethical" business practice to the readers, the MD writers position themselves as representatives of the company accompanied by the signature of the CEO, reporting and informing its business in the past, present and future – that is, its on-going business, financial achievement and ability, its marketing strategies, and so on. As a consequence, while the leaflet clearly belongs to the criticism genre, the CEO's letter is rather complicated in terms of genre: for example, it may belong to promotional genre as well as business report. Due to this complicated hybridity of genres in the CEO's letter, in order to focus specifically on investigating the reaction against GD in terms of intertextual relations, only some parts which particularly deal with the three core participants of the criticisms – [CUSTOMERS], [FOOD] and [WORKERS] (see Section 2, above) – in CEO's letters will be extracted.

4.2 Analysis Focus

Firstly, the study will investigate the consistently foregrounded intratextual meanings in DFs (Discourse Formations) of the three core participants through MD (1997), MD (2003) and MD (2006). Here, in terms of intratextual relations, lexicogrammatical features on each core participant will be described and drawn into semantic relations with the features on other core participants in each of the MDs (1997, 2003 and 2006). Through these intratextual analyses, the changes in McDonald's discourse through the years in 1997, 2003 and 2006 will be revealed. Then, secondly, based on the intratextual meanings, the intertextual relations between MD and GD will be discussed. Here, the changes in McDonald's discourse will be discussed in relation to ideological aspects, since ideology may influence in building formal linguistic features and meanings in discourse. The intratextual and intertextual relations of DFs will be defined as Alliance or Opposition and again as Weak, Medium or Strong.

5. Analysis and Findings

5.1 Intratextual Changes in MD

The diagram (Figure 2) below shows intratextual relations between two different core participants within each MD, and the changes through the years of 1997, 2003 and 2006. Through discussion on these intratextual relations in this section, the intertextual relations between the same core participants from MD and GD, and the changes of the relations through the years are recognized. These will be discussed in section 5.3.

From the diagram below, intratextual relations in MD are not much different through the years. However, they show totally different patterns from the intratextual relations in GD. All the relations in MD are Alliances except the relation between [WORKERS] and [FOOD], but the relations in GD are all Oppositions.

Figure 2. Intratextual Analysis

	<u>MD (1997)</u>	<u>MD (2003)</u>	<u>MD (2006)</u>	<u>GD</u>
[CUSTOMERS] ↔ [WORKERS]	ALL:M	ALL:M	ALL:S	OPP:M
[FOOD] ↔ [CUSTOMERS]	ALL:S	ALL:S	ALL:M	OPP:S
[WORKERS] ↔ [FOOD]	N/R	N/R	N/R	OPP:M

* ALL:S = Alliance:Strong, ALL:M = Alliance:Medium, ALL:W = Alliance:Weak
 * OPP:S = Opposition:Strong, OPP:M = Opposition:Medium, OPP:W = Opposition:Weak
 * N/R = No Relations

For example, in MD (1997) and MD (2003), McDonald's focuses more on the relation between [FOOD] and [CUSTOMERS], putting its effort to [CUSTOMERS] mainly through [FOOD] by improving the taste, lowering the price and developing more menus, which results in the relation in Alliance:Strong. However, in MD (2006), McDonald's focuses more on the relation between [CUSTOMERS] and [WORKERS] which is Alliance:Strong, more through improving services in the restaurants with speed and friendliness from [WORKERS] who is satisfied and happy with improved working conditions.

Unlike MD, GD builds all the relations as Opposition, in which [CUSTOMERS] is drawn as victim by McDonald's promotion which pursues only money and by [FOOD] which causes disease. Also, GD builds [WORKERS] as another victim exploited by McDonald's in relation to [FOOD] and [CUSTOMERS].

In the following sections 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.3 and 5.2, how the intratextual relations shown in the diagram Figure 2 were found and changed will be discussed, to provide the analytical basis for finding intertextual and ideological changes in MD (in section 5.3).

5.1.1 MD (1997)

In MD (1997), the most distinctive feature is that 82% of clauses are appraised. This may mean that McDonald's tries to build the meanings based on its attitudinal expressions, such as emotional responses, evaluation of things and evaluation of human behaviour in the aspects of social norms. In particular, Appreciation among the attitudinal appraisal subtypes is the most frequently used, followed by Judgment and Affect: 48%, 19% and 19%, respectively, among the appraised clauses in the text. Interestingly, the DF of [FOOD] is appraised only by Appreciation while [CUSTOMERS] is only by Affect. As a result, MD (1997) shows that while [FOOD] is positively evaluated in terms of quality and value, the DF of [CUSTOMERS] is positively related to emotion and trust. That is, through the text, on the one hand, the core participant [FOOD] is mainly related to positively assessable expressions, such as '*hotter*', '*fresher*', '*better tasting*', and '*the best price*' (+Appreciation:quality). On the other hand, the core participant [CUSTOMERS] is focused on building affective relations with McDonald's by promotions (Cl. 41 and 42), the service from [WORKERS] (e.g. '*and be friendlier*' (Cl. 27)) and also from positively evaluated [FOOD]. However, the other core participant [WORKERS], as a representative of McDonald's corporation in the restaurants realized by a plural pronoun '*we*', is linked to [FOOD] and [CUSTOMERS], and responsible for making [FOOD] which is hotter, fresher and better tasting and serving [CUSTOMERS] with speed ('*faster*') (t+Appreciation) and friendliness ('*friendlier*') (+Affect) with willingness realized by modal verb '*will*' in Cl. 23 and Cl. 24 (see below, example (1) and (2)).

Let us discuss how the core participants are construed and related to each other in terms of appraisal and transitivity, from the examples below.

- (1)
We'll make hotter, fresher food that's better tasting. (Cl. 23)
- (2)
We'll serve customers faster, (Cl. 24) || make sure (Cl. 25) || they get what || they ordered, || (Cl. 26) || and be friendlier (Cl. 27) || while doing it. (Cl. 28)
- (3)
This has many facets; (Cl. 36) || an important one is food tastes. (Cl. 37)
- (4)
So, we're looking at our menu (Cl. 38) || to make sure (Cl. 39) || it has the taste || [you want at a price [[you want to pay.]]] (Cl. 40)
- (5)
Make customers happy with everyday low prices and outstanding restaurant operations. (Cl. 76)

While, in example (1), [FOOD] is evaluated as *'hotter, fresher'* and *'better tasting'*, example (5) describes emotion of [CUSTOMERS] as *'happy'* by the means of positively appreciated [FOOD] (+Appreciation:quality) (Circumstance: manner:means) which represents price and restaurant operations. In particular, in the lexical items *'the taste you want at a price you want to pay'* (Attribute) in example (4), in terms of transitivity, *'the taste'* is qualified by *'you want at a price you want to pay'* as an embedded clause, and again *'a price'* is also qualified by *'you want to pay'*. Here, the taste and the price of [FOOD] are depending on the happiness from [CUSTOMERS] (+Affect: happiness). Also, in example (5), *'with everyday low prices'* (Circumstance: Manner:means) is represented as [FOOD], to be used to cause happiness of [CUSTOMERS]. As a consequence, McDonald's as Attributor makes [FOOD] and [CUSTOMERS] very closely connected by the embedded/embedding or the circumstance. Furthermore, particularly, in relation to the taste, in Cl. 37 in example (3), in terms of transitivity, McDonald's identifies *'food tastes'* (Token) as *'important one'* (Value) with thematizing *'important one'*. It does not simply mean that *'food tastes'* is important, but means that *'food tastes'* is the key element to make the value gap which is the second priority in McDonald's business in 1997 (Cl. 32). Also, importantly, McDonald's itself senses [FOOD] that [CUSTOMERS] wants and likes, realized by high probability of modality in two clause complexes (example (2) and (3)).

When it comes to intratextual relations in MD (1997), as discussed already, the DFs of [FOOD] and [CUSTOMERS] are very strongly and positively connected (Alliance:Strong). The relations between [CUSTOMERS] and [WORKERS] are also positively considered but not as strongly as the relations between [FOOD] and [CUSTOMERS]. In particular, although the core participant [CUSTOMERS] is built as positive meaning in the relations with [WORKERS], [WORKERS] is described only as representative of the company to provide good service to [CUSTOMERS], which causes Alliance:Medium intratextual relations. In relation to [FOOD] and [WORKERS], there is no relation found through the text. However, [WORKERS] ideologically relates to [FOOD] as well as [CUSTOMERS]. For instance, in examples (1) and (2), [WORKERS] is represented as a plural pronoun *'we'*. This inevitably collapses the massive differences between employer and employee or between boss and workers – and in doing so creates an ideological relation between [CUSTOMERS] and [WORKERS] and also [FOOD] and [WORKERS].

Let us briefly discuss each core participant rather than its relations to other core participants in the text. As already mentioned, the core participant [FOOD] is construed as *'great'*, *'hotter'*, and *'fresher'* with meaning of positive valuation. Most importantly, McDonald's focuses on its *'taste'* to attract more customers into the restaurant. In this relation, [CUSTOMERS] is construed as a key factor to make decision on [FOOD] to increase McDonald's market share. Through the text, McDonald's targets various groups of [CUSTOMERS] by addressing *'individual market needs'* rather than targeting children only. Also, McDonald's focuses on building an emotional bond with [CUSTOMERS] through a new promotional campaign. However, the core participant [WORKERS] is not mentioned except as the representative who is responsible to provide high quality of service and food and to build Affect with customers in the stores, energized by McDonald's.

5.1.2 MD (2003)

While MD (1997) appraises 82% of clauses, only 49% of clauses in MD (2003) are appraised with showing similar patterns to MD (1997) in distribution of attitudinal appraisal subtypes: Affect (18%), Appreciation (46%) and Judgment (18%). This may reflect a huge change in McDonald's discourse, in which McDonald's may make its position as neutral and focus more on describing its experiential activities and reality rather than describing its emotional and self-evaluating responses.

The examples below will help our understanding on how McDonald's builds the meaning of each core participant and the meaning relations between them in MD (2003).

(6)

We will also enhance our overall customer experience. (Cl. 103)

(7)

Additionally, we are responding to lifestyle issues with an initiative [[that focuses on important areas: menu choice, physical activity and education.]] (Cl. 109)

(8)

We are improving our food taste attributes (Cl. 63) || and adding new menu items [[that our customers want.]] (Cl. 64)

(9)

To strengthen restaurant operations in 2004, (Cl. 98) || we are marshalling our resources (Cl. 99) || to make a significant, positive impact on the speed, accuracy and friendliness of our service. (Cl. 100)

(10)

We narrowed our non-McDonald's brand activity, (Cl. 35) || and we focused our attention on our customers. (Cl. 36)

(11)

We also appreciate our customers' desire for safe products [[that fit within their lifestyles.]] (Cl. 106)

In terms of appraisal, while McDonald's in MD (1997) mainly focuses on building affective relations with [CUSTOMERS] through providing positively evaluated [FOOD] and building friendliness by [WORKERS], MD (2003) shows rather different meanings in these relations. That is, MD (2003) focuses on improving something related to [CUSTOMERS], such as 'customer experience' and 'lifestyle issues', as well as building emotional relations directly with [CUSTOMERS]. In more detail, for instance, the core participant [CUSTOMERS] in Cl. 103 (in example (6)) represents the lexical items 'our overall customer experience' and it is appraised by the process 'enhance' (Appreciation: quality). Also, interestingly, in example (7), McDonald's itself seems to recognize the problem on [FOOD] – realized by the expression 'we are responding to lifestyle issues' – and to put forward the solutions, especially like 'menu choice, physical activity and education' which are evaluated as 'important' (+Appreciation: valuation). Here, McDonald's tries to avoid the blame on its food by placing [CUSTOMERS] on the agentive position, realized in metaphorical expressions: 'menu choice', 'physical activity' and 'education'. That is, in detail, in nominalised expressions 'menu choice' and 'physical activity', the lexical items 'choice' and 'activity' are derived from the material processes 'choose' and 'act', respectively, with their implicit actor 'customers'. In another nominalised expression 'education' which is derived from material process 'educate', [CUSTOMERS] implicitly comes as the goal of the action, and takes the responsibility for themselves in their choice of [FOOD],

due to the resultant expectation of education on food choices. While McDonald's shows some changes in the way of building relations with [CUSTOMERS], [CUSTOMERS] still generally is construed as emotional relations. For instance, in example (8), the embedded clause in Cl. 64 which represents the affect of [CUSTOMERS] qualifies [FOOD] as the thing the customers want. Also, in example (9), the lexical items 'the speed, accuracy and friendliness of our service' represent [WORKERS] and cause positive affect from [CUSTOMERS]. The DF of [CUSTOMERS] is also construed from the view of social sanctions in Cl. 36 in example (10), in which the behaviour toward [CUSTOMERS] leads the reader to appraise morally positively (t+Judgment: propriety). Also, in Cl. 71-73 (see Appendix) in MD (2003), McDonald's strongly focuses on [CUSTOMERS], especially realized by 'the customer is our boss' in Cl. 73. Here, in terms of transitivity, 'the customer' (Token) is identified and qualified as 'our boss' (Value) in McDonald's business activities. In relation to consumer targeting, while MD (1997) mentions the target groups of [CUSTOMERS] with vague expressions like 'individual market needs' (in Cl. 42 in MD (1997)), MD (2003) clearly mentions the key target groups as 'young adults, women and families' in Cl. 58 (see Appendix).

The DF of [FOOD] is construed in relation to the taste and to developing new menu, realized in Cl. 109 (in example (7)) and Cl. 63 and 64 (in example (8)), in which [FOOD] is positively evaluated in quality and value in terms of appraisal. The meaning relation between [FOOD] and [CUSTOMERS] is construed as Alliance:Strong, which is still strong as much as the relations in MD (1997), but in a slightly different way. That is, as mentioned above, [FOOD] does not only qualify Affect of [CUSTOMERS] as in MD (1997), but also is qualified by lifestyle of [CUSTOMERS]. In Cl. 106 (example (11)), [FOOD] is qualified and evaluated by 'lifestyle', which is related to the desire of [CUSTOMERS]. In this regard, McDonald's seems to reconstruct the meaning relations between [FOOD] and [CUSTOMERS] by using a new code of 'lifestyle', rather than constructing only strong affectual relations between the two participants by using 'price' and 'tastes'.

Also, McDonald's in MD (2003) puts [CUSTOMERS] as the centre of its 'Plan to Win', which is realized by Cl. 95 (see Appendix). Moreover, [WORKERS] which represents 'people' and 'place' and [FOOD] which represents 'products' and 'price' are focused on building positively evaluated meaning in relation to the 'experience' of [CUSTOMERS] in Cl. 103 (see Appendix). Here, also, [WORKERS] is strongly linked to [CUSTOMERS], but still considered as a representative to deliver good service with speed and friendliness as a key factor for success in business (Cl. 100, see Appendix) and even their performance in the restaurant is rigorously measured (Cl. 102, see Appendix). Therefore, the intratextual relation between [CUSTOMERS] and [WORKERS] in MD (2003) is constructed as Alliance:Medium. However, unlike MD (1997), [WORKERS] is not mentioned directly related to [FOOD] through MD (2003).

Through MD (2003), the meaning in the DF of [FOOD] is construed based on developing new menus, extending value menus and improving food taste. Also, interestingly, McDonald's mentions an issue of 'nutrition' by mentioning 'safety' and 'quality' of [FOOD] in Cl. 106 (example (11)) and Cl. 108. This may be the huge change of McDonald's discourse in responding to the criticism, compared with MD (1997).

5.1.3 MD (2006)

MD (2006) shows quite different patterns in appraisal from MD (1997) and MD (2003). While 82% of clauses in MD (1997), only 45% of clauses in MD (2006) are appraised. In MD (2006), Judgment is the most frequently used – which is the most significant change in MD – followed by Appreciation and Affect: 40%, 27% and 13%, respectively. Interestingly, there is no appraisal of Affect in relation to [CUSTOMERS] in MD (2006), while the appraisals for [CUSTOMERS] in MD (1997) and MD (2003) are dominated by Affect – especially in MD (1997) dominated only by Affect. Also, [FOOD] in MD (2006) is never appraised by Appreciation but rather by Judgment, while it is mainly evaluated with Appreciation in MD (1997) and MD (2003). Here, McDonald's may build the meanings for [FOOD] related to the issue of social sanction rather than its quality and value. Also, the appraisal of [WORKERS] shows some changes in MD (2006), in which [WORKERS] is implicitly appraised in terms of Affect.

(12)

'keep your eyes on the fries' (Cl. 8) || when we refer to the first challenge. (Cl. 9)

(13)

Clearly, we are keeping our eyes on our fries. (Cl. 54)

(14)

This involves maintaining fiscal discipline and tight controls on Company expenses... keeping a relentless focus on all details of our restaurant operations... understanding the changing needs of our customers and striving to be more relevant in their lives... and making the right investments in new products, equipment, technologies and other restaurant innovations [[to drive our business forward.]] (Cl. 15)

(15)

You'll see them in the ambiance of our restaurant designs... in the convenience of our extended hours of operations... in the efforts we are making to educate our customers regarding balanced, active lifestyles... and in the care [[we are taking to be a trusted, responsible company [[that does the right thing for our customers and our communities.]]]]] (Cl. 46)

(16)

Most important, you'll see them in the eyes of our employees, because of the training [[they receive]] and the opportunity [our System provides.]] (C47)

In example (12), the clausal expression *'keep your eyes on the fries'* leads the readers to implicitly evaluate [FOOD] which is the core business of McDonald's as positive in moral aspects (*t+Judgment: propriety*). Furthermore, in example (13), the moral evaluation on [FOOD] is more focused and convinced by the lexical item *'Clearly'* (*Graduation: focus*), which means that McDonald's keeps focusing on its core business to ensure that it makes more profits. Also, in the expression *'the right investments in new products, equipment, ...'* in example (14), McDonald's action of *'investments'* for [FOOD] is evaluated as positive in social esteem (*+Judgment: capacity*). More importantly and interestingly, another expression *'striving to be more relevant in their lives'* can be compared with *'responding to lifestyle issues'* in example (7) in MD (2003). Here, the nominalised process *'striving'* sounds more desperate to the lifestyle issues than the process *'responding'* in MD (2003). However, the lexical meaning of *'strive'* is *'to make effort to do something'*, but *'respond'* is *'to react'*. Therefore, McDonald's in MD (2006) seems to show only their efforts relevant to the issue of lifestyle rather than to react directly to the issue. The example (15) is rather complicated in appraisal relations. First of all, the thing for [CUSTOMERS] *'the right thing for our customers and our communities'* which is evaluated as positive (*+Appreciation: balance*) qualifies the company – *'a trusted, responsible company'* – which is again appraised as positive (*+Judgment: veracity*), and then qualifies the expressions *'the care'* which is positively appraised (*+Affect: secure*). That is, the action and the things for [CUSTOMERS] in McDonald's business practice qualify affections of McDonald's toward [CUSTOMERS] to be morally truthful. The example (16) shows one of the most significant changes in MD, in that while MD (1997) and MD (2003) consider [WORKERS] only as representative of McDonald's to serve [CUSTOMERS] with [FOOD] friendly and in speed, MD (2006) seems to recognize that [WORKERS] needs job training and opportunity. In the expression *'in the eyes of our employees'*, the core participant [WORKERS] is implicitly appraised with satisfied response (*t+Affect: satisfaction*) and this is more

clearly realized by the following expression *'because of the training they receive and the opportunity our System provides'* (Circumstance: cause: reason).

Again, unlike MD (1997) and MD (2003), MD (2006) explicitly mentions [WORKERS] in some clauses, such as in Cl. 47-53. In particular, through the text, McDonald's construes its belief that [WORKERS] who is satisfied by training and opportunities provided by the company attracts [CUSTOMERS] into the restaurants. Here, the metaphoric expression *'in the eyes of our employees'* (Circumstance: location:spatial) can be the evidence of workers' satisfaction (*t+Affect: satisfaction*). This results in strong intratextual relations between [CUSTOMERS] and [WORKERS] (Alliance:Strong) in MD (2006). However, the relation between [CUSTOMERS] and [FOOD] is less strong than in MD (1997) and MD (2003). It may be because embedding/embedded or circumstantial relation between [CUSTOMERS] and [FOOD] which may tie up the relation more strongly are not found in MD (2006). Rather, MD (2006) tries to construct new meanings on [FOOD] by building a close relation with McDonald's management, using the lexical items *'investment in new product'* and *'keeping our eyes on our fries'*, and also by changing the focus of the meanings on [CUSTOMERS] to new trend or lifestyle from the price or the tastes. For example, in example (14) and (15), McDonald's uses the expressions like *'the changing needs of our customers'* and *'to educate our customers regarding balanced, active lifestyles'*, in which [CUSTOMERS] is implicitly linked to [FOOD] from the aspect of new trend in food culture. Therefore, [FOOD] is not only depending on [CUSTOMERS] but also leading a new food culture by education in MD (2006). In this regard, although McDonald's builds the positive meaning in the DF of [FOOD] in the aspects of social sanction, the relation between the DFs of [FOOD] and [CUSTOMERS] becomes less strong than in MD (1997) and MD (2003) – Alliance:Medium. The relation between [FOOD] and [WORKERS] is still not found through MD, other than the ideological use of *'we'*.

Additionally, MD (2006) shows several distinctive features in terms of transitivity. First of all, in Cl. 44-47 (see Appendix), the readers are invited as Senser who witnesses the fundamentals of McDonald's (Phenomenon) including quality, service, cleanliness and value in some places (Circumstance: location:spatial), such as *'you'll see them in...'*. Then, McDonald's builds the meanings related to the core participants in the place of Circumstance. As a result, although MD (2006) does not appraise as frequently as MD (1997) does, it may still sound emotional, persuasive, promotional and evaluative, which is interpersonally oriented. The other distinctive feature is found in Cl. 15 (example (14) above). Here, Carrier (*'this'*) – representing the short- and long-term objectives in McDonald's – attributes four nominal groups as Attribute. In this relation, McDonald's seems to intensify the details of its short- and long-term objectives brought in nominal forms within one clause.

5.2 Greenpeace Discourse (GD)

Investigating GD will provide the chance for the study to look at how McDonald's maps the meaning relations with GD and changes its ideological relations, particularly through finding the intertextual relations in responding to the criticisms. The findings in the intratextual analysis in MD which we

have discussed above will be discussed in terms of intertextual relations in the following section. In terms of intertextual relations, the focus will be given more to the ideological changes in responding to its ideologically opposite discourse, GD. Therefore, GD should be discussed based on the three core participants and their intratextual relations.

Let us briefly discuss how the meanings on the core participants and their relations are built through the text. GD is very interpersonal meaning oriented, by criticizing McDonald's business practice with making the image of McDonald's harmful and wrongdoing. From a linguistic point of view, this might be from its frequent use of appraisals. Actually, 87% of clauses in GD are appraised while MD appraises 82% (1997), 49% (2003) and 45% (2006). In particular, in the appraised clauses, Judgment is the most frequently used followed by Appreciation and then by Affect, among the three types of attitudes in appraisal: 62%, 15% and 4%, respectively. This may reflect a distinctive feature in criticism genres, in which the meaning-making is built normally based on criticizing human behaviour in the aspects of social sanction and norm. Also, in terms of transitivity, while MD is most dominated by material process type, GD is most dominated by relational process type, then secondly by material type: 53% and 43%, respectively. This may mean that MD focuses mainly on their activities related to [CUSTOMERS], [FOOD] and [WORKERS], but GD focuses mainly on generalizing as "wrongdoing" business activities related to the DFs of the core participants and describing their state.

Through GD, the DF of [CUSTOMERS], representing 'children' and 'parents', is construed as a victim by the promotion of McDonald's to hide its reality behind the image of caring and fun in order to target children who may drag parents into the restaurant, and also by [FOOD] which is junk and unhealthy food to cause disease. The other core participant [WORKERS] is also a victim of McDonald's by having unequal power status relationship with McDonald's, which is realized by frequent use of modality of obligation – 'have to work' (Cl. 27), 'are forced to accept' (Cl. 29) and 're compelled to smile' (Cl. 30) – and by low wages without overtime rates. That is, the DF of [WORKERS] is connected with [CUSTOMERS] and [FOOD] by meaning of obligation, which means that [WORKERS] is forced to provide [CUSTOMERS] with [FOOD] with speed and friendliness but paid low wages even without overtime rates. However, the unequal power relations are caused by McDonald's not by [CUSTOMERS] or [FOOD], which a little weakens the relations. In this point, the DF of [WORKERS] has the intratextual relations with the DFs of [CUSTOMERS] and [FOOD] as Opposition:Medium. However, [FOOD] is criticized in the aspect of 'nutrition', criticizing ingredients and farming methods, which may cause disease or food poisoning. In this regard, [FOOD] is explicitly related to [CUSTOMERS] as the relation of Opposition:Strong .

The meanings, construed in MD and GD through the analysis so far, are briefly summarized in Figure 3, which may help find and understand the intertextual relations between MD and GD in the following section 5.3.

Figure 3. Semantic Realization

	MD 1997	MD 2003	MD 2006	GD

[CUSTO- MERS]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - targeting various consumer groups - targets to build Affect (e.g. <i>'happy'</i>) with low price, fast serving and better tasting food - powerful targets in decision making on food (e.g. <i>'the taste'</i> and <i>'the price'</i>) - targets to build affective relationship with McDonald's and workers (e.g. <i>'unique emotional bond'</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - targeting young adults, women and families as the key consumer group - considered as the boss who drives McDonald's business activities. - through "i'm lovin' it" campaign, McDonald's brings excitement from customers using contemporary look and sound. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - their needs are changing and McDonald's tries to meet them - McDonald's tries to educate customers on balanced, active lifestyles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - targeting children as a target consumer group - victims of McDonald's promotion to make a profit, lured with promotion - allured to drag parents - victims of McDonald's unhealthy food which causes disease
[FOOD]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - great food, hotter and fresher food with positive valuation - developed with better taste and low price, which customers want - focused on customers' desire - strong probability of engagement of McDonald's to build affect of satisfaction from customers - approached on managerial decision making level of McDonald's (e.g. <i>'new food preparation system'</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - focused on enhancing food tastes and developing new menus to cause happiness from customers - mentioning 'nutritional' issues in some way, using the expressions like <i>'safety and quality of our food'</i> - developing new menu items customers want 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - delivering outstanding experience to customers by keeping eyes on fries. - McDonald's is still based on their fundamentals – quality, service, cleanliness and value, which is related to safety and nutrition issues - meeting the changing needs of customers by high quality of core menu (e.g. hamburger and fries, Happy Meal choices and new premium salads and sandwiches) - making investment in new products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - junk food and unhealthy food with negative valuation - promoted as <i>'nutritious'</i> - causing some diseases to customers (e.g. hyperactivity, serious kidney failure) - criticized focused on customers' health
[WORK- ERS]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - representatives of McDonald's in the stores - implicitly responsible to provide high quality of service and food and to build Affect with customers in the stores - energized by McDonald's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - still representatives of McDonald's in the restaurants to provide highly evaluated service with speed, accuracy and friendliness to customers. - provided with hospitality training and measured their performance in restaurants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - McDonald's train and develop employees with spending more than \$1 billion a year. - a huge number of managers, operators and global senior management started the career from the crew position in McDonald's - contribute to bring the success of McDonald's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - victims who are exploited with low wages and long hour work without overtime rate payment - unequal power relations with McDonald's

5.3 Intertextual and Ideological Changes in MD

Based on the linguistic features and the meanings found from the previous sections on intratextual analysis, the following diagram (Figure 4) shows the intertextual relations of DFs between GD and MD, which are the most important findings in relation to the purpose of the study. The intertextual

relations, which are shown in the diagram, are the relations between the same participant as constructed in the different discourses, MD and GD, whereas the intratextual relations shown in the diagram Figure 2 in section 5.1 are the relations between different participants in the same discourse.

Figure 4. Intertextual Analysis : GD vs. MD

		<u>GD – MD(1997)</u>	<u>GD – MD(2003)</u>	<u>GD – MD(2006)</u>
[CUSTOMERS]	↔ [CUSTOMERS]	OPP:M	ALL:M	OPP:M
[FOOD]	↔ [FOOD]	OPP:M	ALL:W	ALL:W
[WORKERS]	↔ [WORKERS]	N/R	N/R	OPP:M

* ALL:S = Alliance:Strong, ALL:M = Alliance:Medium, ALL:W = Alliance:Weak
 OPP:S = Opposition:Strong, OPP:M = Opposition:Medium, OPP:W = Opposition:Weak

In terms of intertextual relations, McDonald's has significantly changed in its construction of intertextual meanings and patterns in DFs of core participants through the period between 1997 and 2006. Generally, in MD (1997), McDonald's does not respond to the criticisms. Considered from the social situation in 1997 when the McLibel case ended, McDonald's was faced by its damaged social images. Through MD (1997), its endeavour to overcome this matter can be realized by its frequent uses of modality - *e.g.* 'will' - (Cl. 21-29), by using present progressive tenses (Cl. 38-45) and also by hypotactic and paratactic relations between clauses which enhance cause and effect relations (Cl. 46-48 and Cl. 76-82). So to speak, in order to win the readers who may be potential customers as well as shareholders, suppliers and employees over to the company, McDonald's provides them with its vision of the future, states its works in progress and suggests solutions on its propositions in MD (1997). Here, to deal with the criticisms on exploiting children, McDonald's mainly emphasizes building emotional relationships with customers through promotional activities. It also emphasizes improving 'tastes', 'speed' and 'price' of its food without mentioning any nutritional issues to deal with the criticism directly. The resultant intertextual relations in the DFs of [FOOD] to [FOOD] and [CUSTOMERS] to [CUSTOMERS] are opposed, which proves McDonald's shows its arrogant attitudes in responding to the criticisms of GD.

Since 1997, McDonald's images had been tumbled into a down-market and unhealthy brand. A book titled 'Fast Food Nation: The Dark Side of the All American meal' was published in 2001, in which the author, Eric Schlosser, criticized American fast food culture. Also, a documentary film 'Super Size Me' which was starred and directed by Morgan Spurlock was released, proving the poor nutrition of McDonald's food and even becoming one of the nominees for 2004 Academic Award documentary film. To overcome its damaged brand image, in 2003, McDonald's launched its new promotional campaign with its slogan 'i'm lovin' it' and also its new 'Plans to Win' project. Through MD (2003), these two promotions are strongly focused on customers and food. The campaign 'i'm lovin' it' targets young adults, women and families with aiming at increasing sales by providing customers with excitement. McDonald's 'Plans to Win' also considers customers' experience

as the key for success. Here, in relation to the issue on customers, McDonald's responds to the criticism of GD in which McDonald's lures children into and parents are dragged by them, in two different ways. Firstly, in the DF of [CUSTOMERS] in MD (2003), customer is identified as 'boss', who is the focus of attention in McDonald's business, and also who has desire for safe products which fit his/her lifestyle. This realizes that McDonald's pays all attention on customers' voice, in order to build ideological relations with customers, on the one hand. McDonald's, on the other hand, constructs customers as agent in action, such as '*menu choice*' and '*physical activity*', in the DF of [CUSTOMERS]. That is, customers take the responsibility for their own decision on food choice to take care of their health themselves. However, secondly, McDonald's overtly responds to the criticism of GD by shifting its target customer group to '*young adults*', '*women*' and '*families*' from '*children*' in its new campaign, constructing the intertextual relations in alliance. Therefore, the intertextual relation of [CUSTOMERS] to [CUSTOMERS] between MD (2003) and GD can be defined as in Alliance: Medium. In relation to the issue on food, through MD (2003), although there is no overt agreement with GD in which [FOOD] is constructed as '*junk*' or '*poisonous*', there are some covert agreements found because McDonald's makes connection to the nutritional issues by improving the safety and the quality with developing new menu. Also, McDonald's seems to recognize the problem of its food, realized in reconstruction of [FOOD] by connecting to the term '*lifestyle*'. As a result, the intertextual relationship could be defined as Alliance:Weak, in that, although it could be in opposition because of absence of the overt agreements with the criticism, McDonald's compromises with the criticism of GD by the covert agreements.

In MD (2006), McDonald's seems to persuade readers to trust the company, realized in some clauses which are constructed on the same transitivity structure. For instance, McDonald's invites readers using '*you*' as Sensor who witnesses the fundamentals of McDonald's (as Phenomenon), including '*quality*', '*services*', '*cleanliness*' and '*value*' (Cl. 43-47). This is one of the most significant changes in MD between 1997 and 2006. That is, while, in MD (1997), McDonald's focuses on building emotional social relationships with constructing itself as Actor of business activity, it focuses mainly on building trustworthy relationships by inviting readers as Sensor to witness its business activities in MD (2006). This causes the change of the intertextual relationship between [CUSTOMERS] in MD (2006) and [CUSTOMERS] in GD, which comes to opposition, with no overt and covert responses to the issue of exploiting children. Rather McDonald's strengthens the relationship between the company and customers by emphasizing moral aspects of its efforts to focus on the core business – such as '*making the right investments ...*' (Cl. 15), '*a trusted, responsible company that does the right thing for our customers and our communities*' (Cl. 46), and '*Clearly, we are keeping our eyes on our fires*' (Cl. 54). Here, it also responds to the nutritional issue covertly by the engagement with the new salads and sandwiches evolving to meet customer's needs, which constructs the intertextual relationship in alliance. Another significant change is that while McDonald's in MD (1997) and MD (2003) does not make any comments on the issue of workers to deal with the criticism in which McDonald's workers are portrayed as victims under pressure from the company with low wages, it constructs its strong

relationship with the workers through MD (2006). However, McDonald's in MD (2006) opposes to the criticism because it only emphasizes that huge numbers of senior managers and restaurant managers started their careers as crew members of the restaurant. That is, McDonald's builds a sense of comradeship between the manager groups and the restaurant workers with constructing the trustworthy relationship with readers as well as workers in MD (2006). This effort to build the positive relationship with workers is also realized in that McDonald's strongly connects customers to the training and opportunity of workers.

Through the years from 1997 to 2006, in relation to the title or the term for customers, MD shows some ideological changes. For instance, MD (1997) is most dominated by the pronoun *'they'*, but MD (2003) is by *'customers'* except possessive pronoun *'their'*, then MD (2006) is dominated by the pronoun *'you'*. Here, McDonald's constructs the customers mainly as the target of selling their products in MD (1997) and MD (2003). However, in MD (2006), it focuses on reinforcing the solidarity with them by including the customers within the pronoun *'you'*, which narrows social distance between the company and the customers.

6. Conclusion

Through the study, we have seen how McDonald's discourse has been shaped and changed while it is responding to the social criticisms, to construct its social image, identity and relationships. Generally, MD does not directly attack or respond to the criticisms. Rather, it responds indirectly with creating different meanings and social relationships from different perspectives from the criticisms. For instance, in 2003 and in 2006, by placing a term *'lifestyle'* as the centre of its campaign, McDonald's reconstructs the social relationships and the meanings of customers and food, which was already mentioned in the previous sections (5.1.2, 5.1.3, and 5.3). This is, also, one of the huge changes in McDonald's discourse, compared with its arrogant responses to the criticisms in 1997 by emphasizing only the tastes and value of its food and the emotional relationship with customers.

In conclusion, in terms of ideological changes in McDonald's discourse in dealing with the criticisms, the study reveals that McDonald's has sought to recover its damaged brand image through constructing strong relationships with customers and their needs by connecting to new social terms or phenomena (e.g. *'lifestyle'* and *'customers' desire for safe products'*), rather than through directly responding to the criticisms. Furthermore, in constructing the relationships, it has used different ideological strategies with turning its attention from mainly its products and customers into new social and cultural matters and issues. Here, the criticisms seem to have triggered off the issues on fastfood business practices to the level of society, to force the fastfood companies to respond to the social voices on the issues in the end.

References

- Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Day, S. (2003). After Years at Top, McDonald's Strives To Regain Ground. *The New York Times (NYT)* (3/Mar/2003)
- Eggs, S. and Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London and NY: Cassell
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Matthiessen, C. (1999). *Construing Experience through Meaning: A Language-based Approach to Cognition*. London: Cassell
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (1998). Exploring Corporate Rhetoric: Metadiscourse in the CEO's Letter. *The Journal of Business Communication*, Volume 35, Number 2, April, p224-245.
- Martin, J.R., Matthiessen, C. and Painter, C. (1997). *Working with Functional Grammar*. New York: St. Martin's Press
- Martin, J.R. and Rose, D. (2000). *Working with Discourse: Meaning beyond the Clause*. London: Continuum
- McAndrew, J. (2001). *Intertextuality, Heteroglossia and Systemic Functional Linguistics: A framework for Analyzing Ideology*. Ph.D. Thesis. Sydney: Macquarie University, NCELTR.
- McAndrew, J. (2004). Towards a framework for analyzing ideology: Applying intertextuality, heteroglossia and systemic functional linguistics. In M. Putz, J. Aerselaer and T. van Dijk (eds.), *Communicating Ideologies: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Language, Discourse, and Social Practice*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Revelli, L. (2000). Getting started with functional analysis of texts. In L. Unsworth (ed.), *Researching Language in Schools and Communities: Functional Linguistic Perspectives*. London: Cassell.
- Ritzer, G. (2002). *The McDonaldization of Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Spurlock, M. (Director) (2004). *Super Size Me* [DVD].
- Schlosser, E. (2001). *Fastfood Nation : What the All-American Meal is Doing to the World*. London: Allen Lane.

Text (Data)

- What's Wrong with McDonald's? (1986)
<http://www.mcspotlight.org/campaigns/current/wwwmd-us.pdf>
- CEO's Letter to Shareholders (1997)
http://www.mcdonalds.com/corp/invest/pub/annual_rpt_archives/1997_annual.RowPar.0003.ContentPar.0001.ColumnPar.0002.File.tmp/ltrshare.pdf
- CEO's Letter to Shareholders (2003)
http://www.mcdonalds.com/corp/invest/pub/annual_rpt_archives.html
- CEO'S Letter to Shareholders (2006)
http://www.mcdonalds.com/corp/invest/pub/2006_Annual_Report.html

Appendix. – Text Analysis (GD 1986, MD 1997, 2003, 2006)

GD

Cl. No	Appraisal		Transitivity			Clauses
	Type	Appraised	Main Part'nt	Process Type	Circumstances	
[CUSTOMERS]						
1			Actor [Mc]	Material	Location:temporal Location:spatial	McDonald's spend over \$1.8 billion every year worldwide on advertising and promotions,
2	t-Judgement +Appreciation	McDonald's Company & place	(Actor) [Mc]	Material		trying to cultivate an image of being a 'caring' and 'green' company [[that is also a <i>fun</i> place [[to eat.]]]]
3	t-Judgement	McDonald's	Goal [C]	Material	Manner:means	Children are lured in << >> with the promise of toys and other gimmicks
4			(Actor) [C]	Material	Location:spatial	<< (dragging their parents behind them) >>
5	t+Appreciation t-Judgement	Ronald McDonald McDonald's	Attribute [Mc]	Rel:Attr		But behind the <i>smiling face</i> of Ronald McDonald lies the reality –
6	t-Judgement Grad.:focus	McDonald's	Token [Mc]	Rel:Id		McDonald's <i>only</i> interest is money,
7	t-Judgement	McDonald's	(Actor) [Mc]	Material	Location:spatial Manner:comparison	making profits from whoever and whatever [[they can]], just like all multinational companies.
[FOOD]						
11	-Appreciation t-Judgement	Food McDonald's	(Actor) [Mc]	Material		PROMOTING <i>UNHEALTHY</i> FOOD
12			Actor [Mc]	Material	Role:guise	McDonald's promote their food as 'nutritious',
13	-Appreciation	food	Token	Rel:Id		but the reality is that [[it is <i>junk</i> food – high in fat, sugar and salt, and low in fibre and vitamins.]]
14	-Judgement	A diet of this food	Carrier [F]	Rel:Attr		A diet of this type is linked with a <i>greater risk</i> of heart disease, cancer, diabetes and other diseases.
15			Carrier [F]	Rel:Attr		Their food also contains many chemical additives,
16			Carrier [F]	Rel:Attr	Location:spatial	some of which may cause ill-health, and hyperactivity in children.
17				Mental		Don't forget too
18	t-Judgement	Meat	Token [F]	Rel:Id		that meat is the cause of the majority of food poisoning incidents.
19	t-Judgement	McDonald's	Carrier [Mc]	Rel:Attr	Location:temporal Cause:reason Location:spatial	In 1991 McDonald's were responsible for an outbreak of food poisoning in the UK,
20			Carrier [C]	Rel:Attr	Location:spatial	in which people suffered serious kidney failure.
21	t-Judgement	Modern intensive farming methods	Carrier	Rel:Attr	Cause:reason	With modern intensive farming methods, other diseases – [[<i>linked to chemical residues or unnatural practices</i>]] – have become a danger to people too (such as BSE).
[WORKERS]						
22	-Judgement	McDonald's	(Actor) [Mc]	Material		EXPLOITING WORKERS
23	Grad.: focus t-Judgement	Wages McDonald's	Recipient [W]	Material		Workers in the fast food industry are paid <i>low</i> wages.
24	t-Judgement	McDonald's	Actor [Mc]	Material		McDonald's do not pay overtime rates
25	Grad.: focus		Actor [W]	Material	Extent:temporal	even when employees work very long hours.
26	-Affect	workers	Carrier [W]	Rel:Attr		<i>Pressure</i> [[to keep profits high and wage costs low]] results in understaffing,
27	t-Judgement		Actor [W]	Material	Manner:quality	so staff have to work harder and faster.

28	Grad.:focus		Carrier	Rel:Attr	Cause:reason	As a consequence, accidents (particularly burns) are common.
29	t-Judgement		Carrier [W]	Rel:Attr		The majority of employees are people [[who have few job options and so are forced to accept this exploitation]],
30	t-Judgement		Actor [W]	Material		and they're compelled to 'smile' too!
31	Grad.: focus		Carrier [W]	Rel:Attr		Not surprisingly staff turnover at McDonald's is high,
32			(Attributor)	Rel:Attr		making it virtually impossible [[to unionise and fight for a better deal.]]
33			Carrier	Rel:Attr		which suits McDonald's [[who have always been opposed to Unions.]]

MD 1997

Cl. No	Appraisal		Transitivity			Clauses	Relevant CP
	Type	Appraised	Main Parti'nt	Pr. Type	Cir.		
< TEXT 1 >							
19	+Judgement +Appreciation	restaurant operations	Token [Mc]	Rel:Id		Our first <i>priority</i> is to <i>improve</i> restaurant operations.	[F] [W]
20	+Appreciation	gap	(Actor) [Mc]	Material		To create a <i>meaningful</i> gap [between McDonald's and the competition,]	
21	Grad.:Force(high)		Actor [Mc]	Material		we <i>must excel</i> .	
22	+Appreciation	(McDonald's)	Token [Mc]	Rel:Id		We <i>must be the best</i> .	
23	+Appreciation	food, tasting [F]	Actor [Mc]	Material		We'll make <i>hotter, fresher</i> food [[that's <i>better</i> tasting.]]	[F]
24	+Appreciation t+Affect	Service [W] [C]	Actor [Mc]	Material	Manner:quality	We'll serve customers <i>faster</i> ,	[C] [W] [F]
25	Grad.:focus		(Behavior) [Mc]	Behav'ral		(we'll) make <i>sure</i>	
26	t+ Appreciation		Actor [C]	Material		they get what <i>[[they ordered,]]</i>	[C] [F]
27	+Affect	[W]	(Carrier) [W]	Rel:Attr		and be <i>friendlier</i>	[C] [W]
28			(Actor) [W]	Material		while doing it.	[W]
29	+Appreciation	our restaurants [F]	Attributor [Mc]	Rel:Attr		We'll make our restaurants <i>more appealing</i> .	[W] [F]
30	+Judgement	step	Actor [Mc]	Material		We've already taken an <i>important</i> step -	
31	+Appreciation	Food [F]	Actor [Mc]	Material		we've developed a new food preparation system [[that makes it easier to serve <i>great</i> food at the speed of McDonald's.]]	[F] [W]
< TEXT 2 >							
32	+Judgement		Token [Mc]	Rel:Id		Our second <i>priority</i> is to re-open the value gap.	[F]
33	+Appreciation	Prices [F]	Senser [Mc]	Mental		We want <i>the best</i> prices [for customers,]	[F] [C]
34			Senser [Mc]	Mental		but we also want	
35	+Affect	[C]	Senser [C]	Mental		them to <i>enjoy</i> the total experience.	[C] [F] [W]
36			Carrier	Rel:Attr:po		This has many facets;	
37	+Appreciation	Food tastes [F]	Token [F]	Rel:Id		and <i>important</i> one is food tastes.	[F]
38			Behaver [Mc]	Behav'ral		So, we're looking at our menu	[F]
39	Grad.:Force(high)		(Actor) [Mc]	Behav'ral		to make <i>sure</i>	
40	t+Appreciation	the taste [F]	Carrier [F]	Rel:Attr:poss		it has the taste <i>[[you want at a price [[you want to pay.]]]</i>	[F] [C]
41	+Appreciation	emotional bond [C]	Actor [Mc]	Material	Manner:means	We're emphasizing the <i>unique</i> emotional bond [[we have with customers]] through a new U.S. advertising campaign.	[C]
42			Actor [Mc]	Material	Manner:means	We're also encouraging visits through more local advertising [[which addresses individual market needs.]]	[C]
< TEXT 3 >							
43	+Judgement Grad.: force(high)		Token [Mc]	Rel:Id		Our last and <i>most important priority</i> is people.	[C] [W]

44	t+Appreciation		Actor [Mc]	Material		We're <i>strengthening relationships</i> [with our franchisees]	[C]
45			(Actor) [Mc]	Material		energizing employees.	[W]
46			Actor [Mc]	Material		We've started	
47			(Actor) [Mc]	Material		by reorganizing the U.S. business.	
48	t+Affect	[C]	(Actor) [Mc]	Material	Loc.:spatial	bringing management and decision-making <i>closer to customers and franchisees</i> .	[C]
< TEXT 4 >							
75	+Appreciation	strategies	Carrier [Mc]	Rel:Attr		Our strategies [internationally] are <i>simple</i> .	
76	+Affect +Appreciation	Customers [C] restaurant operations [F] [W]	(Attributor) [Mc]	Rel:Attr	Manner:means	Make customers <i>happy</i> with everyday low prices and <i>outstanding</i> restaurant operations	[C] [F] [W]
77	+Judgement		Actor [C]	Material		so they visit <i>more frequently</i> .	[C]
78			(Actor) [Mc]	Material		Increase market share	
79	+Affect	[C]	(Actor) [Mc]	Material	Manner:quality	by <i>attracting</i> more customers more often.	[C]
80			(Actor) [Mc]	Material		And, increase profitability	
81	+Judgement	McDonald's	(Carrier) [Mc]	Rel:Attr		by being <i>more efficient</i>	[W]
82			(Actor) [Mc]	Material		and creating economies of scale.	

MD 2003

Cl. No	Appraisal		Transitivity			Clause	Relevant CP
	Type	Appraised	Main Part'nt	Process Type	Circumstance		
<TEXT 1>							
6			Behaver	Behav'ral		As you will recall,	
7	Grad.:focus	need	Carrier [Mc]	Rel:Attr		our business was in <i>serious</i> need of improvement	
8			Token	Rel:Id		When I became Chairman and CEO at the beginning of 2003.	
9			Sayer	Verbal	Location:temporal	I said back then	
10	t-Judgement	[Mc]	Agent [Mc]	Material		<i>that we had taken our eyes off our fries,</i>	[F]
11			Actor [Mc]	Material		And we paid a price	
12	-Affect	Customers [C]	Actor [Mc]	Material		Our performance had <i>disappointed</i> our customers, our shareholders and ourselves.	[F][C]
<TEXT 2>							
21	+Appreciation	change	Carrier	Rel:Attr		Credit [for this <i>remarkable</i> change in such a short time] is shared among our dedicated owner/operators, our suppliers and our employees	[W]
22	Grad: Force(H)		Actor [Mc] [W]	Material		- they exceeded our expectations.	[W]
< TEXT 3 >							
25			Sayer [Mc]	Verbal	Location:temporal	<i>In 2003, we promised</i>	
26			Actor [Mc]	Material		<i>That we would redefine our approach to growth...</i>	
27			Actor [Mc]	Material		And we delivered	
28			(Actor) [Mc]	Material	Location: spatial	By focusing on [[adding more customers to existing restaurants, [[rather than just adding more restaurants to our System.]]]	[C]
29	Grad.:force(H)	cultural change	Token	Rel:Id		This meant a <i>remarkable</i> cultural change [after 48 years]	
30			(Actor) [Mc]	Material		- learning to grow	
31	t+Judgement	(McDonald's)	(Carrier) [Mc]	Rel:Attr		<i>by being better,</i>	[F]
32			(Carrier) [Mc]	Rel:Attr		Rather than being bigger.	
33			We [Mc]	Material	Manner:degree	We reduced capital expenditures by \$700 million	
34			(Actor) [Mc]	Material		To reflect our strategic shift.	

35			Actor [Mc]	Material		We narrowed our non-McDonald's brand activity,	
36	t+Judgement	[C]	Actor [Mc]	Material	Location: spatial	<i>And we focused our attention on our customers.</i>	[C]
37	+Appreciation	Operation [F] [W]	Agent [Mc]	Rel:Attr		Most important, we made operations <i>excellence</i>	[F][W]
38			(Agent) [Mc]	Rel:Attr		and marketing leadership the cornerstones of everything [[we did last year.]]	
39	+Judgement	Impact our customers or .. [C]	Actor	Material		If an initiative didn't <i>positively</i> impact our customers or our restaurants,	[C]
40			Carrier	Rel:Attr		it wasn't on our agenda.	
41			Assigner:[Mc]	Rel:Id		We called this "clearing the decks,"	
42	Grad. : focus	Focus and discipline	Actor	Material		which produced <i>much-needed</i> focus and discipline.	
< TEXT 4 >							
50	+Appreciation	way	Actor [campaign]	Material	Manner:means	unprecedented worldwide "i'm lovin' it" campaign – with its contemporary look and sound – has connected with customers in a <i>powerful</i> way.	[C]
51	+Affect	(campaign) [C]	Actor [campaign]	Material		It has created <i>excitement</i> .	[C]
52			Actor [campaign]	Material		It is driving increased sales.	
53	+Appreciation	(sale)	Actor [campaign]	Material	Location: spatial	And it is bringing the <i>magic</i> back to McDonald's marketing.	
54			Inducer [campaign]	Mental	Manner: quality Matter	"i'm lovin' it" has helped us to think differently about [[how we present ourselves to customers,]]	[C]
55	+Appreciation	approach	Actor [Mc]	Material		and we'll continue to use this <i>creative</i> approach	
56	Grad.:Focus	Customer segments [C]	(Actor) [Mc]	Material		to build relevance with our <i>key</i> customer segments.	[C]
57			Actor [Mc]	Material		"i'm lovin' it" targets young adults, women and families –	[C]
58	+Affect		Carrier [Mc]	Rel:Attr		and we're <i>proud</i>	
59			Token [campaign]	Rel:Id		that the campaign was ranked one of the five best of 2003 by <i>The Wall Street Journal</i> .	
< TEXT 5 >							
60			Sayer [Mc]	Verbal		<i>We also promised</i>	
61	+Appreciation	Restaurant operations [F] [W]	Actor [Mc]	Material		<i>that we would improve our restaurant operations ...</i>	[F] [W]
62			Actor [Mc]	Material		and we are making progress [on a variety of fronts.]	
63	+Appreciation	Food taste attributes [F]	Actor [Mc]	Material		We are <i>improving</i> our food taste attributes	[F]
64	+Affect	new menu items [F] [C]	(Actor) [Mc]	Material		and adding new menu items [[that our customers <i>want</i> .]]	[F] [C]
65			Actor [Mc]	Material	Manner: quality Acc...comitative	We are working closely with our owner/operators	
66	+Appreciation	the efficiency and effectiveness of our restaurants	(Actor) [Mc]	Material		to <i>improve</i> the efficiency and effectiveness of our restaurants.	[W]
67			Actor [Mc]	Material	Acc.:comitative	We're working with our suppliers	
68			(Actor) [Mc]	Material		to identify production and sourcing efficiencies [worldwide.]	[F]
69			Actor [Mc]	Material	Location: spatial	And we're measuring our results in every restaurant	
70			Actor [Mc]	Material	Manner: quality Location: spatial	to help us improve even further in the future.	
71			Goal [Mc]	Material		All of our activities are being driven by our customers,	[C]
72			Senser [Mc]	Mental		because we know	
73			Token [C]	Rel:Id		the customer is our boss.	[C]
< TEXT 6 >							
94			Goal [Mc]	Material	Acc.:comitative	Our entire System is aligned with our plan [to do just that – McDonald's Plan to Win.]	
95	+Appreciation -Appreciation	Goals Drivers of our customers' experiences [C]	Token [Plan to Win]	Rel:Id		This Plan contains <i>aggressive</i> goals and measures [for success] [based on the <i>critical</i> drivers of our customers' experiences – people, products, price, place and promotion.]	[C] [F] [W]
96			Goal [Mc]	Material		McDonald's performance is not driven by one product or one initiative.	[F]

97			Carrier	Rel:Attr		Our long-term success will result from executing and innovating [in each of our business drivers.]	
98	Grad.: focus	Restaurant operations [F] [W]	(Actor) [Mc]	Material	Location:temporal	To strengthen restaurant operations in 2004,	[F] [W]
99			Actor [Mc]	Material		we are marshalling our resources	
100	+Appreciation t+Affect	Impact on the speed, accuracy and friendliness of our service Our service [W] [C]	(Actor) [Mc]	Material		to make a <i>significant, positive</i> impact on the speed, accuracy and <i>friendliness</i> of our service.	[W]
101			Actor	Material		This includes providing our people with more hospitality training	[W]
102	t+Judgement	Measuring our operational performance [W]	(Actor)	Material		and <i>rigorously</i> measuring our operational performance.	[W]
103	+Appreciation	Our overall customer experience [C]	Actor [Mc]	Material		We will also <i>enhance</i> our overall customer experience	[C]
104			(Actor) [Mc]	Material		by continuing to reinvest in existing restaurants.	
105	+Appreciation	Food taste [F]	Value [F]	Rel:Id		<i>Enhancing</i> food taste, adding variety and extending value menus to more markets will remain priorities as well.	[F]
106	+Affect +Appreciation	Our customers' desire [C] Products [F]	Senser [Mc]	Mental		We also <i>appreciate</i> our customers' desire for <i>safe</i> products [[that fit within their lifestyles.]]	[C] [F]
107			Actor [Mc]	Material		So we will continue to play a leadership role	
108	T+Judgement	[F]	Behaver [Mc]	Behav'ral		<i>assuring the safety and quality of our food.</i>	[F]
109	+Appreciation	Menu choice, physical activity and education [F] [C]	Actor [Mc]	Material	Acc: comitative	Additionally, we are responding to lifestyle issues with an initiative [[that focuses on three <i>important</i> areas: menu choice, physical activity and education.]]	[F] [C]

MD 2006

Cl. No	Appraisal		Transitivity			Clause	Relevant CP
	Type	Appraised	Main Part'nts	Pr. Type	Circumstance		
< TEXT 1 >							
7			Sayer [Mc]	Verbal	Location:Spatial	At McDonald's, we say	
8	t+Judgement	[F]	Attributor [Mc]	Rel:Attr		"keep your eyes on the fries"	[F]
9			Sayer [Mc]	Verbal	Location:temporal	when we refer to the first challenge,	
10	+Appreciation	Experience [C]	Token	Rel:Id	Extent:frequency	which is to deliver a consistently <i>outstanding</i> experience to the 52 million customers [[who visit McDonald's]] every single day.	[C]
11			Behaver [Mc]	Behavior		And when we consider the long-term realities of our business,	
12			Attributor [Mc]	Rel:Attr		we <i>must</i> "keep the innovation pipeline filled."	
13			Token	Rel:Id		This is McDonald's short-hand [for the long-term research, planning and development [[required to maintain our historic leadership in the highly competitive restaurant business.]]]	
14			Value	Rel:Id	Accomp.: comitative	It is my responsibility, along with the senior leadership team, to strike an effective balance between these immediate and long-term objectives.	
15	+Judgement	Investments [F]	Carrier	Rel:Attr	Location:spatial	This involves maintaining fiscal discipline and tight controls on Company expenses... keeping a relentless focus on all details of our restaurant operations... understanding the changing needs of our customers and striving to be more relevant in their lives... and making the <i>right</i> investments in new products, equipment, technologies and other restaurant innovations [[to drive our business forward.]]	[F] [W] [C]
< TEXT 2 >							
16	+Affect		Carrier [Mc]	Rel:Attr	Role:guise	As Chief Executive Officer, I am <i>proud</i> [[to report that since early 2003,]]	
17			Actor [Mc]	Material		when we announced comprehensive plans [[to revitalize our business]]	
18			(Actor) [Mc]	Material		and initiated our Plan to Win,	

19	+Appreciation	That balance	Actor [Mc]	Material		we have struck that balance [<i>better</i> than at any time in our history.]	
20			Carrier [Mc]	Rel:Attr		Our success has been a total System effort,	
21			Actor [Mc] [W]	Material		with McDonald's owner/operators, Company employees and suppliers aligning	[W]
22	Grad: focus	[F] [C]	(Actor) [Mc] & [W]	Material	Extent:frequency Manner:means	<i>fully</i> to serve more customers, more often, more profitably than ever before.	[C] [W]
< TEXT 3 >							
40	Grad.:focus		Carrier [Mc]	Rel:Attr		<i>Clearly</i> , we are remaining <i>true</i> [to the heritage of our founder Ray Kroc.]	
41			Actor [Mc]	Material	Location: temporal	More than a half century ago, he established the fundamentals of the McDonald's formula [for success] -quality, service, cleanliness and value.	[F] [W] [C]
42			Actor	Material	Role:guise	These same fundamentals now serve as the cornerstones of our Plan to Win.	
43			Actor	Material	Location:spatial	Wherever you go in the McDonald's System, to any of our 31,000 restaurants worldwide,	
44			Senser	Mental	Location:spatial Cause:purpose	you will see them at work for our customers.	[C]
45	t+Judgement	[F]	Senser	Mental	Location:spatial	<i>You'll see them in the quality of our core menu</i> [– from classic McDonald's hamburgers and French fries... to Happy Meal choices... to our new premium salads and sandwiches –] [[45.1 // 45.2]]	[F] [C]
45.1			Actor [Mc]	Material		always evolving	
45.2	t+Judgement	[F]	Actor [Mc]	Material		to meet the changing needs of our customers.	
46	+Judgement	Company [C]	Senser	Mental	Location:spatial	You'll see them in the ambiance of our restaurant designs... in the convenience of our extended hours of operations... in the efforts we are making to educate our customers regarding balanced, active lifestyles... and in the <i>care</i> [[we are taking to be a <i>trusted, responsible</i> company [[that does the <i>right</i> thing for our customers and our communities.]]]]	[C] [F] [W]
47	t+Affect	[W]	Senser	Mental	Location:spatial Cause:reason	Most important, you'll see them <i>in the eyes of our employees</i> , because of the training [[they receive]] and the opportunity [[our System provides.]]	[W]
48			Actor [Mc]	Material	Extent:duration	The McDonald's System spends more than \$1 billion a year	
49			(Actor) [Mc]	Material		to train and develop our people,	[W]
50	+Appreciation	customer service [C]	Actor	Material		and this is paying off in <i>improved</i> customer service scores.	[C] [W]
51			Actor	Material	Role:guise	Moreover, 67,000 restaurant managers worldwide, 1,200 U.S. owner/operators, and 40% of our global senior management – << >> – began our careers as crew members.	[W]
52						<< myself included >>	
53	+Appreciation	Testament, Training and opportunity [W]	Carrier	Rel:Attr		This is a <i>remarkable</i> testament [to McDonald's belief [[that <i>great</i> training and <i>great</i> opportunity are flip sides of the same coin.]]	[W]
54	Grad.: Focus t+Judgement	[F] [F]	Actor [Mc]	Material		<i>Clearly</i> , we are keeping our eyes on our fries.	[F]