

JOLANTA ŁĄCKA-BADURA
University of Economics, Katowice

‘NOMINATIONS AND APPLICATIONS INVITED’ – TEXTUAL CONVENTIONS OF ACADEMIC DISCOURSE REFLECTED IN ACADEMIC JOB ADS

This paper aims at investigating whether the linguistic strategies and features generally attributed to academic discourse are reflected in the texts of online academic job postings, and if so, to what degree such elements make academic job ads different from their corporate counterparts. This corpus-based study focuses on job advertisements understood as samples of written academic and corporate discourses. The function that academic job postings perform for academic communities may be considered parallel to the role that recruitment ads announcing business-related positions play in corporate communities. This functional homogeneity is reflected in numerous similarities between the textual strategies used in both sub-corpora. The more ‘academic’ character of academic job postings manifests itself primarily through a higher degree of grammatical formality, and limited use of the personal voice and explicit persuasion.

1. Textual conventions and features of academic discourse

The concept of ‘discourse’, often characterized as complex and ambiguous (see e.g. van Dijk 1997; Miczka 2002), might be defined in general terms as “talk and text in context” (van Dijk 1997: 3). This paper will be concerned with the study of a corpus comprising texts representing two fields of discourse: ‘employment discourse’ understood as a component of the wider field of ‘institutional/business discourse’, and ‘academic discourse’. ‘Business discourse’, which originated from the concept of ‘professional language’, is founded on the notions of discourse as ‘situated action’ and of ‘language at work’ (Bargiela-Ciappini *et al.* 2007); it is understood as being “all about how people communicate using talk or writing in commercial organizations in order to get their work done” (ibid: 3)

As regards the notion of ‘academic discourse’, there is a great deal of debate concerning its very existence and distinction from other types of specialist dis-

courses (see e.g. Zamel 1998, Butler 2006), and even more discussion contesting the obligation to comply with traditionally understood norms and textual conventions of academic writing typical of Anglophone discourse communities (see e.g. Swales 1997; Benesch 2001; Butler 2006). Yet many EAP researchers invariably claim that, despite significant differences among the varieties and conventions of academic discourse depending on discipline, a set of textual features recurring in texts produced by scholars across academic disciplines, i.e. a 'general' academic type of language, might be identified (see e.g. Jordan 1997; Hyland 2006).

Having acknowledged the voices that question the uniformity of academic English, Lyda proposes a picture of academic language as

language situated in the context of academic community, continuously modified by its use and modifying the context to perform actions aiming at the attainment of the goals of the community by means of conventionalized forms of communication operating within the community. (2007: 37)

As this paper does not aspire to contribute to the above mentioned debate, nor does it aim to discuss the sensitive issues related to the undisputed hegemony of the Anglophone conventions in academic writing, it appears reasonable to assume for the purposes of this study that academic discourse is a reality, and its certain recurring patterns and structures make it distinct from other types of discourse.

Among the most prominent features of broadly understood academic written texts, the one mentioned most frequently by EAP researchers is (after Bhatia 1993; Jordan 1997; Hinkel 2004; Hyland 2006; Macpherson 2008; Osuchowska and Kleparski 2009) the relatively high degree of formality and objectivity/ neutrality achieved through e.g.:

- high lexical density
- use of formal vocabulary and high nominal style
- frequent use of passive sentences and avoidance of grammatical structures considered informal (e.g. contractions, direct questions, exclamations)
- hedges
- impersonal voice (avoidance of first and second person pronouns, limited use of other features of engagement)
- avoidance of other (explicit) means of persuasion

The textual features of 'general' academic discourse listed above have been adopted as the criteria for the contrastive analysis of corporate recruitment advertisements and academic job postings to be presented in the following parts of this paper.

2. Corporate and academic job postings

Corporate job advertising is one of the methods used by employers in the recruitment process which "involves seeking and attracting a pool of people from which qualified candidates for job vacancies can be chosen" (Byars and Rue

2000: 150). In the times of growing competition and ever-higher demand for efficiency, recruiting the right people for company vacancies is considered by many HR managers "a top priority" (ibid.: 150). Companies may seek to fill a particular position internally (from among the existing employees), or externally, i.e. outside the organization, for example through job advertising in various media, employment agencies, employee leasing companies, corporate websites, employee referrals, unsolicited applications, campus recruiting (ibid.: 152-156).

Recruiting in the academic context seems to have, at least from the point of view of the management of educational institutions, a similar aim: to gain access to the most valuable candidates, attract their attention and encourage them to apply. Universities and colleges, similarly to corporations, also recruit internally (from among the institution's present faculty), or externally, for example through scholarly associations and academic networking, as well as advertise academic vacancies on institutional websites, academic job search websites, in journals and newspapers, both printed and online, devoted to higher education (see Heiberger and Vick 2001).

Comparing academic and corporate recruitment practices appears to be a justified endeavour, all the more that there are voices among both academic career advisors and scholars that speak of 'marketization' of tertiary education (Heiberger and Vick 2001), as well as 'marketization' and 'commodification' of university discourse (Fairclough 1995). "Institutions of higher education come increasingly to operate (under government pressure) as if they were ordinary businesses competing to sell their products to consumers" (ibid.: 141). Enders and Musselin (2008), analyzing recent trends and future projections for higher education in the 21st century, claim that boundaries between academia and "other sectors and stakeholders in society" are increasingly blurred; "the introduction of staff management techniques in universities (...) has been expanded and led some authors to conclude that academics are becoming 'managed professionals'" (ibid.: 133).

Thus it seems reasonable to assume that in both corporate and academic recruitment advertising employers seek to "attract the attention of the best candidates who may not even be seeking another role, while not raising false expectations and allowing a healthy amount of self-selection" (Secord 2003: 354); notwithstanding, similarly to corporate job advertisements which are also meant to project a positive image of the organization on the job market (ibid.), the additional role of academic job postings is probably to build or reinforce the reputation and credibility of educational institutions.

In the opinion of a large proportion of employers using job ads in the recruitment process, the Internet, despite its limitations, appears to be the optimal medium for vacancy advertising, primarily due to broad (international) reach, relatively low costs, and fast transfer of data (Stone *et al.* 2005; Byars and Rue 2000). Those factors have contributed to the selection of Internet job sites as the source of the corpus analyzed in the present study.

3. Methodology

A contrastive analysis of a corpus comprising corporate and academic job postings has been conducted for the purposes of this paper. The corpus consists of 50 academic job postings placed on 2 academic job sites (www.jobs.ac.uk and www.academiccareers.com), as well as 50 recruitment ads inviting applications for various business-related positions, found in the Internet editions of 2 major newspapers (the Daily Telegraph and the New York Times). The job advertisements were retrieved in the period from 15 July 2010 to 5 February 2011.

To enhance objectivity and ensure greater comparability of data, both the corporations and tertiary education institutions which placed the advertisements can be considered ‘Anglophone’; moreover, all of the corporate job vacancies selected for the analysis require that candidates are educated to a degree level, allowing for the positions in the whole corpus to be roughly regarded as ‘well educated’ and ‘highly professional’.

The research tools used to compare the two sets of texts are the following:

- **text statistics** (including average text length, average sentence and word length, lexical density and text readability)
- **text structure analysis** following Swales’ move-step model, where a ‘move’ is understood as “discoursal or rhetorical unit that performs a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse” (Swales 2004: 228)
- **analysis of formality and neutrality indicators** (including methods of building credibility and patterns of engagement, use of the Passive and nominalization, absence of contractions, limited use of persuasive mechanisms)
- comparison of the corpus lexemes against the Academic Word List.

4. Comparison of academic job postings and corporate recruitment ads

4.1. Text statistics

The basic statistical data, i.e. the number of words and sentences, the average sentence length, the number of paragraphs and text readability have been calculated using the Microsoft Office – Word 2007. The Text Content Analysis Tool at <http://www.usingenglish.com/resources/text-statistics.php> has been used to calculate lexical density. Table 1 summarizes the statistics:

Table 1. Basic statistical data of CJAs and AJAs

	CJAs*	AJAs**
Number of words	19356	17816
Number of sentences	780	707
Average sentence length	19.8	20.5
Number of paragraphs	1133	947
Average number of paragraphs/ad	22.7	18.9
Flesch Reading Ease	25.1	19.9
Flesch Kinkaid Grade Level	14.4	15.1
Lexical density	71.1%	66.7%

* CJAs: Corporate Job Advertisements

** AJAs: Academic Job Advertisements

With regard to the number of words and sentences, as well as the average sentence length, CJAs and AJAs turn out to be quite similar; AJAs comprise a lower number of words, sentences and paragraphs, the difference however is probably not significant enough to allow any conclusive interpretation. Lexical density (i.e. the relation of lexical words to total words) is almost identical in both sub-corpora; together with the readability indices, it demonstrates that both CJAs and AJAs may undoubtedly be regarded as very difficult and demanding, best understood by university graduates. This may be attributed, at least partially, to the high level of text condensation in both academic and professional corporate recruitment advertisements, as well as the abundance of specialized vocabulary in both sub-corpora, characteristic of academic and occupational discourse.

4.2. Structural analysis

For the purposes of the study, the move structure framework (see e.g. Swales 1990; Bhatia 1993) has been adopted to analyze the structural patterns in the corpus. A detailed analysis of the move-step structure would go beyond the scope of this paper, thus the structural patterns will be examined only in general terms. Accordingly, the order in which the moves identified appear in particular job ads in the corpus will not be accounted for, all the more so that it shows a great deal of diversity, and the moves often intermingle and overlap, making them difficult to separate.

The content of both corporate and academic job advertisements is likely to include the following building blocks: the job title/ faculty position, information about the organization, description of the job and responsibilities it entails, the qualifications and experience that candidates are expected to demonstrate, an outline of the remuneration and extra benefits, instructions for responding to the

ad and, in some cases, an Equal Employment Opportunity statement. Besides, all of the online postings analyzed begin with a highlighted heading specifying the name of the job title, in most ads followed by a brief job description including the job title (repeated), job status/category, location, reference number, date of application, the name of employer/university, sometimes the remuneration package/range (in a various order). For the purposes of the present study, this section has been marked as MOVE 0 since, apart from the reference to remuneration and benefits, it seems to play the role of a sub-heading, and does not contribute to the analysis of the differences between academic and non-academic job postings. On the other hand, the inclusion of details concerning the salary and benefits (specified or described either in the sub-heading OR in the main body of a job advertisement) appears to be of a great significance for the study and thus will be accounted for in the move-analysis. The Equal Employment Opportunity statement (marked as 2*) has been interpreted as a step in the move presenting the company/institution, as it seems to play a considerable role in creating an employer's profile and positive image.

The following common structural framework of the job advertisements analyzed has been identified:

- MOVE 0 Heading and introductory job description ('sub-heading')
- MOVE 1 Announcing the availability of a position (optionally: BASIC information about the vacancy)
- MOVE 2 Presenting the company/institution
- MOVE 3 Specifying job responsibilities and requirements
- MOVE 4 Offering benefits
- MOVE 5 Inviting applications/Instructing candidates how to apply

The distribution of the moves identified in the corpus is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of moves in two sub-corpora of job ads (2 x 50 ads)

MOVES		CJAs		AJAs	
Move 0 Heading and short job description		50	100%	50	100%
Move 1 Announcing (explicitly) the availability of a position		33	66%	43	86%
Move 2 Presenting the company/ institution		47	94%	32	64%
2* EEO statement		6	12%	30	60%
Move 3 Specifying job responsibilities and requirements		50	100%	50	100%

MOVES		CJAs		AJAs	
Move 4 Offering benefits:	ONLY salary (specified)	26	12%	17	34%
	Total JAs with salary specified	28	56%	19	38%
	Benefits (including salary specified)	3 22	44%	2	4%
	Benefits (salary not specified)	16	32%	8	16%
	Benefits (with or without salary specified)	38	76%	10	20%
	TOTAL JAs offering benefits	44	88%	27	54%
Move 5 Inviting applications/ Instructing candidates how to apply		41	82%	50	100%

As can be seen from the above breakdown of moves in the two sub-corpora, Move 0 and Move 3 are present in all the texts analyzed, which seems to validate the claim that those two moves are obligatory in recruitment advertisements. CJAs and AJAs are quite comparable in terms of the occurrence of Move 1 and Move 5; it might however be concluded that AJAs are slightly more explicit, informative and precise in announcing the vacancy and instructing candidates how to apply, OR that the application procedures for higher education institutions are more complicated and thus require more explanation/instruction. More significant differences occur with regard to the presence of Moves 2 and 4; they may be interpreted as follows:

- 1) CJAs seem to be more focused on promoting the potential employers than AJAs
- 2) although discriminative employment practices are forbidden by law, and the absence of the EEO statement in the majority of CJAs does not mean that employers do not respect employment legislation, yet the fact that the majority (60%) of AJAs (compared to only 12% of CJAs) include such a statement may indicate that colleges and universities wish to emphasize that non-discrimination policy has become an integral and highly valued aspect of academic culture.
- 3) although a higher percentage of CJAs specify the amount of salary (56% versus 38% AJAs), yet AJAs seem to be more precise, objective and neutral with regard to the benefits offered to potential candidates: a strikingly lower percentage of AJAs promise ‘attractive compensation packages’, ‘excellent

benefits’, ‘exciting opportunities’ (20% versus 76% CJAs); overall, CJAs resort to promising more frequently than AJAs. The persuasive aspect of both sub-corpora will be discussed in more detail in section 4.3.5.

4.3.1. Formality and neutrality indicators

As proposed in section 3, relatively high formality and neutrality are among the most prominent features of academic discourse. Apart from lexical density calculated in 4.1, other formality and neutrality indicators analyzed comprise: formal vocabulary, use of hedges, avoidance of informal grammatical structures, impersonal voice and explicit persuasion.

4.3.1.1. Vocabulary

Due to the limited scope of this study, the investigation and interpretation of lexical patterns in CJAs and AJAs are only cursory. The vocabulary used in the sub-corpora has been analysed by means of

- 1) identifying the most frequently used lexemes
- 2) comparing the most frequently occurring lexemes with the Academic Word List.

Table 3 on the next page summarizes the 50 most frequently used lexemes in both sub-corpora.

As Table 3 demonstrates, the most frequently used lexemes clearly reflect the contexts of both sub-corpora; items such as *job, experience, project, development, team, business, products, company*, are closely related to the corporate environment; on the other hand, it is far from surprising that lexemes such as *research, university, college, teaching, faculty, programme, academic*, are prevalent in AJAs. It also seems entirely reasonable that the CJA list comprises the notions of *customers, clients, employers, employees, managers*, while the AJA results include ‘parallel’ notions of *students, undergraduates, faculties, professors, assistants*. The dissimilarities may not plausibly be attributed to AJAs reflecting features of academic language and CJAs being the mirror of corporate discourse. They should rather be explained as due to both sub-corpora referring to separate areas of professional activity. Moreover, 15 of the most frequently used lexemes (30%) appear in BOTH CJAs and AJAs, apparently indicating that the core lexicons of both sub-corpora demonstrate significant similarities, probably identifiable in ALL job advertisements.

The lexemes found in both sub-corpora have also been compared with the high-incidence lexical items compiled by A. Coxhead in the Academic World List (see e.g. Gillett *et al.*, 2009). The lexemes whose occurrence frequency in the CJAs and AJAs is above or equals 5 are listed in Table 4, along with the total number of AWL lexemes and the percentage of AWL items present in respective sub-corpora.

Table 3. 50 most frequently used lexemes in CJAs and AJAs

50 MOST FREQUENTLY USED LEXEMES (number of occurrences)			
CJAs		AJAs	
1. job * (162)	25. time (54)	1. research (148)	26. opportunity (44)
2. experience (159)	26. software (52)	2. university (144)	27. education (43)
3. project (94)	27. opportunity (51)	3. college (135)	28. online (43)
4. year (93)	28. now (50)	4. application (132)	29. area (44)
5. development (91)	29. email (49)	5. teaching (97)	30. degree (44)
6. company (89)	30. client (48)	6. position (91)	31. date (44)
7. team (89)	31. system (47)	7. candidate (84)	32. require (41)
8. business (88)	32. benefit (47)	8. faculty (81)	33. school (40)
9. products (88)	33. program (46)	9. program (78)	34. business (40)
10. manager (83)	34. including (45)	10. academic (77)	35. letter (40)
11. management (82)	35. strong (45)	11. student (75)	36. undergraduate (37)
12. work (79)	36. industry (44)	12. department (71)	37. study (37)
13. require (75)	37. position (44)	13. please (69)	38. include (37)
14. salary (75)	38. design (43)	14. information (63)	39. accounting (36)
15. skill (69)	39. market (42)	15. apply (63)	40. post (35)
16. new (65)	40. manage (41)	16. job (62)	41. requirement (34)
17. level (63)	41. knowledge (41)	17. science (62)	42. qualification (33)
18. service (63)	42. process (41)	18. management (55)	43. process (33)
19. candidate (63)	43. account (41)	19. applicant (50)	44. work (33)
20. customer (57)	44. full (41)	20. development (49)	45. instruction (32)
21. career (57)	45. technical (39)	21. professor (49)	46. discipline (32)
22. marketing (55)	46. please (38)	22. assistant (48)	47. interest (32)
23. role (55)	47. register (37)	23. successful (47)	48. new (32)
24. location (54)	48. employee (37)	24. references (47)	49. demonstrate (31)
	49. develop (37)	25. level (46)	50. graduate (31)
	50. abilities (36)		

* **Bold** type indicates words which appear among the 50 most frequent instances in BOTH sub-corpora

Table 4. AWL lexemes in CJAs and AJAs

AWL LEXEMES (frequency ≥ 5 occurrences)	
CJAs	AJAs
<p><i>access*</i>(20), <i>achieve</i>(11), <i>acquisition</i>(5), <i>administrative</i>(7), <i>analyze</i>(14), <i>analysis</i>(16), <i>analyst</i>(5), <i>analytical</i>(10), <i>appropriate</i>(5), <i>area</i>(23), <i>aspect</i>(5), <i>assign</i>(7), <i>assignment</i>(5), <i>assist</i>(10), <i>assistance</i>(6), <i>benefit</i>(47), <i>capability</i>(14), <i>category</i>(20), <i>challenge</i>(10), <i>challenging</i>(7), <i>channel</i>(5), <i>code</i>(11), <i>collaboration</i>(7), <i>commission</i>(6), <i>communication</i>(29), <i>community</i>(28), <i>compensation</i>(7), <i>complex</i>(14), <i>computer</i>(10), <i>construction</i>(5), <i>consultant</i>(25), <i>consult</i>(17), <i>contract</i>(10), <i>contribute</i>(9), <i>coordinate</i>(5), <i>consultant</i>(26), <i>corporate</i>(17), <i>creative</i>(12), <i>culture</i>(5), <i>data</i>(15), <i>define</i>(10), <i>demonstrate</i>(7), <i>design</i>(43), <i>diverse</i>(9), <i>document</i>(10), <i>emerge</i>(5), <i>ensure</i>(19), <i>environment</i>(27), <i>establish</i>(18), <i>evaluation</i>(5), <i>expertise</i>(18), <i>exposure</i>(6), <i>external</i>(5), <i>facilitate</i>(5), <i>financial</i>(12), <i>focus</i>(13), <i>foundation</i>(9), <i>funds</i>(8), <i>generation</i>(6), <i>grant</i>(5), <i>identify</i>(11), <i>image</i>(8), <i>impact</i>(8), <i>implementation</i>(13), <i>implement</i>(16), <i>improvement</i>(11), <i>individual</i>(17), <i>infrastructure</i>(6), <i>initiative</i>(11), <i>innovation</i>(14), <i>innovative</i>(9), <i>institution</i>(7), <i>integrate</i>(6), <i>intelligence</i>(8), <i>interaction</i>(10), <i>interactive</i>(19), <i>internal</i>(12), <i>investment</i>(5), <i>issue</i>(11), <i>job</i>(162), <i>legal</i>(28), <i>locate</i>(6), <i>location</i>(56), <i>maintain</i>(15), <i>major</i>(10), <i>media</i>(14), <i>method</i>(5), <i>methodology</i>(6), <i>minimum</i>(7), <i>monitor</i>(7), <i>motivate</i>(7), <i>network</i>(6), <i>networking</i>(12), <i>outcome</i>(5), <i>overall</i>(6), <i>participate</i>(10), <i>partner</i>(25), <i>plus</i>(26), <i>policy</i>(10), <i>previous</i>(7), <i>priority</i>(7), <i>procedure</i>(6), <i>process</i>(41), <i>processing</i>(10), <i>professional</i>(38), <i>project</i>(94), <i>range</i>(24), <i>region</i>(10), <i>regional</i>(8), <i>register</i>(55), <i>relevant</i>(8), <i>require</i>(75), <i>requirement</i>(31), <i>research</i>(20), <i>resources</i>(14), <i>revenue</i>(10),</p>	<p><i>academic</i>(77), <i>access</i>(5), <i>administration</i>(5), <i>administrative</i>(11), <i>analysis</i>(7), <i>annum</i>(14), <i>appropriate</i>(23), <i>approximately</i>(8), <i>area</i>(44), <i>assessment</i>(6), <i>available</i>(25), <i>benefits</i>(10), <i>capacity</i>(6), <i>challenge</i>(6), <i>classical</i>(11), <i>code</i>(5), <i>commitment</i>(14), <i>committed</i>(17), <i>communication</i>(18), <i>comprise</i>(6), <i>computational</i>(7), <i>contact</i>(10), <i>contribute</i>(23), <i>contribution</i>(5), <i>creative</i>(15), <i>criteria</i>(7), <i>cultural</i>(10), <i>demonstrate</i>(31), <i>design</i>(25), <i>diverse</i>(7), <i>diversity</i>(17), <i>dynamic</i>(5), <i>economic</i>(8), <i>economics</i>(16), <i>economy</i>(5), <i>emerge</i>(5), <i>enhance</i>(7), <i>ensure</i>(7), <i>environment</i>(31), <i>establish</i>(9), <i>evaluation</i>(5), <i>evidence</i>(8), <i>expanding</i>(6), <i>expertise</i>(17), <i>external</i>(6), <i>facilities</i>(8), <i>fee</i>(5), <i>field</i>(25), <i>finance</i>(12), <i>financial</i>(6), <i>focus</i>(6), <i>grade</i>(9), <i>identify</i>(7), <i>impact</i>(7), <i>individual</i>(17), <i>innovation</i>(6), <i>innovative</i>(11), <i>institute</i>(19), <i>institution</i>(13), <i>instruction</i>(32), <i>instructor</i>(15), <i>intellectual</i>(8), <i>involve</i>(6), <i>issue</i>(7), <i>job</i>(62), <i>liberal</i>(9), <i>locate</i>(9), <i>medical</i>(8), <i>minimum</i>(10), <i>minority</i>(11), <i>obtain</i>(5), <i>participate</i>(12), <i>period</i>(8), <i>physical</i>(6), <i>policy</i>(10), <i>potential</i>(10), <i>primary</i>(7), <i>prior</i>(5), <i>process</i>(33), <i>professional</i>(33), <i>project</i>(12), <i>publication</i>(7), <i>range</i>(16), <i>relevant</i>(14), <i>require</i>(41), <i>requirement</i>(34), <i>research</i>(148), <i>resources</i>(7), <i>role</i>(11), <i>sector</i>(12), <i>security</i>(16), <i>select</i>(8), <i>significant</i>(5), <i>site</i>(5), <i>strategy</i>(13), <i>submit</i>(23), <i>sustainability</i>(5), <i>team</i>(12), <i>technology</i>(19), <i>terminal</i>(5), <i>transfer</i>(5), <i>vision</i>(5)</p>

<i>role</i> (55), <i>scheme</i> (7), <i>sector</i> (16), <i>security</i> (27), <i>seek</i> (16), <i>select</i> (5), <i>significant</i> (8), <i>site</i> (11), <i>solution</i> (20), <i>specific</i> (9), <i>specification</i> (5), <i>status</i> (9), <i>strategic</i> (19), <i>strategy</i> (27), <i>submit</i> (5), <i>summary</i> (15), <i>target</i> (8), <i>task</i> (98), <i>team</i> (89), <i>technical</i> (39), <i>technique</i> (6), <i>technology</i> (33), <i>temporary</i> (7), <i>variety</i> (8)	
--	--

* **Bold** type indicates AWL items which appear in BOTH sub-corpora (occurrence frequency ≥ 5)

TOTAL NUMBER OF DIFFERENT AWL LEXEMES IN BOTH SUBCORPORA	
CJAs	AJAs
434	411

TOTAL NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES OF AWL LEXEMES (% of the TOTAL NUMBER OF WORDS in both sub-corpora)	
CJAs	AJAs
2672 (13.81%)	2035 (11.43%)

Both the percentage and variety of AWL lexemes are slightly higher in CJAs, with 434 different lexemes and 13.81% of AWL items in the sub-corpus, compared with 411 AWL lexemes and 11.43% of AWL items in AJAs. As many as 54 of the AWL lexemes identified in AJAs (almost 54% of the lexemes whose occurrence frequency is ≥ 5) are also present in CJAs, some of them with very similar frequency of occurrence (e.g. *creative*, *diverse*, *emerge*, *environment*, *evaluation*, *expertise*, *external*, *impact*, *individual*, *innovative*, *locate*, *minimum*, *participate*, *policy*, *professional*, *requirement*). The greatest dissimilarities in the occurrence frequency of the AWL items common to both sub-corpora may again be attributed to both sets of job advertisements referring to separate areas of professional activity rather than reflecting academic or non-academic discourse (e.g. *job*, *team* showing considerably higher frequency in CJAs, as opposed to *research* which occurs over 7 times more frequently in AJAs). An analysis of the AWL items which are exclusive to each sub-corpus appears to confirm the above explanation (e.g. lexemes such as *academic*, *field*, *grade*, *institute*, *publication* are present ONLY in AJAs, whereas items such as *construction*, *networking*, *partner*, *revenue*, *specification*, *task* have been found ONLY in CJAs).

However general and superficial the above analysis may be, it nonetheless seems to demonstrate that, as far as the occurrence of AWL items in both sub-corpora is concerned, AJAs cannot plausibly be regarded as more ‘academic’ than CJAs.

4.3.1.2 Hedges

Taking into account the fact that the communicative functions of academic texts (which normally provide the material for analyzing hedges in academic discourse) and job advertisements differ considerably, as well as acknowledging the multitude and ambiguity of hedging strategies in academic discourse (see e.g. Meyer 1997; Resche 2000), it should be noted that a thorough analysis of all the forms and functions of hedging in the sub-corpora studied would probably go far beyond the scope of this paper. Therefore it will be limited to the most general and obvious instances, with a view to demonstrating overall similarities and differences between CJAs and AJAs.

The hedging structures listed in Table 5 below are most probably used with a view to creating an impression of objectivity and neutrality. They seem to act as ‘shields’ covering employers against the risk of being criticised for presenting themselves in excessively/unjustifiably positive terms, providing untrue/imprecise information, or promising something that may not be fulfilled. For example:

- (1) *Peninsula Medical School, within the Peninsula College of Medicine and Dentistry, is **widely regarded** as the strongest of the new medical schools in the UK. (AJA26)¹*
- (2) ***We think** it's because we are doing something that has never been done before. (CJA44)*
- (3) *Preference **may be given to** applicants with interests in one or more of the following: ... (AJA25)*
- (4) *Salary is competitive and teaching is **relatively light**. (AJA9)*

On the other hand, some of the hedges imply that the scope of job responsibilities may turn out to be broader than that specified in the advertisement:

Table 5. Hedges in CJAs and AJAs

Instances of structures functioning as hedges		in CJAs	Number/% of CJAs	in AJAs	Number/% of CJAs
Nouns	possibility	1	1 (2%)	1	1 (2%)
Adjectives	possible	--	--	1	1 (2%)
	likely	--	--	1	1 (2%)

¹ A complete list of the CJAs and AJAs analyzed in this study is provided in Appendix 1.

Instances of structures functioning as hedges		in CJAs	Number/% of CJAs	in AJAs	Number/% of CJAs
Adverbs	probably	--	--	1	1 (2%)
	generally	1	1 (2%)	--	--
	virtually	1	1 (2%)	1	1 (2%)
	relatively	--	--	1	1 (2%)
	specially/especially	1	1 (2%)	4	3 (6%)
	particularly	5	4 (8%)	8	8 (16%)
	preferably	9	9 (18%)	4	4 (8%)
	almost	--	--	1	1 (2%)
	approximately	--	--	8	6 (12%)
Verbal structures	try to..	--		1	1 (2%)
	(We) tend to..	--		1	1 (2%)
	(We) think that ...	1	1 (2%)	--	
	(We are) recognized	4	4 (8%)	1	1 (2%)
	(We are) regarded as	--		1	1 (2%)
	(are) not limited to	1	1 (2%)	6	4 (8%)
Grammar and syntax	may	5	5 (5%)	6	4 (8%)
	might	--		2	2 (4%)
	can	4	4 (4%)	5	5 (10%)
	could	2	2 (4%)	--	
	would	16	9 (18%)	14	10 (20%)
	but	8	8 (8%)	17	10 (20%)
	although/though	2	1 (2%)	2	2 (4%)
	however	2	2 (4%)	4	4 (8%)
	while	1	1 (2%)	1	1 (2%)
	one of ...	10	10 (20%)	11	11 (22%)
	some	11	10 (20%)	3	3 (6%)
Total number of instances of hedging/ number and percentage of JAs comprising hedges		85	39 (78%)	106	37 (74%)

- (5) *Duties and Responsibilities include, **but are not limited to** the following: (...)*
(AJA21)

Other instances demonstrate that the hedging devices used in CJAs and AJAs perform a role inherent to the communicative purpose of job advertising, i.e. encouraging the best candidates and discouraging those unsuitable for the position announced, but at the same time imply that valuable candidates may be considered even if they do not meet all the requirements specified.

- (6) *All qualified candidates are encouraged to apply; **however**, Canadians and permanent residents will be given priority.* (AJA6)
(7) ***Some** preference will be given to individuals in the broad area of analysis and who have the potential to contribute to interdisciplinary offerings, **however** exceptionally strong candidates in all areas will be considered.* (AJA7)

Another reason for resorting to hedging strategies is that of politeness and diplomacy, for example:

- (8) ***While we thank all applicants in advance for their interest** please note that only applicants selected for an interview will be contacted* (AJA20)

The above cursory analysis of hedges used in both sub-corpora indicates that AJAs seem to demonstrate a slightly more cautious and diplomatic approach than CJAs. The difference however does not appear to be sufficiently salient to justify a conclusion that academic job postings make use of hedging strategies to a significantly higher degree than corporate recruitment ads.

4.3.1.3 Grammatical markers of formality

The Microsoft Office Word 2007 has been used to calculate the percentage of passive sentences used in both sub-corpora; the corpus has also been scanned for the presence of nominalized forms. The frequency of occurrence of such informal grammatical structures as contractions, direct questions and exclamations has also been examined. The results are summarized in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6. Passive sentences and in CJAs and AJAs

	CJAs	AJAs
Percentage of passive sentences in sub-corpora	6%	18%
Number/percentage of JAs using passive sentences	33 (66%)	44 (88%)

Table 6 indicates that, with regard to the use of passive sentences as a criterion of formality, AJAs appear to be considerably more formal than CJAs. While the proportion of AJAs including passive sentences is 22 percentage points higher than CJAs, the percentage of the total of passive sentences used in the academic sub-corpus is triple compared to corporate recruitment ads.

Nominalized structures are used most frequently in sections referring to position requirements and job descriptions in both sub-corpora, for example:

(9) *Experience with the **investigation and evaluation** of advanced technologies and their **applicability** to help satisfy operational **capability gaps**. (CJA39)*

Table 7. Nominalizations in CJAs and AJAs

		CJAs	AJAs
Number and percentage of JAs using nominalized forms		50 (100%)	50 (100%)
Number and percentage of JAs with occurrence frequency of nominalized forms	>10	30 (60%)	28 (56%)
	6 – 10	16 (32%)	20 (40%)
	≤5	4 (8%)	2 (4%)

As can be seen in Table 7, the percentage of CJAs and AJAs in which the occurrence frequency of nominalized forms exceeds the level of 10 is very similar; small differences can be observed for lower occurrence frequencies, with a slightly higher number of AJAs using 6-9 nominalizations, and a somewhat larger proportion of CJAs comprising fewer than 6 nominalized forms. It should nonetheless be emphasized that both sub-corpora demonstrate a similarly significant degree of nominalization, which seems to result from the highly condensed nature of recruitment advertisements as such, rather than from the ‘academic’ character of the job postings analysed.

A greater dissimilarity between the two sub-corpora can be found with regard to the presence of informal grammatical structures, as illustrated in Table 8.

Table 8. Occurrence of informal grammatical structures in CJAs and AJAs

		CJAs	No/ % of CJAs	AJAs	No/ % of AJAs
Contractions	We’re	7	5 (10%)	1	1 (2%)
	You’ll	21	6 (12%)	0	--
	You’d	1	1 (2%)	0	--
Direct questions		30	13 (26%)	2	2 (4%)
Exclamations		17	9 (18%)	0	--

Table 8 demonstrates that AJAs appear to be considerably less tolerant of grammatical informality than CJAs; instances of contractions, direct questions and exclamations are extremely rare in AJAs, whereas CJAs comprise a comparatively higher degree of grammatical informality. Direct questions and exclamations clearly perform a persuasive function, which will be discussed in more detail in section 4.3.1.5.

4.3.1.4 *Impersonal voice*

Although the convention of using impersonal rather than personal voice, regarded as contributing to the neutrality and objectivity of academic discourse, is frequently overlooked by academic writers and seems to be increasingly discussed, if not challenged, by EAP researchers (see e.g. Benesch 2001, Butler 2006), yet many scholars, especially in science and engineering, tend to suppress the personal voice in their writing; the more extensive use of first-person pronouns in the humanities and social sciences might possibly be perceived as serving “promotional and interactional purposes” (Hyland 2006: 52). Following the assumption that emphasis on ‘solidarity’ and ‘inclusion’ through the use of first- and second-person pronouns should be avoided in academic writing, ways of addressing candidates have been calculated for both sub-corpora. Table 9 summarizes the results of the calculation.

Table 9. Percentage of CJAs and AJAs using personal pronouns as terms of address²

Number/Percentage of JAs using different terms of address	CJAs		AJAs	
	YOU/your	20	40%	4
MIXED (you + impersonal)	21	42%	18	36%
IMPERSONAL	9	18%	28	56%
WE/our/us	31	62%	19	38%

The analysis of the ways of referring to employers and addressing candidates suggests that the personal voice in CJAs is present to a higher degree than in AJAs. While the percentage of ads making use of BOTH personal and impersonal terms of address is roughly similar in both sub-corpora, the use of first-person references to employers and direct references to candidates is considerably higher

² Only structures using the pronoun YOU/YOUR have been covered in the YOU category; Imperatives such as ‘Apply here’ used at the end of a job ad have been excluded from the calculation (they are most probably generated automatically by the website)

in CJAs than in AJAs (62% vs 38%, and 40% vs 8%, respectively). The findings may justify the conclusion that the addressers' voice in academic job postings is more impersonal than in corporate recruitment ads, and thus the former project an image of greater neutrality and objectivity, generally attributed to academic discourse.

4.3.1.5 Avoidance of explicit persuasion

Beside the use of first- and, in particular, second-person pronouns employed to address readers directly and thus create the impression of inclusion and familiarity, other textual features of engagement as indicated by Ravelli and Ellis (2004) comprise asking direct questions, making suggestions, using directives (e.g. imperatives, obligation modals) and references to shared knowledge. Those strategies are used to "pull readers along or position them, focusing their attention, recognizing their uncertainties, including them as discourse participants and guiding them to interpretations"(ibid.: 6). Similarly to the role they play in corporate advertising discourse, directives and interrogatives used in job ads are clearly meant to perform persuasive and promotional functions.

As shown in Table 8, AJAs comprise considerably fewer instances of direct questions than CJAs (2 vs 30, respectively). Only one of the questions identified in AJAs is of a persuasive/encouraging nature:

(10) Are you interested in a change or a new challenge? (AJA44)

By contrast, ALL of the 30 interrogatives found in CJAs are of highly persuasive character, and clearly perform a function identical to the role that questions play in product and service advertisements, i.e. projecting the positive image of the addressers, promising benefits to the addressees, or (in job ads) mixing promises with requirements. For example:

(11) Are you looking for a great opportunity where you can make your mark and money? (CJA4)

(12) Do you have 3-4 years Project management experience? Do you fancy a new challenge?(CJA18)

Apart from the instances mentioned, exclamations (used in 18% of CJAs and absent in AJAs) invite applications, instruct candidates how to apply, express employers' values and attitudes, emphasize job requirements, or perform the acts of boasting, for example:

(13) You will be working with an award winning team and the projects you will be overseeing are the best of the best! (CJA18)

(14) Respond here! (CJA40)

(15) We enjoy our work and we'll be the first to admit it! (CJA44)

Other utterances encouraging candidates to apply comprise directives expressed through imperatives and obligation modals, or (indirectly) through representatives, for instance:³

(16) *This role is closing very soon so please get your details over today to be considered. (CJA18)*

(17) *Now that you have read this far, it is time to submit an online application at www...*

Click on Careers and see what your potential possibilities are along with more detailed information about our company. (CJA40)

Such encouragements, typical of product and service advertisements, are absent in the sub-corpus of AJAs; found in 15 CJAs (30%), they indicate that the degree of persuasiveness in the latter is higher than in academic job postings.

On the other hand, slogans (also inherent to product and service advertisements), however rare in both sub-corpora, are slightly more frequent in AJAs; they are used in 3 academic job postings and only 1 corporate recruitment ad:

(31) *Sell for the Best! (CJA46)*

(32) *Dispensing and enhancing patient care in the 21st century (AJA30)*

(33) *Voluing People (AJA39)*

(34) *Excellence through diversity (AJA50)*

Beside the exclamations, direct questions, invitations/encouragements and slogans discussed above, textual mechanisms of persuasion occur with greatest frequency and intensity in Moves 2 and 4 in both sub-corpora, i.e. in the sections referring to employers' self-presentation, and promising benefits to selected candidates, respectively. As has been indicated in 4.2, the occurrence of the two moves (especially Move 4) is significantly higher in CJAs, and this alone suggests that AJAs appear to be less persuasive and promotional than CJAs. A multitude of explicit and implicit means of persuasion identified in the above mentioned moves certainly deserves a more profound analysis; as this study aims at providing a general view of textual mechanisms in CJAs and AJAs, and focuses on features of academic discourse in which avoidance or limited use of explicit persuasion are recommended, only a brief mention is made here of employers' persuasive strategies of boasting and promising. Table 10 roughly summarizes the presence of persuasive utterances in Moves 2 and 4.

³ As this section aims at discussing means of persuasion used in both sub-corpora, imperatives and obligation modals used as polite instructions (e.g. To apply, please send your CV using/Interested candidates should e-mail their CV...) are excluded from the analysis.

Table 10. Persuasion in MOVES 2 and 4

		CJAs	AJAs
SELF- PRESENTATION		47 (94%)	32 (64%)
	neutral	1 (2%)	3 (6%)
	persuasive (boasting)	46 (92%)	29 (58%)
BENEFITS		44 (88%)	27 (54%)
	neutral (salary ONLY)	6 (12%)	17 (34%)
	persuasive (promising)	38 (76%)	10 (20%)

The findings indicate that, with regard to employers' self-presentation and the benefits offered to candidates, CJAs resort to persuasive strategies considerably more frequently than AJAs. 58% of AJAs comprise the acts of boasting, as opposed to 92% of CJAs; the difference between the percentage of AJAs and CJAs promising benefits (other than the specified amount of salary) turns out to be even more impressive (20% and 76%, respectively).

Overall, the limited and cursory analysis of persuasive mechanisms in both sub-corpora seems to indicate that, in case of AJAs, the principle of avoiding explicit persuasion, although far from being fully respected, is reflected to a significantly higher degree than in business-related recruitment ads. Even though such a difference may result from a variety of factors exceeding the scope of this study, yet academic and corporate discourse strategies most probably contribute to the level of persuasion in both sub-corpora.

5. Conclusions

The foregoing discussion has attempted to examine whether textual strategies and patterns generally attributed to academic discourse are reflected in the texts of online academic job postings, and to what degree such features make academic job ads different from corporate recruitment advertisements addressed to well-educated candidates. The analysis reveals compelling similarities between the two sub-corpora in terms of basic text statistics, the formality and complexity of the vocabulary used, as well as a remarkably high degree of text condensation resulting in frequent occurrence of nominalized structures. AJAs seem to demonstrate only a slightly higher level of caution and neutrality achieved through more frequent occurrence of hedging devices. On the other hand, corporate recruitment ads appear to make greater use of informal grammatical structures such as contractions, direct questions and exclamations. The most significant differences between the two sub-corpora can be observed with regard to the terms of address and means of persuasion used to encourage candidates. The impersonal voice, generally attributed to academic discourse, is significantly more

present in AJAs. Academic job postings also seem to be more neutral and objective in terms of considerably less frequent use of explicit persuasion, especially in sections referring to employers' self-presentation, and promising benefits to future employees.

All things considered, it may be concluded from the above analysis that academic job postings indeed, to certain extent, reflect some of the conventions and patterns commonly associated with academic texts, the standard of neutrality in particular. Nonetheless, both sub-corpora demonstrate a remarkably high degree of formality, reflecting, beside other (extra-linguistic) considerations, the formal character of academic and corporate discourses.

Appendix 1

CORPORATE JOB ADVERTISEMENTS

CJA	JOB TITLE	EMPLOYER	WEBSITE	ACCESSED
CJA1	Account/Project Manager – Promotional Marketing	Three people (R)*	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA2	Account manager	Admiralty	www.telegraph.co.uk	15 July, 2010
CJA3	Brand proposition manager	Admiralty	www.telegraph.co.uk	15 July, 2010
CJA4	Business Development manager	A&L leisure Limited	www.telegraph.co.uk	1 August, 2010
CJA5	Category Development and Innovation Director	The Body Shop International plc	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA6	European PR and Marketing Manager	Nigel Wright Recruitment (R)	www.telegraph.co.uk	15 July, 2010
CJA7	Ferrous Metallurgists	TWI	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA8	Field Sales Consultants	Keystage (R)	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA9	Head of Partner Solutions	Admiralty	www.telegraph.co.uk	15 July, 2010
CJA10	Head of Proposals	Costain	www.telegraph.co.uk	1 August, 2010
CJA11	Image Sales Executive	Natural History Museum	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA12	Junior Brand Manager	Railwood Associates Ltd	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA13	Commercial and Marketing Development Manager	JD Williams	www.telegraph.co.uk	15 Oct, 2010
CJA14	Media and Copy Writer	MHA	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA15	Plant General Manager- ECT	Johnson Matthey Plc	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA16	Product Manager B2B	Nigel Wright Recruitment (R)	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010

CJA	JOB TITLE	EMPLOYER	WEBSITE	ACCESSED
CJA17	Regional Marketing Manager	unspecified	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA18	Resource Manager	unspecified	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA19	Sales and Marketing Director	VP Consulting	www.telegraph.co.uk	15 July, 2010
CJA20	Senior Interaction Designer	IC Group	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA21	Senior Proposition Manager	unspecified	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA22	Social Media Sales Consultant	Meltwater Buzz	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA23	Supply Chain Manager	Odgers Select (R)	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA24	Unit Quality Director	Howgate Sable (R)	www.telegraph.co.uk	31 August, 2010
CJA25	General Manager	National Trust	www.telegraph.co.uk	20 Nov, 2010
CJA26	FP&A Director-Media/Entertainment	Ajilon Professional Staffing (R)	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA27	Senior Business process Improvement Consultant	M.E. Weaver & Associates LLC (R)	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA28	Corporate Strategy Manager – Retail and Consumer Products	Parker and Lynch (R)	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA29	Chief Operating Officer	e-Corp English	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA30	Program Officer – Health Care	California Community Foundation	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA31	Director of Business Development	Braver PC	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA32	Consultant, Security Policy and Risk Modeling	Sentinel HS Group. LLC	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb., 2010
CJA33	Manager – Business Intelligence	ZC Associates	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA34	Business Process Analyst	Ruchman and Associates, Inc.(R)	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010

CJA	JOB TITLE	EMPLOYER	WEBSITE	ACCESSED
CJA35	Builder/Production Guru	Aquent	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA36	Usability Analyst	PACE Staffing Alternatives (R)	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA37	Senior Development Engineer	Melexis Nashua	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA38	Associate Technical Consultant	PTC Global Solutions	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA39	Senior Systems Engineering Technical Advisor	TASC, Inc.	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA40	Director of Regional Operations	Freeman	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA41	Real-Time Software Engineer	GMTO Corporation	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA42	NLP/Machine Learning Engineer	Winter Wyman (R)	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA43	Software Architect- Wireless Networking Products	Aviat Networks	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA44	Research Engineer, Search Sciences	eBay	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA45	Consultant, Manager – Healthcare IT		www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA46	Hilti Sales Consultant	Hilti	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA47	Regional Males Manager	unspecified	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA48	Top notch Corporate Paralegal for Financial Institution	Robert Half Legal (R)	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA49	Corporate legal Administrative Assistant	AppleOne	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010
CJA50	Senior Attorney, Lateral Attorney, Senior Partner Attorney, Lawyer	Tim Morrissey (R)	www.nytimes.com	5 Feb, 2010

* name of recruitment agency acting on behalf of employer (employer's name not provided)

ACADEMIC JOB ADVERTS

AJA	JOB TITLE	INSTITUTION	WEBSITE	ACCESSED
AJA1	Adjunct Faculty – Business/Marketing	Westwood College	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA2	Assistant/Associate Professor of Accounting	Concord University	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA3	Assistant or Associate Prof. of Management, Marketing or Accounting/Finance	Colorado College,	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA4	Assistant Professor – Soybean Breeding and Genetics	Purdue University,	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA5	Assistant Professor, Supervision & Management	Broward College	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA6	Assistant Professor – Eighteenth-Century Literature	University of Toronto at Mississauga	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA7	Assistant Professor	College of Charleston	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA8	Faculty, Research and Extension	Vanderbilt University	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA9	Assistant Professor in Applied Mathematics	Columbia University	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA10	Assistant Professor of Computer Science	Furman University	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA11	Assistant Professor of English	Augsburg College	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA12	Assistant Professor of Environmental Studies: Sustainability/GIS Expertise	Shepherd University	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA13	Assistant Professor of Management Information Systems	Virginia Military Institute	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010

AJA	JOB TITLE	INSTITUTION	WEBSITE	ACCESSED
AJA14	Assistant Professor of Microbiology	University of Massachusetts Amherst	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA15	Assistant Professors-Multiple positions	Harvard Business School	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA16	Criminology Faculty	University of the Fraser Valley	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA17	Dean of Science and Technology Academic Affairs	CUNY – City University of New York	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA18	Dean of the Eller College of Management	University of Arizona	www.academiccareers.com	11 October, 2010
AJA19	Electrical and Computer Engineering: Open Rank Faculty	University of Illinois	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA20	Permanent Faculty – Animation	Alberta College of Art + Design	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA21	Faculty position in English, emphasis on Multimedia Journalism	California University of Pennsylvania	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA22	Faculty Position in Game Design	Becker College	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA23	Frederick Douglass Institute Visiting Scholar	California University of Pennsylvania	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA24	Instructor-Graphic Design (Tenure Track)	Raritan Valley Community College	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA25	Lecturer/Senior Lecturer . Biology (3 positions)	James Cook University	www.academiccareers.com	11 Oct, 2010
AJA26	Associate Research Fellow in Nanoparticle and Platelet Interaction	Peninsula College of Medicine and Dentistry	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA27	Business Systems Analyst	Cornwall College	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA28	Chair Algebraic/Arithmetic Geometry	University of Bristol	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010

AJA	JOB TITLE	INSTITUTION	WEBSITE	ACCESSED
AJA29	Chair in Classical Studies	Open University – Faculty of Arts	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA30	Chair in Clinical Pharmacy	University of Birmingham	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA31	Departmental Lectureship in Persian Literature	University of Oxford	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA32	Director of Online Studies (DOS) Doctor in Education	Laureate Online Education in Partnership with the U. of Liverpool	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA33	Doctoral Research Studentships	University of Wolverhampton	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA34	Lecturer – Political Science/International Development/Public Policy	Cranfield University	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA35	EPSRC PhD Plus fellowship m2010	University of Nottingham	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA36	Established Professorship of Accounting	National University of Ireland	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA37	Fellow, Chaplain and Dean of Divinity	New College, Oxford	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA38	Fully-funded EPSRC PhD Research Grant Studentship	Imperial College London	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA39	Funded PhD opportunity	University of Stirling	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA40	Lecturer/Senior Lecturer in Education	Canterbury Christ Church University	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA41	Lecturer in Creative Writing	University of Leicester	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA42	Lecturer in Facility and Environment Management	University College London	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA43	Lecturer in Public Health Nursing	University of Hull	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010

AJA	JOB TITLE	INSTITUTION	WEBSITE	ACCESSED
AJA44	Lecturer in Social Sciences – Quantitative Methods	Cardiff University	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA45	Lecturer or Senior Lecturer in Sports Therapy	Edge Hill University	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA46	Lectureship in Competition Law	University of Edinburgh	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA47	Medical/Applied Statistician in Genetics	University of Cambridge	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA48	Part-time (hourly paid) Lecturers in Politics and International Relations	Middlesex University	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA49	Part time Lecturer – Bassoon	Leeds College of Music	www.academicjobs.uk	22 Sept, 2010
AJA50	Lecturer in Law	University of Bristol	www.academicjobs.uk	11 Oct, 2010

References

- Bargiela-Ciappini, F., C. Nickerson and B. Planken. 2007. *Business Discourse*. Houndmills: Palgrave/MacMillan.
- Benesch, S. 2001. *Critical English for Academic Purposes: Theory, Politics, and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bhatia, V. K. 1993. *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. London and New York: Longman.
- Butler, H. G. 2006. *A Framework for Course Design in Academic Writing for Tertiary Education*. PhD Dissertation, University of Pretoria <http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-09112007-125845/unrestricted/00front.pdf> Accessed 4 Feb, 2011.
- Byars, L. L., and L. Rue. 2000. *Human Resources management. Sixth Edition*. Irwin McGraw Hill.
- Crystal, D. 2003. *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dijk van, T. A. 1997. The Study of Discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Structure and Process*, 1-34. London: SAGE Publications.
- Enders, J., and C. Musselin. 2008. Back to the Future? The Academic Professions in the 21st Century. In OECD, Higher Education to 2030, Volume 1: Demography. Paris: OECD Publishing. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/48/29/41939654.pdf> Accessed 3 Feb, 2011.
- Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: the critical study of language*. London/New York: Longman.
- Gillett A., A. Hammond and M. Martala. 2009. *Inside Track to Successful Academic Writing*. London: Pearson Educational.
- Heiberger, M. M., and J. M. Vick. 2001. *The Academic Job Search Handbook*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hinkel, E. 2004. *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hyland, K. 2004. Patterns of engagement: dialogic features and L2 undergraduate writing. In L. J. Ravelli and R. A. Ellis (eds.) *Analysing Academic Writing*, 5-23. London: Continuum.
- Hyland, K. 2006. *English for Academic Purposes. An advanced resource book*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jordan, R. R. 1997. *English for Academic Purposes. A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyda, A. 2007. *Concessive Relation in Spoken Discourse. A Study into Academic Spoken English*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Macpherson, R. 2008. *English for Academic Purposes*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Meyer, P. G. 1997. Hedging Strategies in Written Academic Discourse: Strengthening the Argument by Weakening the Claim. In R. Markkanen and H. Schröder (eds.) *Hedging and Discourse: Approaches to the Analysis of a Pragmatic Phenomenon in Academic Texts*, 21-41. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Miczka, E. 2002. *Kognitywna struktury sytuacyjne i informacyjne w interpretacji dyskursu*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Osuchowska, D., and G. A. Kleparski. 2009. *The Rudiments of Academic Writing*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.
- Ravelli, L. J., and R. A. Ellis. 2004. *Analysing Academic Writing. Contextualized Frameworks*. London and New York: Continuum.

- Resche, C. 2000. Hedging across genres: An approach for non-native students of English for Economics. In *ASp* 27/30, 289-308. <http://asp.revues.org/2193> Accessed 21 February, 2011.
- Secord, H. 2003. *Implementing Best Practices in Human Resources Management*. CCH Canadian Limited.
- Stone, D. L., K. M. Lukaszewski and L. C. Isenhour. 2005. E-Recruiting: Online strategies for Attracting Talent. In H. G. Gueutal and D. L. Stone (eds.) *The Brave New World of eHR. Human Resources Management in the Digital Age*, 22-53. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Swales, J. M. 1990. *Genre Analysis. English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. 1997. English as Tyrannosaurus rex. In K. Hyland 2006. *English for Academic Purposes. An advanced resource book*, 124-127. London and New York: Routledge.
- Swales, J. M. 2004. *Research Genres. Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zamel, V. 1998. Questioning Academic Discourse. In V. Zamel and R. Spack (eds.) *Negotiating Academic Literacies. Teaching and Learning across Languages and Cultures*, 187-198. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

