

1. Introduction

As to the marketization of PhD programs in linguistics, the present research is probably the first attempt to apply Fairclough's (1993) three-dimensional critical discourse analysis (CDA) to the assessment of such a phenomenon. CDA is a framework which can be dissected into 3 dimensions:

- (1) Analysis of text;
- (2) Analysis of discourse practice; and
- (3) Analysis of social practice.

Integrally, CDA of public discourse, including admission prospectuses, can be construed as treating the social practice of the marketization of university education like discourse (or discursive) practices expressed through authentic texts in prospectuses.

As a giant advocate for CDA, Fairclough (1993, pp. 134-135) asserts that we can “reflectively” and “social-theoretically” investigate the public discourse of university admission treated “as a form of social practice, a socially and historically situated mode of action in a dialectical relationship with other facets of ‘the social’ (its ‘social context’). Such discourse is socially shaped, but it is also socially shaping, or constitutive”; indeed, “it is vital that CDA explores the tension between these two sides of language use”. Other relevant researches on marketization of public discourse include Askehave (2007), Han (2014), Newman and Jahdi (2009), Sanigar (2013), Teo (2007), as well as Zhang and O'Halloran (2013).

But none of the above researches focuses on the application for admission to PhD programs generally and PhD programs in linguistics particularly. The present research believes that universities assume applicants for PhDs in linguistics are more demanding than the MAs or BAs in linguistics. And competition due largely to the globalization of university education is so intense that universities worldwide need to marketize their academic programs, including PhDs, via producing or even ‘manipulating’ public discourse in prospectuses.

2. Analytics of Marketization Discourses on PhD Programs in Linguistics

Such marketization even applies to prestigious ‘hegemonies’ University of Cambridge (Cambridge) and Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), which also marketize their PhDs in linguistics using somewhat ‘grounded’ (i.e. well-balanced and sensible) and non-irritating self-flattery, assume that optimistic employment prospect, academic rigor and energetic research atmosphere conveyed

by the wordings of the discourses in their e-prospectuses means excellence and big appeal to such potential PhD candidates. We know that flattery appeals to our vanity. But, nowadays, an ‘appropriate’ degree of self-flattery can be very persuasive to prospective PhD students who have high opinions of themselves to apply for their PhD programs in linguistics offered by universities, e.g. Cambridge’s and MIT’s PhD programs in linguistics.

These PhDs are (1) textually ‘sold’ to their target consumers—research postgraduates of linguistics and of certain areas of expertise (specialty) in linguistics—through (2) specific discourse practice, i.e. “production and interpretation of texts” in their e-prospectuses. Fairclough (1993, pp. 156) points out that “the primacy of the promotional function in contemporary prospectuses entails drawing upon genres associated with advertising and other forms of promotional activity as well as the more traditional informationally oriented genre of university prospectuses...”. This is not a negligible consideration because though both universities are so renowned that they have no apparent need to promote their respective PhD programs, Cambridge and MIT do proactively and frankly commit their prospective candidates to what (3) social practice customarily expects that their PhDs in linguistics attract the elites worldwide. As far as social practice is concerned, Fairclough (1993, pp. 156) suggests that this is “a major historical shift in the nature and objectives of university prospectuses, in line with the wider changes in higher education”—marketization due to globalization of tertiary education.

Those discourses on the websites of these two preeminent universities are deliberately used to build an image of academic excellence such that Cambridge’s and MIT’s PhD programs in linguistics constitute an ‘attraction’ to the most motivated applicants. Of course, a university’s overall and subject-wise reputations tremendously impact on whether potential candidates would be keen on applying for its PhD in linguistics rather than its rivals. But can we intuitively believe and claim that these two hegemonies need not to promote their programs? This can be answered by using CDA to inspect the e-prospectuses of the PhD programs in linguistics offered by Cambridge and MIT for the academic year 2017-18, of which the miniatures are cited in Appendix II 5.1 to 5.7.

Holistically, the quantity or the ‘length’ of discourses disseminated via Cambridge’s and MIT’s websites for their PhD programs in linguistics is obviously larger or longer than some other universities’. MIT highlights what every applicant is ultimately and pragmatically concerned—employment prospect (Appendix II 5.1), whereas Cambridge offers no such crucial information. Their websites also provide prospective applicants with detailed account of high-level introduction to requirement (Appendix II 5.2); departmental research orientation (Appendix II 5.3); uniqueness

of PhD programs in linguistics (Appendix II 5.4); supervision of PhD candidates (Appendix II 5.5); research community (Appendix II 5.6); and history and prospect (Appendix II 5.7).

Individually, each sub-Appendix II consists of discourses conveying the subject matter, and the wordings used in these discourses are discussed here:

(1) **Appendix II 5.1: Employment Prospect**

MIT knows their applicants' concern of graduate employment and states the fact of life that "academic jobs are difficult to obtain...". "Are" rather than probability modals 'might be', 'would be', or 'could be' is deliberately used to 'affirm' the stiffness in competition for academic posts in reality. But MIT shows its record of graduate employment by mentioning that "many" of "our" graduates "have taken up" post-doctoral fellowships... before finding "more permanent" positions.

Then, MIT uses "nonetheless" to mitigate the pessimism over the potential fierce competition in the job market by saying that "almost all" of our graduates "have found", present perfect, teaching or research post. Concretely, MIT showcases that recent graduates are employed in "tenure-track and tenured positions" at some big names among universities and research institutions. These facts of successful track record of job placement of graduates speak for themselves. The use of "our graduates" rather than "MIT's graduate" signals a surely warm welcome by adopting a personalized style of communication—"our".

Unexpectedly, Cambridge does not provide any information about its graduate job placement. Centering on research work after graduation, it seems that MIT may be able to outperform Cambridge in being the draw for a tremendous number of devoted applicants.

(2) **Appendix II 5.2: High-level Introduction to Requirement**

Cambridge overtly says that its PhD in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics is "intellectually demanding" and "only" applicants with the "necessary" level of attainment and motivation should "undertake" research "at the highest level of scholarship". Altogether, these five quotes signify the high expectations of Cambridge for their potential PhD candidates. Moreover, applicants' intellectual self-sufficiency is definitely what Cambridge is looking for. It is not surprising for Cambridge to differentiate the pursuit of its PhD program in linguistics from that of an MA degree in linguistics.

As to MIT, the stress is on of PhD in Linguistics is on "rigorous and quite demanding" in terms of "time and energy". The 'force' of this statement seems to be less awesome than

that of Cambridge's because MIT does not use the phrase "the highest level" while using the qualifier "quite" before "demanding". It seems that MIT allows itself more elasticity in discretionarily recruiting its PhD candidates. But this does not imply that the competition for admission to MIT is therefore less keen, nor that it is easier to be admitted to MIT than to Cambridge.

Like what Cambridge expects, MIT's anticipation is that "a high level of commitment and concentration is required" to successfully complete its PhD in Linguistics. Such wording conveys a sense of impersonality by using nominalization "commitment" (noun) and "concentration" (noun) rather than using an agentless passive like "you are required (passive) to commit (verb) and to concentrate (verb)". This use of nominalization can be justified if both nouns aim to represent two 'sorts' of personal qualities, personalities, virtues, or attitudes.

Relatively unique, MIT's PhD in Linguistics is full of "a relatively large number of required courses" because MIT intends to broaden its candidates' horizon so that "this extra effort pays off in the long run" by attaining "a high level of competence in more than one area". And importantly, MIT's graduate with its PhD in Linguistics can "qualify for academic and other positions in more than one specialty". This last point echoes the information about promising employment prospect of MIT PhD in Linguistics and can really reinforce some potential candidates' inclination to enter MIT's program. But this has already 'assumed' prospective applicants would not dislike taking a wide range of coursework in a PhD program, especially those candidates with a master's degree.

(3) Appendix II 5.3: Departmental Research Orientation

Cambridge openly expresses the overarching aim of its Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics is "to achieve excellence across a broad spectrum of linguistic research". Here "excellence" and "broad spectrum" clearly deliver a message to potential applicants: they are expected to thrive on the perpetual drive to pursue excellence in not only a small but a large number of research areas. Cambridge's Department, in fact, integrates theoretical linguistics with applied linguistics. Prospective candidates should also be prepared to conduct teaching assistance in line with the Department's "high quality teaching informed by current research". As Fairclough (1993, pp. 156) suggests, these aims of the Department "bring in a genre of prestige or corporate promotion". Indeed, Cambridge adopts wording

“the Department” rather than inclusive “we”. On the contrary, as Fairclough (1993, pp. 156) pinpoints “the personalization of the institution (as *we*) ...”, MIT’s wording uses “we” to personalize its ‘department’ and conveys a sense of community. One reason to account for Cambridge’s choice of wording is that its Department is a relatively high-profile “strategic alliance” or more precisely a merger of two key antecedent academic units into the Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics.

On the other hand, MIT emphasizes that “a distinctive feature of the Linguistics Program at MIT has been its insistence on explicit theories of language formalized as grammatical rules and constraints”. This overt insistence is set against Fairclough’s assertion (1993, pp. 157) which entails that “the avoidance of explicit obligational meanings marks a significant shift in authority relations. Promotional material addresses readerships as consumer or clients ... the client is positioned as having authority”. Although Fairclough’s insight makes sense, MIT’s department has the ‘market power’ to set its research agenda based on its branding, which lets MIT’s department ‘advantageously compete’ in the global market, which is not a perfectly competitive one in an economic sense, for elite postgraduate PhD students in linguistics. Thus, Fairclough (1993, pp. 157) adopts the term “hegemonic status”, which we consider applicable to the linguistics departments of and the whole of Cambridge and MIT. Under Chomsky’s leadership, MIT’s linguistics department predominantly “holds that humans have an innate language faculty in which the universal principles of human language are grounded”. This stance is exactly what MIT’s department takes. But the emergence of other theoretical paradigms like systemic functional linguistics, construction grammar, pattern grammar, local grammar etc. may challenge the glorified status of MIT’s department.

(4) Appendix II 5.4: Uniqueness of PhD Programs in Linguistics

There are obligational and permissive modal auxiliary verbs, pointed out by Fairclough (1993, pp. 154), in Cambridge’s promotional passage: ‘may’ in “... some PhD students may do most of their work in libraries ...”; ‘must’ in “... the dissertation must make a significant contribution to learning ...”; ‘must’ and ‘should’ in “... since by definition doctoral research must be original ... should not hesitate to discuss with the Department ...”. Such obligational and permissive devices are conventional and can be utilized by top

linguistics departments more effectively than by other established departments of linguistics aspiring to world-class status, but not quite there yet.

Though MIT's PhD in Linguistics, unlike Cambridge's, does not require a master degree with distinction for admission, it is surprising that MIT offers a "5-year" PhD in Linguistics, especially in generative linguistics. And MIT "ha[s] found that the best way to achieve this goal is for students to work from the very beginning on problems that are relevant to real-life research". MIT's wording uses "have found" (present perfect), which implies solid experience in supervising successful PhD in Linguistics, "the best way", which implies the MIT way is the best one among some other approaches, and "real-life", which implies research that goes beyond the ivory tower.

(5) Appendix II 5.5: Supervision of PhD Candidates

The beginning unambiguously states that "Candidates for the PhD in Cambridge are guided by a supervisor, though they will normally also discuss their work with a number of other experts in their field." As most of the cases, variant terms "candidates", "PhD students", or "students" are placed at the beginning of sentences in the head position in a phrase or in the subject slot of a sentence, e.g. "Candidates for the PhD ..."; "Students registered for the PhD ..."; "Non-native speakers of English"; and "PhD students might reasonably expect ...". Are all these coincidences? Probably not. What such an 'arrangement' conveys is that PhD candidates are at the center of the PhD program so are supervised with great care by his/her supervisor. And "supervisor" is also a term that fills either a subject slot or an object slot, as an agent in passive voice. Both students and their supervisors are under the spotlight.

(6) Appendix II 5.6: Research Community

MIT's message is that "graduate student research is the central focus of the MIT Linguistics Program". This discourse could be rephrased as 'The central focus of the MIT Linguistics Program is graduate student research'. But MIT's wording deliberately places "graduate student research" at the subject position of this sentence, where is also the theme of that sentence. This reflects how much MIT cares about its students of PhD in Linguistics.

And it is "the high quality of the graduate student research" that earns its "noteworthy discoveries" and reputation, "over the year", of MIT's PhD in Linguistics. Surprisingly, MIT believes that "these research efforts are most effectively enhanced by an atmosphere

of cooperation rather than competition”. Besides, to keep research efforts as the theme of a sentence, this discourse puts “research efforts” in the subject slot in a relative clause even though the not usually favoured use of passive voice, “are most effectively enhanced by”, is adopted. And “atmosphere”, like culture, is intangible but quite rightly singled out as the soft side of creating the aura of a cooperative research community.

(7) Appendix II 5.7: History and Prospect

Cambridge’s “Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics was created on 1 August 2011 by merging the former Department of Linguistics and the Research Centre for English and Applied Linguistics.” What and why does this matters? Such a discourse, in fact, echoes and accounts for Appendix 5.3 on Departmental Research Orientation. Broadly speaking, this department is relatively young but it is the outcome of the merger of two “former” academic units. In other words, this new department is a blend of both tradition, “building on the strengths of the previous institutions”, and new endeavor, “a comprehensive range of the language sciences and offers excellent theoretical and empirical research ...”. It is this last feature that captivates prospective applicants who are comprehensively interested in language sciences.

As to graduate program in MIT’s linguistics department, it was founded in 1961. Does anything make this department special? Yes. “Under the leadership of Noam Chomsky and Morris Halle in the 1960’s and 1970’s, the Linguistics Program at MIT rapidly acquired an international reputation as a leading center for research ...”. Importantly, “many of the most influential trends in the study of syntax and phonology had their origins in research conducted at MIT”. Can potential applicants interested in formal linguistics resist such an impressive track record of brilliance? How about current and future exploration? Moving with the times, MIT points out that “in the current decade, the program has integrated research in experimental phonetics and computational modeling of language learning.” This last statement should also be a response to current and emerging trends in linguistics such that it projects a message that MIT not only treasures its tradition but also engages in cutting-edge linguistic research.

3. Conclusion

Holistically, although Cambridge and MIT are two indisputably world-renowned research universities rather than political hegemonies, they have high standings both historically and in the league tables currently of top universities. They can understandably be regarded as scholastic ‘hegemons’ with global impact by nurturing successive generations of elites. Both universities have an amazing long history, dating back to 1209 and 1861 respectively. And such history does reinforce their peerless presence. But do they marketize? Yes, both cannot resist the tsunami of academic “consumerization” under the ‘auspices’ of globalization of higher education. In other words, both need to marketize their PhD programs in linguistics. They are not shy about flattering themselves and their potential customers with their promotional discourses strategizing and articulating how intellectually challenging their PhD programs in linguistics are, and implying that their current and potential students must be the best of the best. There is a noticeable difference in terms of their actual promotion with MIT giving full play to its reputation as a world-famous centre of linguistic research under the leadership of founder Noam Chomsky and its intellectual energy built on collegiality.

(Number of words, excluding Appendixes and Bibliography: 2,845 words)

4. Appendix I: Fairclough's Three Dimensions of Critical Discourse Analysis

In general, dimensions briefly mentioned in the previous section (1) text, (2) discourse practice, and (3) social practice constitute a discursive event examined in Fairclough's (1993, pp. 133-135) three-dimensional analytical framework of CDA. According to Fairclough (1993, pp. 136),

“...the connection between *text* and *social practice* is seen as being *mediated* by *discourse practice*: on the one hand, processes of text production and interpretation are shaped by (and help shape) the nature of the social practice, and on the other hand the production process shapes (and leave ‘traces’ in) the text, and the interpretative process operates upon ‘cues’ in the text.”

“Each *discursive event* has three dimensions or facets: it is a spoken or written language *text*, it is an instance of *discourse practice* involving the production and interpretation of text, and it is a piece of *social practice*.” (ibid, pp. 136)

“In analysis within the *social practice dimension*, ...focus is political, upon the discursive event within relations of *power and domination*. A feature of ... framework of analysis is that it tries to combine a theory of power based upon Gramsci's concept of *hegemony* with a theory of *discourse practice* based upon the concept of *intertextuality* (more exactly, *interdiscursivity*...)...on the one hand, processes of text production and interpretation are shaped by (and help shape) the nature of the social practice, and on the other hand the production process shapes (and leaves ‘traces’ in) the text, and the interpretative process operates upon ‘cues’ in the text.”

An integral constituent conception of CDA is intertextuality (or more precisely interdiscursivity), which Fairclough (1992, pp. 269) puts forward as follows:

“...critical discourse analysis...is a three-dimensional one: *Discursive events* (e.g. interviews, conversations, newspaper articles) are analyzed linguistically as *texts*, as *instances of* discourse practice, and as *instances of* social practice. By ‘*discourse practice*’ I mean the practices of producing, distributing, and consuming texts. The aim is to map these different types or dimensions of analysis onto one another: to reach explanatory understanding of how particular sorts of text are connected with particular forms of *social practice*, and how the connections are mediated by the nature of the *discourse practice*.”

5. Appendix II: Cambridge's and MIT's Prospectuses for PhD in Linguistics

5.1 Employment Prospect

MIT

“Academic jobs are difficult to obtain, with increasingly many applicants competing for a relatively small number of positions. Consequently, students cannot expect to move into an optimal job immediately upon completion of the Ph.D. program. Many of our graduates have taken up post-doctoral fellowships or one-year visiting positions before finding more permanent positions. Nonetheless, in recent years almost all of our graduates have found teaching or research posts. Recent graduates are employed in tenure-track and tenured positions at such North American universities as the University of Chicago, UC Santa Cruz, University of Connecticut, McGill, NYU, University of Massachusetts Amherst, University of Maryland, and the University of Pennsylvania (and in many other excellent departments as well). Others are working at major universities and research institutions in Europe, Japan, Korea and Taiwan.”

Cambridge

Information not available.

5.2 High-level Introduction of Requirement

Cambridge

“PhD study at Cambridge is *intellectually demanding* and should be undertaken *only* by those who have the *necessary level* of attainment and motivation to pursue research or advanced study at the highest level of scholarship. In addition, graduate students in Cambridge are expected to have the *capacity*, and *enthusiasm*, for organising their own research and to work largely on their *own initiative*.”

MIT

“The program is *rigorous* and quite *demanding* of students' *time and energy*. A high level of *commitment* and *concentration* is required to complete it successfully. The program also contains a *relatively large number* of required courses. We have found that this *extra effort* pays off in the long run, since students are exposed to a richer mix of research topics and methods. This also means that our students attain a high level of competence in *more than one area*, and thus qualify for academic and other positions in *more than one specialty*.”

5.3 Departmental Research Orientation

Cambridge

“The aims of the Department are:

- to achieve excellence across a broad spectrum of linguistic research
- to provide high quality teaching informed by current research
- to foster a broad and integrated approach to the study of linguistics”

“Boundaries between sub-disciplines of linguistics are highly permeable within and beyond the Department as reflected in the Department's Research Clusters and research projects, but also in collaborations of the Department's staff with members of other institutions within the University and in the fact that many linguists work in other Departments, Faculties and even Schools of the University. The Cambridge Language Sciences Initiative, an initiative by the University of Cambridge to make Language Sciences a strategic priority for institutional support, aims to bring all those researchers concerned with research into various aspects of the language sciences together. The Department is centrally embedded in the Initiative as it has the largest concentration of Linguists in one institution.”

MIT

“A distinctive feature of the Linguistics Program at MIT has been its insistence on explicit theories of language formalized as grammatical rules and constraints. The concern for explicitness facilitates the comparison and evaluation of alternative models. Only after extensive parts of the grammars of different languages have been formulated is it sensible to ask questions concerning the ways in which languages differ—or the ways in which all languages are the same. Consequently, a large part of our effort is devoted to the study of linguistic detail (for example, the interpretation of English verb phrase ellipsis, the morpho-semantics of the Greek perfect, the syntax of multiple questions, prosodic phrasing in Korean, or the articulation of reduced vowels in English). We focus on phenomena that we believe will provide rich insights into the nature of language. Their discovery requires effort and persistence, and a certain measure of good luck. Our program has been noted for its psychological interpretation of linguistic theory. This view holds that humans have an innate language faculty in which the universal principles of human language are grounded. In learning their native language, children acquire specific rules that interact in complex ways; the entire

system is learned rapidly and with little effort. The success of human language learners suggests that they rely on a highly restrictive set of principles that does not require (or permit) them to consider many alternatives in the analysis of a particular construction. Since there is no evidence that the underlying principles that define the class of possible rules and grammatical systems are learned, it is thought that these principles serve as the preconditions for language learning, forming part of the innate capacity of every normal child. Viewed in this light, the principles we are attempting to discover constitute part of the genetic endowment of all humans.”

5.4 Uniqueness of PhD Programs in Linguistics

Cambridge

“In British universities the PhD ('Doctorate of Philosophy') is traditionally awarded solely on the basis of a dissertation, a substantial piece of writing which reports original research into a closely defined area of enquiry. Candidates for the PhD in Cambridge are guided by a Supervisor, though they will normally also discuss their work with a number of other experts in their field. The nature of the work depends on topic. Within linguistics, some PhD students may do most of their work in libraries, or spend part of their time collecting and analysing data, or carry out experiments in the phonetics laboratory or psycholinguistics laboratory. The dissertation must make a significant contribution to learning, for example through the discovery of new knowledge, the connection of previously unrelated facts, the development of new theory or the revision of older views. The completion of a PhD dissertation is standardly expected to take three years, and most funding for PhD students is based on this assumption.”

“Prospective applicants can get an idea of the range of topics which can be supervised from the description of staff research interests, the list of members of the Faculty, and from the topics of current PhD students; but, since by definition doctoral research must be original, they should not hesitate to discuss with the Department ideas within or across areas of Linguistics which are not explicitly represented in these places.”

“A PhD is a substantial piece of original scholarship for which the research and writing-up can reasonably be expected to be completed in three years. At MML there is a normal word limit of 80,000 words (including footnotes and appendices but excluding bibliography). The thesis should represent a significant contribution to learning through

Master of Arts in Language Studies
LT5904 Language and Culture in Society

Marketization of PhD in Linguistics of Cambridge and MIT via Prospectuses: A Critical Discourse Analysis
Eddie Chan Wing LAU

the discovery of new knowledge or through the connection of previously unrelated facts, or the development of new theory, revision of older views or some combination of these. In writing the thesis you are expected to take account of previously published work on the subject and the thesis should be clearly and accurately written, paying due attention to English style and grammar.”

MIT

“Our 5-year PhD program is designed to introduce students to the basic concepts and results of research in generative linguistics, so that they can begin productively contributing to the department’s research activities. We have found that the best way to achieve this goal is for students to work from the very beginning on problems that are relevant to real-life research.

The program is rigorous and quite demanding of students’ time and energy. A high level of commitment and concentration is required to complete it successfully. The program also contains a relatively large number of required courses. We have found that this extra effort pays off in the long run, since students are exposed to a richer mix of research topics and methods. This also means that our students attain a high level of competence in more than one area, and thus qualify for academic and other positions in more than one specialty.

All students complete both a Common Curriculum and an additional program of coursework in an Area of Specialization of their choosing (selected at the beginning of the 5th semester, but revisable). See the material linked from the Common Requirements and Specialization tabs for details.”

5.5 Supervision of PhD Candidates

Cambridge

“Candidates for the PhD in Cambridge are guided by a supervisor, though they will normally also discuss their work with a number of other experts in their field.”

“Students registered for the PhD in the Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics will normally have one of the staff of the Department as Supervisor, though sometimes specialists outside the Department will fulfil this role.” “Non-native speakers of English should ensure that their work is checked by a native speaker,

preferably with some subject knowledge. Supervisors cannot be expected to correct poor English but of course may give advice on questions of English writing.”

“PhD students might reasonably expect to see their supervisor fortnightly or at least 3 times a term. The length of a supervision may vary, depending on the stage a student is at, and on the nature of the written work, if any, to be discussed. As a rule, however, such meetings generally last between 30 and 60 minutes.”

MIT

Information not available.

5.6 Research Community

MIT

“Graduate student research is the central focus of the MIT Linguistics Program. The reputation of the program over the years is due in no small measure to the high quality of the graduate student research (particularly at the dissertation level) where many noteworthy discoveries have been made. We believe that these research efforts are most effectively enhanced by an atmosphere of cooperation rather than competition. Many of our research papers have joint or multiple authorship. Some of the best ideas stem from hallway or classroom discussions, or from appointments in faculty and student offices. MIT research in linguistics is a common and shared effort to unlock the secrets of language. The importance of graduate student research is reflected in the frequent citation of MIT dissertations in the professional literature, and in the success of the graduate students’ own publishing endeavor, the MIT Working Papers in Linguistics (MITWPL). The proceeds of MITWPL publications help support student research activities, including conference travel and linguistic fieldwork. Graduate students take on considerable responsibility for the overall intellectual life of the department. Our Colloquium Series, which brings distinguished visitors to campus for talks and meetings with students, is administered by the graduate students as are the many reading and discussion groups such as Ling Lunch, Phonology Circle, LF Reading Group, Morph Beer and Brain and Language.”

Cambridge

Information not available.

5.7 History and Prospect

Cambridge

“The Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics was created on 1 August 2011 by merging the former Department of Linguistics and the Research Centre for English and Applied Linguistics. The Department is part of the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages.

The Department pursues an interdisciplinary approach to theoretical and applied linguistics and avoids uncritical adherence to particular views and theories. Building on the strengths of the previous institutions, the new department covers a comprehensive range of the language sciences and offers excellent theoretical and empirical research in a broad spread of fields from historical linguistics and comparative syntax to language processing and computational linguistics.”

MIT

“The Graduate Program in Linguistics at MIT was founded in 1961, and produced its first PhDs in 1965. Over the years, MIT graduates have taken up positions in many of the leading linguistics departments in the world and now provide much of the intellectual community that makes contemporary linguistics such a strong and lively branch of the cognitive sciences.

Initially housed within the Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures, the Linguistics Program joined with the Philosophy Program in 1976 to form the Department of Linguistics and Philosophy. The two sections of the department operate independent graduate programs, under the leadership of a common Head. The headship alternates between the two wings of the department.

Under the leadership of Noam Chomsky and Morris Halle in the 1960's and 1970's, the Linguistics Program at MIT rapidly acquired an international reputation as a leading center for research on formal models of human-language phonology, morphology and syntax, guided by the bold (and, at the time, novel) hypothesis that language should be studied using the intellectual tools of the natural sciences. Many of the most influential trends in the study of syntax and phonology had their origins in research conducted at MIT. In the 1980s, the program was broadened to include semantics. The study of syntax and semantics within a group sharing the same goals and methodology proved very fruitful. In the 1990's links with the Department of Brain and Cognitive Science

Master of Arts in Language Studies

LT5904 Language and Culture in Society

Marketization of PhD in Linguistics of Cambridge and MIT via Prospectuses: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Eddie Chan Wing LAU

were established to expand the range of research tools and methodologies available for the study of human language. Significant research efforts in language acquisition, sentence processing and neuro-imaging were launched. In the current decade, the program has integrated research in experimental phonetics and computational modeling of language learning.”

6. Bibliography

1. Askehave, I. (2007). The impact of marketization on higher education genres – the international student prospectus as a case in point. In *Discourse Studies*, Vol. 9(6): 723–742.
2. Fairclough, N. (1992). Intertextuality in critical discourse analysis. In *Linguistics and Education*, 4, 269-293.
3. Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: the universities. In *Discourse and Society*, 4/2: 133-168.
4. Han, Z. (2014). The marketization of public discourse: The Chinese universities. In *Discourse & Communication*, Vol. 8(1) 85–103.
5. Linguistics and Philosophy, Department of (Massachusetts Institute of Technology).
<http://linguistics.mit.edu/about/> and <http://linguistics.mit.edu/graduate/>
6. Newman, S. and Jahdi, K. (2009) Marketisation of education: marketing, rhetoric and reality. In *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 33:1, 1-11.
7. Sanigar, M.A. (2013). Selling an Education. Universities as commercial entities: a corpus-based study of university websites as self-promotion. In *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics*, 18.
8. Teo, P. (2007). The marketisation of higher education: A comparative case-study of two universities in Singapore. In *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines*, 1(1), 95-111.
9. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, Department of (The University of Cambridge).
<http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/dtal/> and <http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/dtal/postgraduates/phd>
10. Zhang, Y. and O'Halloran, K.L. (2013). ‘Toward a global knowledge enterprise’: university websites as portals to the ongoing marketization of higher education. In *Critical Discourse Studies*, 10:4, 468-485.