A Corpus-Based Genre Analysis of the Linguistic Specificity of VC Messages on the Websites of Universities in Pakistan

Hina Gul
Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan

Naveed-Ur-Rehman Khattak
Air University, Islamabad

Keywords	Abstract

Keywords

- Sample Corpus
- Specificity
- Antconc
- Vice-Chancellors' Messages
- Linguistic Specifics

Abstract

The present study makes an attempt to study the use of language and its linguistic specificity in the Vice-Chancellors' Messages given on the websites of the public and private sector universities in Pakistan. A sample corpus of the Vice-Chancellors' messages on the websites of the universities is compiled. To analyze the text of the corpus, this research has quantitatively analyzed the text of the Vice-Chancellors' messages available on universities' websites. Ken Hyland's model of Specificity of language is used for the analysis of the corpus. The data is categorized under various linguistic/lexical categories which helped in grouping specific lexical items that are used in these messages. To find out the linguistic specifics of the Vice-Chancellors' messages, corpus tools i.e. Antconc has been used. The analysis showed that various lexical items occur frequently in the Vice-Chancellors' messages. This includes the frequent use of self-mentioning, hedges, directives, reporting Verbs, and lexical bundles. Further, it concludes that the frequent and abundant use of the above linguistic items is integral for the successful communication of the universities' aims and objectives in Vice-Chancellors' messages.

Introduction

The universities' websites aim to advance the universities' mission, brand, and messages to core constituents i.e. applicants, students, employees, donors, and visitors, etc. In higher education information on websites plays a pivotal role in customer and community service. Jeffries (2015) found that 76% of people feel it convenient to read messages from the websites, 52% people prefer reading text messages from the universities' websites, and even 7% considered it as a good way for an organization to get their attention. It is a core business, communication, and promotional tool for universities in providing information and services to the local, national and international public. Vice-Chancellors' message on a university website plays an important role in providing information regarding the overall manifesto of the university to the campus community and general public. In this research, the linguistic specifics of the Vice-Chancellors' messages on the websites of the universities in Pakistan are analyzed and the important functions performed through the linguistic specifics are identified.

1.1   Concept of Specificity in Writing

Specificity in the language is a feature that differentiates different entities/nouns/referents which is specific to a given context (Hyland, 2008). This idea affirms that every language use has some linguistic features and these features vary in different situations. This becomes the basis for disciplinary specificity given by Hyland (2008). He asserts that specificity is a vital concept in exercising English for academic and specific purposes. He called specificity a tool that highlights specific features of academic writing. He worked on disciplinary specificity and found peculiar differences in soft and hard disciplines. The use of language in a particular group for a specific purpose has certain specific conventions. That is the reason every discourse community has its specifics of communication and has become so much of interest due to its relationship to the concept of genre analysis (Hyland, 2008). For instance, Halliday (1989) worked on the specifics of written and spoken language and found that written language has a larger number of nouns, lexemes, and an impersonal tone compared to the spoken language. Hyland highlighted the specific features of academic writing across disciplines i.e. sciences and arts and asserted that writers use certain familiar structures that the reader of the specific genre will expect. He compiled a corpus consisting of 1.5 million words of research articles from 8 disciplines, 4 million words of students' dissertation, and data sets of interviews of 30 academics and analyzed the disciplinary variation based on citation practices, and the use of reporting verbs, hedges, self-mention, bundles, and directives. The results of the corpus analysis showed that teachers need to teach students the conventions that are specific to respective disciplines to prepare them in their academic studies.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

In every language use, written or spoken, linguistic items, words or phrases hold a meaningful relationship. Every genre and text type i.e. essays, editorials, letters, applications, journals, etc., have their specific linguistic features; that need to be identified and described. Vice-chancellors' messages on their respective university websites serve important functions and seem to have specific linguistic features. This research study aims at analyzing the most commonly occurring linguistic items and identifying their functions in the welcome addresses of Vice-chancellors on their respective University websites.

1.3. Research Objectives

The primary objective of this study is to identify the specific linguistic and lexical features along with their functions in the Vice-chancellors' messages on their university websites. The secondary objective is to explore whether the Vice-chancellors' messages can be categorized as belonging to a specific genre based on their linguistic and lexical features.

2. Literature Review

Hyland (2007) asserted that genre-based pedagogies are useful as they can help ESL learners in writing effectively. Experts in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) stress the needs of learners and genre-based language description for designing courses in ESP. Hyland (2002) talked about disciplinary variation and asserted that students must be taught the specific literacy skills of every discipline. Scholars incorporate various advanced methods to genre analysis and have also shown a keen interest in the analysis of web genres. Chandler (1997) described e-communication as a genre of writing by analyzing e-text messages and identifying their conversational or interactional functions. Askehave and Neilsen (2005) worked on the European industrial country website by applying Swales's' model and identified the structure, content, requirements, contacts, discourse community, and the promotion of the organization. Yang (2013) studied the promotional nature of university websites by compiling a corpus called "About Us" and by identifying the keywords that promoted the university in the corpus using 'wordsmith' a corpus tool. Villanueva, Dolom, and Belen, (2018) worked on web-based genre analysis by compiling a corpus of 41 university websites and analyzing the genre at three levels as the identification of moves, keywords in context, and concordance lines.

Computer technology and corpus-based studies have made a great impact on language learning research. Conrad, (2009) and Romer and Wulff (2010), by studying the keywords, concordance, cluster list, the use of demonstrative pronouns, and the frequency of the words across disciplines in the Michigan corpus illustrated the usefulness of corpus-based comparative analysis of texts in students' academic writing research. Wu, Geqi & Zhu, Yongsheng. (2015) compiled a sample corpus of 90 research articles (45 in English and 45 in Chinese) and explores the construction of authorial identity in English and Chinese research articles by examining the frequency of and roles performed by self-mention markers. Hedges as one of the particular features of academic writing has been the subject of research in corpus linguistics. Hyland (1994, 1996a, 1996b, 1998 & 1999), Salager-Meyer (1994), Vande Kopple and Crismore (1990), and Varttala (2001) have studied the significant role of hedging in academic writing and research articles; Whereas, Stubbs (1986), Coates (1987), Horman (1989) and Nittono (2003), have also studied the use of hedges in the context of casual and oral discourse. Reporting verbs in academic writing have also been studied in detail by Charles (2006), Zhang (2008), and Bloch (2010).

In EAP, a significant amount of research is conducted on the use and functions of lexical bundles. Lexical bundles have been referred to with different terms by researchers for instance, "lexicalized sentence stem" (Pawley & Syder, 1983), "cluster" (Scott, 1997), "N-grams" (Stubbs, 2005). Vidacovic and Barker (2010) studied lexical bundles to show that conventionalized lexical bundles mark the proficiency of writers. Chen and Baker (2010) illustrated that with the increase of language proficiency the use of lexical bundles also increased. Likewise, Staples, Egbert, Biber, and McClair (2013) manifested the proficiency

levels of L2-English writers with the use of lexical bundles. Pang (2010) and Salazar (2013) compared the use of lexical bundles in research articles by native and non-native writers. Whereas, Pan, Reppen, and Biber (2016) compared the use of lexical bundles in Telecommunications journals by native English with non-native English academic professionals. Previous studies on lexical bundles mostly focus on one discipline. Salazar (2013) identified lexical bundles in the published articles of biology and biochemistry, Qin (2014) studied lexical bundles in the academic papers and published articles of applied linguistics, Grabowski (2015) analyzed lexical bundles in the corpus of written English pharmaceutical discourse, and Pan et al. (2016) studied the lexical bundles in Telecommunications journals.

In Pakistan genre-based linguistic analysis of the use of language in different domains has recently got the attention of scholars and researchers. Though, at the moment there is a scarcity of research in this area, yet, some useful studies have been conducted in recent times. For instance, Mudasser (2017) conducted a corpus-based analysis of the politeness strategies in the acknowledgment sections of Ph.D. dissertations in Pakistan. Khattak and Shehzad (2018) also studied the specificity of academic verbs and showed the common patterns of the use of academic verbs in the introduction section of the Ph.D. dissertations in the field of English studies in Pakistan. Whereas Ahmed, Yousaf, and Habib (2018) linguistically analyzed the ideational functions in the legal discourse of the Panama case verdict in Pakistan. The current study is significant in the sense that it has identified the linguistic specificity of the frequent use and functions of self-mentioning, hedges, reporting verbs, and commonly occurring lexical bundles in the website messages of the Vice-Chancellors of different universities in Pakistan.

3. Research Methodology

The study has utilized corpus-based research methodology and is therefore quantitative. The data was collected from the websites of HEC recognized universities in Pakistan by the Purposive Nonrandom sampling technique (Dolores & Tongco, 2007). The data consists of 150 Vice-chancellors' messages posted over a period of six months on the websites of different universities i.e. private and public sector in Pakistan. To ensure the authenticity of data a way back, machinery i.e. Archive.org was used, where the collected data from the particular time period was saved. For analyzing data, the 'specificity model' by Hyland (2009) was used. Keyword lists of the lexical specificity given in Hyland's (2009) i.e. self-mentioning, hedges, reporting verbs, and lexical bundles were generated and their frequencies, and collocations were analyzed via software Antconc (3.4.4). After the analysis, the data is interpreted and discussed with reference to the findings of different sample studies in each of the above mentioned lexical category.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

Detailed analyses of the data along with a discussion of the results are as follows:

4.1. Self-Mention

Self-Mention is the first category as per 'Lexical Specificity' by Hyland's (2009). This category indicated that a writer mentions himself/herself in the writing by utilizing certain pronouns with the help of which he intrudes in the text and thus builds a relationship with the arguments made in it and also with the intended readers of the text. For Wu *et al.* (2015) 'Self-mention' is a powerful rhetorical strategy for constructing authorial identity in research articles and proposes that researchers' authorial identity can be considered in three aspects i.e. the detached, the individual, and the collective self; depending on the self-mention devices employed in writing.

Table 1

Self-Mentioning

Pronoun	Person	Frequency	% of Pronouns used in the corpus
We	First person(plural)	404	32.7%
You	Second person	297	23.4%
I	First person(singular)	289	21.6%
Them	Third-person	73	5.92%
Us	Third-person	73	5.92%
They	Third-person	61	4.94%
Me	First-person	35	2.83%
Mine	First-person	1	0.08%

Note. The above table represents the frequencies of the types of self-mentioning pronouns used in the text of Vice-Chancellors' messages.

The pronoun "we" has the highest frequency among the other pronouns. A detailed analysis of the concordance of the pronoun "we" in the corpus revealed that its explicit use with certain nouns and verbs has coupled the position and the claim of the writer, e.g. '*we owe to education* everything that we have achieved in the journey of life', '*we, as an enlightened clan*, are expected to convert challenges into opportunities', '*we solicit the help* of communities and Government and urge them to join hands with us'. This first-person plural pronoun is used to show the shared feelings of the writer of the text and the readers. These shared feelings are expected to have a positive impact on readers through persuading and convincing the readers of what has been communicated in the message. The use of 'we' help the author to generalize whatever they say to the reader. This gives the reader a sense of solidarity which makes them respond to the text as it is directly addressed to them thus perform the function of representing 'collective self' in the writing (Wu *et.al*).

Besides, there is the frequent use of the first-person singular pronoun "I". The percentage of the use of "I" shows that it is also a frequently used pronoun e.g. *I wish* best of luck for everyone' '*I look* forward to welcoming you all at the institute' '*I pray* for your bright future and success in every walk of life'. These examples show that the pronoun 'I' is used by writers to show an authentic perspective to readers. It is used by the writers to show a personal connection to the readers. Emotional bondage is generated between the speakers and writers with the use of first-person pronouns and performs the functions of representing 'individual self' (Wu *et.al*).

Another pronoun used in the welcome addresses of the vice-chancellors' messages is a second-person pronoun "you" which is used frequently in the corpus. This pronoun is used for addressing the readers directly. The second person "you" has three cases. In subjective and objective cases, it carries the same form "you" but in possessive cases, it takes two different forms e.g, "your and yours". The corpus analysis revealed that it has the second-highest frequency with 21.6%. The frequent use of "you" in the text shows the addressee's involvement in the message e.g. '*you are invited* to visit our campus', '*you will be* provided with a detailed orientation to help you to get started with your studies', '*you and your dreams* are important to us, let's materialize them together'. These examples show that the use of the second-person pronouns is also evident in the corpus and its use is preferred in the Vice-chancellors' messages to involve and engage readers in these messages and perform the functions of 'collective self' in the writing (Wu *et.al*).

The pronoun 'them' has the third-highest frequency in terms of its occurrence in the corpus e.g. 'I am proud *of them',* 'credit goes to this esteemed institution that has *given them the best* education, professionalism, and moral values', 'we solicit the help of communities and government and *urge them* to join hands with us', '*they should* take an interest in their studies and activities', '*they are highly* qualified and have a knack to meet the challenges', '*they always* make us proud'. These also perform the functions of 'collective self' in the writing (Wu *et.al*). According to Hyland (2009) self -mentioning in a text gives a writer the ability to claim their work and show the author's own opinion to the readers thus reveals the personal position of the author. The analysis of the self-mentioning in the corpus of Vice-chancellors' messages has shown that first and second-person pronouns are commonly used in these messages. The first person (plural) 'we' is used 32.7%, first person (singular) 'I' is used. 21.6% %, while the second person 'you' is used 23.4% in the corpus. Thus, the use of these pronouns refers to the important functions of individual and collective self in writing the Vice-Chancellors' messages on university websites.

4.2. Hedges

Hedges are the second category as per the 'Lexical Specificity' model proposed in Hyland (2009). According to Hyland (1998), hedging is a communicative strategy employed by writers to enhance or reduce the degree of confidence in the truth of statements, mark the writer's attitude towards the audience along and have rhetorical, interactive, and communicative importance in academic discourse. Lakoff (1972) explained hedges as "words or phrases whose job is to make things more or less fuzzy". Salager Meyer (1994) identified that Hedges illustrate tentativeness and flexibility in the level of claim the writers intend to make. Hedges are linguistic devices that show uncertainty and hesitation in language use and show politeness and indirectness in conversation. Hedges involve tense and aspect of the sentence and show the level of certainty of the writer with the claim they make. Writers use hedges to achieve some rhetoric effects because these serve different

purposes in the text e.g. to reduce the effect of another academic opposing claim, to go with the widely accepted and conventionalized format of academic writing, and to use different politeness strategies in conversation making it more productive for the readers. These hedges are used by the writers to reduce the abrupt response of readers and the risk of opposition. The use of hedges can be understood as a politeness strategy. The use of hedges in writing allows the writer to be less direct and develop a kind of writer/reader relationship. Writers use hedges in their writing to show that the claim they are making is not 100% proven.

Table 2

Hedges

Hedge	Frequency	%age in corpus	Hedge	Frequency	%age in corpus
That	355	37.1%	May	25	2.61%
Will	220	23.03%	Look	23	2.40%
Can	70	7.32%	Should	20	2.09%
Would	47	4.92%	Must	16	1.67%
Believe	33	3.45%	Possible	16	1.67%
About	32	3.35%	Sure	11	1.15%
Like	32	3.35%	Virtual	10	1.04%

Note. The above table shows the frequencies and percentages of the commonly occurring hedges in the Vice-Chancellors' messages.

The above-given Table shows the occurrence of 'That' with the frequency of 37.1%, 'will' 23.03%, 'can' 7.32%, 'would' 4.92%, 'believe' 3.45%, 'about' and 'like' with 3.35%, etc. respectively. The analysis of the corpus reveals that the corpus contains a large number of hedges. For Hyland (2009) the soft disciplines i.e. Social Sciences and Humanities make frequent use of hedges in their writing as compared to those in Science and Engineering. Along with Hyland's disciplinary specificity model, the present corpus of Vice-Chancellors' messages has illustrated frequent use of hedges which shows similarity to soft disciplines. In this way, Vice-Chancellors' messages can be grouped in soft disciplines according to Hyland's findings. It can also be inferred that Vice-Chancellors' messages make frequent use of hedges to interact with the readers in a polite way.

4.3 Directives

The third category as per Hyland (2009) is directives. The directives in English grammar are sentences that guide the reader to perform an action. Derivatives generally contain a high proportion of imperative sentences and they usually begin with action verbs. These usually include inviting, commanding, suggesting, pleading, requesting, expressing a wish, and permitting, etc. In English, directives are expressed in two ways i.e. imperatives and obligation modals. These two types of directives are analyzed and discussed in two separate tables.

Table 3

Modal Auxiliaries

Modal Auxiliary	Frequency	%age in corpus	Modal Auxiliary	Frequency	%age in corpus
Will	220	34.2%	Must	16	2.49%
Have	216	33.6%	Shall	16	2.49%
Can	70	10.96%	Could	7	1.09%
Would	47	7.32%	Ought	3	0.46%
May	25	3.89%	Might	2	0.31%
Should	20	3.11%			

Note. The above table shows the frequencies of frequently used modal auxiliaries in the corpus.

The modal auxiliary 'Will' has the highest frequency and percentage i.e. 34.2%. The use of "Will" serves different functions: writers use it to make sentences that refer to the future, show ability, willingness or commands, etc. The second frequent modal auxiliary in the corpus is "have" with a frequency of 33.6%. This modal is used to create different tenses e.g. present and past perfect tenses. It is used in affirmative and negative statements and also for showing the possibility and probability of something. Another frequently used modal auxiliary is "can" having a frequency of 10.96%. "can" is used to express ability, possibility, and consent.

Table 4

Imperatives

Imperative	Frequency	%age	S.no	Imperative	Frequency	%age
Make	70	12.36%	42.	Advice	2	0.35%
Provide	63	11.1%	43.	Close	2	0.35%
Develop	49	8.65%	44.	Copy	2	0.35%
Program	32	5.65%	45.	Mix	2	0.35%
Find	27	4.77%	46.	Receive	2	0.35%
Center	26	4.59%	47.	Request	2	0.35%
Study	25	4.41%	48.	Route	2	0.35%
Open	22	3.88%	49.	Stimulate	2	0.35%
Prepare	18	3.18%	50.	Adopt	1	0.17%
Process	17	3.0%	51.	Attend	1	0.17%
Facilitate	15	2.65%	52.	Balance	1	0.17%
Assure	14	2.47%	53.	Collaborate	1	0.17%
Post	12	2.12%	54.	Consolidate	1	0.17%
Train	11	1.94%	55.	Determine	1	0.17%
Clear	7	1.23%	56.	Disseminate	1	0.17%
Follow	7	1.23%	57.	Exercise	1	0.17%
Act	6	1.06%	58.	Feed	1	0.17%
Establish	6	1.06%	59.	Flag	1	0.17%
Plan	6	1.06%	60.	Formulate	1	0.17%
Assume	5	0.88%	61.	Furnish	1	0.17%
Implement	5	0.88%	62.	Inform	1	0.17%

Maintain	5	0.88%	63.	Initiate	1	0.17%
Requisite	5	0.88%	64.	List	1	0.17%
Search	5	0.88%	65.	Manage	1	0.17%
Secure	5	0.88%	67.	Measure	1	0.17%
Separate	5	0.88%	68.	Multiply	1	0.17%
Add	4	0.706%	69.	Note	1	0.17%
Apply	4	0.706%	70.	Observe	1	0.17%
Carry	4	0.706%	71.	Operate	1	0.17%
Direct	4	0.706%	72.	Review	1	0.17%
Evaluate	4	0.706%	73.	Schedule	1	0.17%
Line	4	0.706%	74.	Select	1	0.17%
Participate	4	0.706%	75.	Sign	1	0.17%
Rate	4	0.706%	76.	Survey	1	0.17%
Report	4	0.706%	77.	Test	1	0.17%
Assist	3	0.53%	78.	Obtain	1	0.17%
Batch	3	0.53%				
Corporate	3	0.53%				
Perform	3	0.53%				
Require	3	0.53%				
Write	3	0.53%				

Note. The above table represents the frequencies of the imperatives used in the text of Vice-chancellors' messages.

An imperative is a grammatical mood that expresses or directs action. The use of imperatives affects another verb and verb phrases in the sentence. Imperatives are verbs indicating a command or obligation. In an imperative mood, the base form of the verb is used to direct certain actions and it always starts with the verb indicating instructions.

Imperative voices can be affirmative or negative. Hyland (2009) asserts that imperatives direct their readers in three different activities e.g. textual, physical, and cognitive.

4.4 Reporting Verbs

Reporting verbs is also one of the important features in academic writing. Charles (2006), states that reporting verbs in writing enable a writer to mark his/her responsibility towards the statement made by referring to the source in support of their claim. Hyland and Milton (1999, p. 147) claimed that the "appropriate use of reporting verbs will provide maximum interpersonal and persuasive effect" and play important grammatical functions in writing statements in academic writing (Hyland, 1998). These functions of reporting verbs are divided into three basic categories i.e. research acts, cognition acts, and discourse (Hyland, 2000). The fourth category as per the Hyland's (2009) model of Linguistic Specificity is reporting verbs. Academic writing makes use of reporting verbs to report on the work done by others. Reporting verbs are used in present and past tenses according to the discourse it represents. It uses the past tense when reporting the events from the past and uses the present tense when the event continues. The following table shows the frequency of the use of reporting verbs in the Vice-Chancellors' messages.

Table 5

Reporting Verbs

Reporting Verb	Frequency	Percentage in the Corpus
Develop	49	42.6%
Find	27	23.4%
Study	25	21.7%
Report	4	3.47%
Say	4	3.47%
Claim	3	2.60%
Demonstrate	2	1.73%
Show	1	0.86%

Note. The above table shows the frequency of the reporting verbs used in the corpus.

The analysis of reporting verbs in the present study reveals that different reporting verbs are used frequently in the Vice-chancellors' messages e.g. develop, find, study, have a frequency of 42.6%, 23.4%, and 21.7% respectively. According to Hyland (2009), writers

in social sciences use verbs like "suggest, argue, discuss", while writers in natural sciences use verbs like "discover, show, analyze". The differences among different disciplines show that reporting verbs have different shades of meanings. In academic writing, when writers interpret and report the findings of others, they need to use a variety of reporting verbs. . According to Hyland (2009) soft disciplines, i.e. Humanities and social sciences use reporting verbs that are different from reporting verbs used in hard disciplines. In this study, the reporting verbs used are similar to those used in hard sciences i.e. 'find and study' to make their statements more potent and effective. The frequent use of reporting verbs in Vice-Chancellors' messages similar to those used in hard sciences makes these a specific linguistic feature of this type of writing.

4.5 Lexical Bundles

The fifth category as per Hyland (2009) is lexical bundles. The English language has certain commonly occurring expressions which are referred to as chunks or bundles and these are called lexical bundles. Biber and Conrad (2009) defined lexical bundles as the frequently re-occurring sequences of three or more words that have a statistical tendency to exist together in discourse. Lexical bundles can act as the main building blocks of a discourse. Biber, Johansson, Leech, and Finegan (1999) define a lexical bundle as, "a recurrent sequence of words which appears across texts in the same register and help shape distinctiveness of the register", whereas, Biber (2006) also defines lexical bundles as "the most frequent recurring sequences of words in a given register". One can differentiate between various types of these bundles based on their structural patterns and functions in discourse. Several researchers (Biber, Conrad, & Cortes, 2004; Biber, 2006; Hyland, 2008) have also shown that lexical bundles vary in their discourse functions (e.g., expressing stance, discourse organization, or referential meanings). According to Biber and Hyland (2006 & 2008), there are four types of lexical bundles in a particular discourse, and these are the Verb phrase component, Noun phrase components, Prepositional phrase/clausal elements, and other longer clausal structures. The present study has focused on identifying lexical containing three- or four-word clusters in the corpus. The following table shows their frequencies in the corpus.

Table no 6

Three Words Cluster

3 Words	Freq.	%age	3 Words	Freq.	%age	3 Words	Freq.	%age
as well as	47	1.15%	welcome to the	14	0.35%	in the field	10	0.24%
one of the	46	1.12%	of the students	13	0.31%	is committed to	10	0.24%
of the university	45	1.1	the needs of	13	0.3	of knowledge	10	0.2

Phrase	Freq	%	Phrase	Freq	%	Phrase	Freq	%
		0%			1%	and		4%
of the country	43	1.05%	to the university	13	0.31%	Pakistan x s	10	0.24%
in the country	33	0.80%	universities of the	13	0.31%	role in the	10	0.24%
the university is	32	0.74%	academic excellence and	12	0.29%	teaching and learning	10	0.24%
of higher education	29	0.71%	education in Pakistan	12	0.29%	teaching and research	10	0.24%
national and international	28	0.68%	education in the	12	0.29%	the faculty and	10	0.24%
the university of	27	0.66%	i welcome you	12	0.29%	the field of	10	0.24%
the development of	26	0.63%	invite you to	12	0.29%	to be a	10	0.24%
in order to	25	0.61%	of our students	12	0.29%	university in Pakistan	10	0.24%
the university has	25	0.61%	our students to	12	0.29%	vice chancellor of	10	0.24%
of the art	24	0.58%	part of the	12	0.29%	we believe that	10	0.24%
state of the	23	0.56%	university has been	12	0.29%	we need to	10	0.24%
of the world	21	0.51%	challenges of the	11	0.26%	you will be	10	0.24%
welcome you to	20	0.49%	education and research	11	0.26%	you will find	10	0.24%
look forward to	19	0.46%	i invite you	11	0.26%	a number of	9	0.22%
the quality of	19	0.46%	in the region	11	0.26%	a part of	9	0.22%

higher education commission	17	0.41%	is one of	11	0.26%	am confident that	9	0.22%
higher education in	17	0.41%	of academic excellence	11	0.26%	economic development of	9	0.22%
to meet the	17	0.41%	of excellence in	11	0.26%	education commission HEC	9	0.22%
the challenges of	16	0.39%	of the best	11	0.26%	excellence in teaching	9	0.22%
university of Peshawar	16	0.39%	of the leading	11	0.26%	highly qualified faculty	9	0.22%
development of the	15	0.36%	since its inception	11	0.26%	in the world	9	0.22%
faculty and staff	15	0.36%	the fact that	11	0.26%	of the most	9	0.22%
of higher learning	15	0.36%	the government of	11	0.26%	over the years	9	0.22%
the country and	15	0.36%	the university x	11	0.26%	quality of education	9	0.22%
university x s	15	0.36%	be able to	10	0.24%	shaheed benazirbhutto	9	0.22%
the higher education	14	0.35%	i am confident	10	0.24%	socio economic development	9	0.22%
to welcome you	14	0.35%	in higher education	10	0.24%	students and faculty	9	0.22%

Note. The above table represents the frequently used three words cluster of lexical bundles in the corpus.

Table 7

Four Words Cluster

4 Words	Freq.	%age	4 Words	Freq.	%age	4 Words	Freq.	%age
state of the art	23	1.59%	In the place of	6	0.41%	I am proud of	5	o.34%
i invite you to	11	0.76%	pleasure to welcome you	6	0.41%	to keep pace with	5	0.34%
the University of Peshawar	11	0.76%	Shaheed Benazir Bhutto city	6	0.41%	to the development of	5	0.34%
in the field of	10	0.69%	since its inception in	6	0.41%	top universities of the	5	0.34%
is one of the	10	0.69%	socio economic development of	6	0.41%	universities of the country	5	0.34%
the university x s	10	0.69%	to meet the challenges	6	0.41%	university of engineering technology	5	0.34%
higher education commission HEC	9	0.62%	to welcome you to	6	0.41%	we are proud of	5	0.34%
i am confident that	9	0.62%	universities of the world	6	0.41%	welcome you all to	5	0.34%
i welcome you to	9	0.62%	welcome you to the	6	0.41%	you for your interest	5	0.34%
one of the leading	9	0.62%	will be able to	6	0.41%	a wide range of	4	0.27%

as well as the	8	0.55%	and extra-curricular activities	5	0.34%	and humanity at large	4	0.27%
higher education in the	8	0.55%	as well as in	5	0.34%	are proud of our	4	0.27%
i look forward to	8	0.55%	be a part of	5	0.34%	as the vice chancellor	4	0.27%
of higher education in	8	0.55%	economic development of the	5	0.34%	at the same time	4	0.27%
one of the best	8	0.55%	for your interest in	5	0.34%	chartered by the government	4	0.27%
one of the most	8	0.55%	forward to welcome you	5	0.34%	Co-curricular and extra	4	0.27%
the challenges of the	8	0.55%	higher education in Pakistan	5	0.34%	curricular and extra –curricular	4	0.27%
the higher education commission	8	0.55%	in the development of	5	0.34%	education commission of Pakistan	4	0.27%
as one of the	7	0.48%	in the fields of	5	0.34%	excellence in teaching and	4	0.27%
by the higher education	7	0.48%	it is indeed a	5	0.34%	for the development of	4	0.27%
development of the country	7	0.48%	look forward to welcome	5	0.34%	for the quality of	4	0.27%
seat of higher learning	7	0.48%	of Pakistan it is	5	0.34%	forward to welcoming you	4	0.27%

to the university of	7	0.48%	of the country and	5	0.34%	great pleasure to welcome	4	0.27%
with the support of	7	0.48%	of the country in	5	0.34%	higher education commission of	4	0.27%
a large number of	6	0.41%	of the country the	5	0.34%	humanities and social sciences	4	0.27%
and look forward to	6	0.41%	role in the development	5	0.34%	in one of the	4	0.27%
benazirbhutto city university	6	0.41%	since its establishment in	5	0.34%	in this part of	4	0.27%
by higher education commission	6	0.41%	that you will find	5	0.34%	institutions of higher education	4	0.27%
by the government of	6	0.41%	the development of a	5	0.34%	is a matter of	4	0.27%

Note. The above represents the frequencies of four words cluster of lexical bundles in the sample corpus of Vice-Chancellors messages.

The above Tables exemplified the types and structure of lexical bundles used in the present corpus. The first Table illustrates the three-word lexical bundles and their frequency. There are certain three-word lexical bundles used commonly in the corpus e.g. as well as, one of the, of the university, of the country, in the country with a frequency of 1.15%, 1.12%, 1.10%, 1.05%, and 0.08% respectively. The second Table shows the frequency of four-word lexical bundles in the corpus. Here the dominant bundles are state of art, I invite you too, in the field of, with the frequency of 1.59%, 0.76, and 0.69% respectively. Based on their frequent use, they are divided into two categories e.g. primary lexical bundles and secondary lexical bundles. The lexical bundles used more than 5 times are commonly used bundles and referred to as the primary lexical bundles of the corpus e.g. as well as, one of the, of the country, state of the art, I invite u to have the frequency of 1.15%, 1.12%, 1.10%, 1.59% respectively. The bundles used less than five times, are regarded as the secondary lexical bundles e.g. all the best, all across the, we are proud of, having the frequency of 0.09%, 0.07%, and 0.23% respectively.

5. Conclusion

The findings of the study show that the linguistic specificity of this style of writing contains the frequent use of *self-mentioning* ('We', 'you' and 'I') that according to Wu *et al.* (2015), displays the authorial identity, mark solidarity of the writer with the readers, and perform the functions of reflecting the individual and collective self in writing. *Hedges* ('that', 'will' and 'can' etc.) that according to Hyland (1998), mark writer's attitude towards the audience, communication with the readers in a polite manner and represent the importance of courteous language in the messages of the Vice-Chancellors on university websites. *Directives* ('will', 'have' and 'can' etc.) to illustrates the usefulness of the message in terms of readers' interest in a suggestive manner and the possible impact of it in future prospects and to direct the readers in three different activities i.e. textual, physical and cognitive (Hyland, 2009). *Reporting verbs* ('Develop', 'Find', 'Study' and 'Report') to maximize the interpersonal and persuasive effect of the Vice-Chancellors messages and dominantly perform the function of developing cognition of the readers (Hyland, 2000). *Lexical bundles* of three and four words in abundance that according to Biber and Hyland (2006 & 2008) show the high-level language proficiency and expert mode of writing such messages by the Vice-Chancellors on the university websites. The frequency of the use of the above linguistic items manifests that the Vice-Chancellor's messages on the website of the universities play a very important function in conveying the manifesto of the university and is therefore written in a formal academic language. The findings of the study indicated that the keywords used in the text present a positive image of the university, and that the language of the Vice-Chancellors messages on websites is communicative, informative, and also promotional in nature.

References

Ahmed, V., Yousaf, M., & Habib, A. (2018). Ideational Metafunctions in Legal Discourse: A Critical Linguistic Analysis of Panama Case Verdict. *Erevena: Journal of Linguistics & Literature* 2 (1), 65-82.

Askehave, I., & Nielsen, A. E. (2005). What are the characteristics of digital genres? – Genre theory from a multi-modal perspective. In Proceedings of the *38th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* (pp. 97-98). IEEE Computer Society, USA.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). The Longman grammar of spoken and written English. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Cortes, V. (2004). If you look at…: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks. Applied Linguistics, 25(3), 371-405.

Biber, D. (2006). University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bloch, J. (2010). A concordance- based study of the use of reporting verbs as rhetorical devices in academic papers. Journal of Writing Research 2(2), 219-244.

Dolores, M., Tongco, C. (2007). Purposive Sampling as a Tool for Informant Selection. Ethnobotany Research & Applications. A journal of Plant, People, and Applied Research. 5:147-158.

Chandler, D. (1997). An Introduction to Genre Theory.

http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/intgenre/intgenre.html Kasesniemi & Rautiainen (2002)

Coates, J. (1987). Epistemic modality and spoken discourse. Transactions of the Philological Society, 85, 100-131.

Conrad. S, (2009). Genre analysis: Structural and linguistic evolution of the English-medium medical research article. *English for Specific Purposes, 28*(2), 93-104.

Charles, M. (2006). Phraseological patterns in reporting clauses used in the citation: A corpus-based study of theses in two disciplines. English for Specific Purposes, 25, 310-331.

Chen, Y. H., & Baker, P. (2010). Lexical bundles in L1 and L2 academic writing. Language Learning & Technology, 14(2), 30-49.

Grabowski, Ł. (2015). Keywords and lexical bundles within English pharmaceutical discourse: A corpus-driven description. English for Specific Purposes, 38, 23-33.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1989). Spoken and written language (language education). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Horman, L. A. (1989). The evaluative consequences of hedges, hesitations, and intensifiers: Powerful and powerless speech-styles. Human Communication Research, 15, 383-406.

Hyland, K. (1994). Hedging in academic writing and EAP textbooks. English for Specific Purposes, 13(3), 239-256.

Hyland, K. (1996a). Talking to academy: Forms of hedging in science research articles. Written Communication, 13,251-281.

Hyland, K. (1996b). Writing without conviction? Hedging in science research articles. Applied Linguistics, 17, 433-454.

Hyland, K. (1998). Hedging in scientific research articles. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hyland, K. (1999). Talking to students: Metadiscourse in introductory course books. English for Specific Purposes, 18, 3-26.

Hyland, K. & Milton, J. (1999). Assertions in students' academic essays: A comparison of English NS and NNS student writers. In R. Berry, B. Asker, K. Hyland, & M. Lam (Eds.), Language Analysis, Description, and Pedagogy (pp. 147-161). Hong Kong: Language Centre, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

Hyland, K. (2000). Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2002). Specificity revisited: How far should we go now? *English for specific purposes, 21*(4), 385-395.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy, and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of second language writing, 16*(3), 148-164.

Hyland, K. (2008a). Small bits of textual material: A discourse analysis of Swales' writing. *English for Specific Purposes, 27*(2), 143-160.

Hyland, K. (2008b). As can be seen: Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation. English for Specific Purposes, 27(1), 4-21.

Hyland, K. (2009). Writing in the disciplines: Research evidence for specificity. *Taiwan International ESP Journal, 1*(1), 5-22.

Jeffries (2015). Simulation Theory: Brief Narrative Description. *Nursing Education Perspectives*

September/October 2015, 36(5), 292 – 293.

Khattak, N. U. R., & Shehzad, W. (2018). A corpus-based study of the specificity of academic verbs in introduction sections of Ph.D. dissertations in English studies in Pakistan. *Dialogue XIV*(1), 63-74.

Lakoff, G. (1972). Hedges: A study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts. Chicago Linguistic Society Papers, 8, 183-228.

McEnery, T., & Wilson, A. (2005). Corpus linguistics. In R. Mitkov (Ed.), *The oxford handbook of computational linguistics* (pp. 448-463). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mudasser, S. (2017). Corpus-based analysis of politeness strategies in acknowledgement section of selected Pakistani Ph.D. literature and linguistics theses. *Erevena: Journal of Linguistics & Literature 1*(1), 20-37.

Nittono, M. (2003). Japanese hedging in friend-friend discourse. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Columbia University, USA.

Pan, F., Reppen, R., & Biber, D. (2016). Comparing patterns of L1 versus L2 English academic professionals: Lexical bundles in telecommunications research journals. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 21, 60-71.

Pang, W. (2010). Lexical bundles and the construction of an academic voice: A pedagogical perspective. Asian EFL Journal 47(1), 30-43.

Pawley, A., & Syder, F. H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (eds). Language and communication (pp. 191-225).

Pawley, A., & Syder, F. H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (eds). Language and communication (pp. 191-225).

Qin, J. (2014). Use of formulaic bundles by nonnative English graduate writers and published authors in applied linguistics. System, 42(1), 220-231.

Römer, U., & Wulff, S. (2010). Applying corpus methods to written academic texts: Explorations of MICUSP. *Journal of writing research, 2*(2) 99-127.

Salager-Meyer, F. (1994). Hedges and textual communicative function in medical English written discourse. English for Specific Purposes, 13(2), 149-171.

Salazar, D. (2013). Biomedical English: A corpus-based approach. Oxford: John Benjamins.

Scott, M. (1997). PC analysis of keywords – and key keywords. System, 25(1), 233-245.

Staples, S., Egbert, J., Biber, D., & McClair, A. (2013). Formulaic sequences and EAP writing development: Lexical bundles in the TOEFL iBT writing section. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12(3), 214-225.

Stubbs, M (2005). The most natural thing in the world: quantitative data analysis on multi-word sequences in English. Paper presented at Phraseology 2005, 13–15 October 2005, Louvainla-Neuve.

Stubbs, M. (1986). A matter of prolonged fieldwork: Notes towards a modal grammar of English. Applied Linguistics, 7, 1-25.

Vande Kopple, W. J., & Crismore, A. (1990). Readers' reactions to hedges in a science textbook. Linguistics and Education, 2, 303-322.

Varttala, T. A. (2001). Hedging in scientifically oriented discourse: Exploring variation according to discipline and intended audience. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Tarnpereen Yliopisto, Finland.

Vidakovic, I., & Barker, F. (2010). Use of words and multi-word units in skills for life writing examinations. Cambridge ESOL: Research Notes, 41, 7-14.

Villanueva, L. S., Dolom, M. A. C., & Belen, J. S. (2018). Genre analysis of the "about us" sections of Asian Association of Open University websites. *Asian Association of Open Universities Journal, 13*(1), 37-59.

Yang, W. (2013). 'Why to choose us?' texts in university websites: A genre analysis. *Taiwan International ESP Journal, 5*(1), 45-80.

Wu, Geqi, Zhu & Yongsheng. (2015). Self-mention and authorial identity construction in English and Chinese research articles: A contrastive study. Linguistics and the Human Sciences. 10. 133-158. 10.1558/lhs.v10i2.28557.

Zhang, X. (2008). A contrastive study of reporting in Master's Theses in native Chinese and in Native English. Dissertation presented for the degree of MSc in Applied Linguistics. The University of Edinburgh.