At Work and At War: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Combat Job Descriptions on GoArmy.com

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in English at George Mason University

By

James Graham
Bachelor of Arts
George Mason University, 2003

Director: Dr. Susan Lawrence, Assistant Professor
Department of English

Spring Semester 2011
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my wife Dhanielle, without whose faith and support I would never have accomplished even the most modest of my life's goals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my mother, Lynda, and my father Jim, for being firm but loving exemplars of a philosophy of lifetime learning and a tireless work ethic.

I wish to thank my wife Dhanielle for inspiring my academic accomplishments, and for her enduring love and support.

I wish to thank my daughters, Ava, Katie and Olivia, for giving me undeniable reasons to strive to be my best.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

ABSTRACT

AT WORK AND AT WAR: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE
COMBAT JOB DESCRIPTIONS ON GOARMY.COM

James Graham, MA

George Mason University, 2011

Thesis Director: Dr. Susan Lawrence

Since the end of conscription in the early 1970s, the US Army has needed to convince
potential recruits to consider enlistment, and with the advent of the Internet, this
discourse gained range and persistence like never before. These benefits have been put to
effective use in supporting the recent occupations of Afghanistan and Iraq, the personnel
strains of which have made recruiting discourse more important than ever.

The Army has historically been subject to criticism for its recruiting practices, which
even in peacetime have drawn fire from media, scholarly and advertising industry sources
for the tendency to be one-sided at best and outright deceptive at worst. Existing
scholarship, however, has focused on previous or historical forms of this discourse, and
no research has yet focused on the unique form this discourse takes today.

This study examines how the service currently represents combat jobs to potential
recruits. I conduct a critical discourse analysis of the combat job descriptions on the
Army's recruiting website goarmy.com to identify the means by which the Army's
recruiting discourse constructs the modern combat soldier's work. In conclusion, I show
how this discourse obscures the less-attractive aspects of the combat soldier's work, such
as physical, moral and psychological hazards while foregrounding other, more attractive
potential aspects of service, such as technology skills and training.

These discursive strategies have social and cognitive effects that constitute a unique type
of power imbalance—manipulation—in that it seeks to convince the audience to take
action that is decidedly against their own interests and in the interests of the Army.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the abolition of the military draft in the United States in 1973, the United States Army has embraced a recruiting model to fill the combat ranks, a necessity of peacetime foreign policy and in times of overt conflict. Part of this strategy includes high-profile media advertising incorporating technologies such as the Internet, which all of the services today use as a primary means of reaching audiences and advertising the concept of military service to eligible potential recruits. Recruiting websites allow the military services levels of persistence and consistency unavailable to them before. In the past, military recruiters relied upon limited promotional materials such as brochures and media advertising to entice potential recruits into visiting a physical office, where it was the recruiter's job to communicate the recruiting messages of the service to the potential enlistee, and to manage individual discussions surrounding potential career options and general aspects of military life. Today, these websites include everything from explications of military life and values to detailed descriptions of the available jobs in which potential recruits can serve during their enlistments. The amount of information on these sites, along with their persistence and communicative reach as mass-media, make recruiting websites an ideal tool for maintaining the flow of recruits needed to fulfill the services' manpower goals in support of current and future US foreign policy.

If the means by which the services can reach potential recruits has become somewhat easier with the Internet, the context surrounding recruiting and enlistment has only gotten more complex and difficult. On one hand, a weak national economy has historically almost always seen a correlating spike in military enlistment, a circumstance that increases the effectiveness of military recruiting messages and means. The truth is that the military has always been seen as a potential source of personal development and economic advancement for low-income rural and inner-city youth, and military programs such as the Montgomery GI Bill and service-level college funds have only strengthened the persuasive argument for enlistment. The military occupations of Iraq and Afghanistan, as with Vietnam, on the other hand, have made war and its horrors an omnipresent element of the daily national discourse. Every day, reports of fierce fighting, wounded and killed US service members, and the difficulties inherent in those particular missions abound in the media, and are made even more prominent by the multitude of media outlets offering coverage of these conflicts online. Additionally, the "indentured" nature of modern US military service contracts, and controversial policies such as involuntary extension and reenlistment (known in the 21st Century as "stop-loss"), have seriously complicated the decision to enlist or not. Given the possible imbalance of benefits and consequences in modern military enlistment, and especially in times of long-term combat operations, it seems necessary to closely examine the means by which the armed forces convince their target audiences to volunteer for military service.

The US Army's recruiting discourse seeks to engage a potential recruit with various texts (brochures; print, television and radio ads, and content on the GoArmy.com website) that portray military service in a light that will give the potential recruit reason to act (e.g., to seek more information from the site or a recruiter, if not enlist outright). These texts include pages within the site that address topics on service and military life, from soldier pay details to basic training subjects and preparation, to how and where to contact a recruiter. Almost all of this content is meant to give prospective recruits information about what their life would be like once they enlist, including the kinds of work the Army offers.

Life in the Army includes, and is most often closely tied to, the work that a soldier performs, and the role he or she plays in the service. For most soldiers occupying combat jobs in the Army, for example, work and life can often be difficult to discern from one another. For instance, living quarters (mostly barracks) for most enlisted infantrymen are places where work tasks and off-duty socialization alike take place, and the people amongst whom most combat soldiers live are also their co-workers. In Basic Training, field training and deployment, work and living are often one and the same, such that a tank crewmember will most often perpetually live and work in and around their assigned vehicle and its crew, without a clear line between work and non-work activities. It should suffice to say, then, that work in the Army's combat jobs is a core element of a service member's experience after enlisting.

The GoArmy.com recruiting site constructs and portrays this work to potential applicants for combat jobs through dedicated content such as the job descriptions available on the "Careers and Jobs" portion of the site. These job descriptions are as close as the site comes to a succinct and detailed portrayal of combat soldiers' work in the Army, with the purpose of informing a potential recruit about the types of work available to them upon enlistment. Because the work and life of the combat soldier are so closely linked, I will examine these texts for language that represents this work and analyze how it does so.

2. CRITICAL DISCUSSION

MEDIA, SCHOLARLY, AND ADVERTISING CRITICISM OF US ARMY RECRUITING DISCOURSE

Military recruitment advertising, though rarely the subject of critical empirical inquiry, seems nonetheless an interesting example of the "gray area" of rhetoric: where purpose blurs between informing readers and selling them something. Though few examples of research into military advertising exist, criticism of military advertising abounds in the media, especially among news outlets in the US and England. Although rare, scholarly research into Army recruiting discourse shows a highly critical attitude toward its use (and lack) of language. Finally, the perspective from the advertising industry completes the triangle of criticism focused on military recruiting discourse.

One focus of media criticism that carries a special social exigency concerns perceived predatory recruiting efforts aimed at lower-income areas and certain racial demographics. In Jessica Siegel's *Washington Post* article "What Army Ads Don't Say," written more than a decade before the terrorist attacks on the US in 2001, and just after the beginning of the first Gulf War, directs critique at military recruiting in high schools, and the strategies that recruiters use:

"Be All You Can Be" ads say on television during football and basketball games, on the radio, on billboards. "It's Not a Job, It's an Adventure." I was enraged watching kids buy the targeted siren song of discipline, travel, skills and, of course, the inevitable "training." Training for what, really, in the end? The recruiters didn't get around to surgical strikes with smart bombs (1).

Siegel critiques what she seems to see as a core problem in modern military recruiting discourse, namely, she concludes, how "no recruiter, no ad, ever used the word 'casualties'" (1). This conclusion, which caps Siegel's critique, specifically singles out the practice of strategic omission in recruiting discourse as a significant social transgression, a perspective that other critics in the media share.

While Siegel's piece was critical of military recruiting discourse and practice in general, other instances of media criticism have since focused this critical lens on the efficacy and ethics of the US Army's then-new slogan, "An Army of One" (2001). John Leo's piece in *U.S. News & World Report* titled, "One Tin Slogan" notes how the Army's attitude toward its messaging is often different that what critics see:

Louis Caldera, secretary of the Army, says of young people, 'What we are telling them is that the strength of the Army is in individuals. Yes, you're a member of the team and you've got support from your fellow teammates, but you as an individual make a difference.' Bob Garfield, a critic for *Advertising Age*, says of

the same slogan: 'It's a clever campaign, but substantially dishonest. The Army is not, never has been, and never will be about one soldier. Individuality has absolutely nothing to do with Army life' (2).

Garfield's notion that the Army would dishonestly misinform potential recruits, even at such a high level of the discourse as its slogan or catch-phrase, gives rise to questions as to the potential depth of such dishonesty, and only serves to strengthen the sense of exigency in further analyzing of the Army's recruiting language.

Criticism in the Western news media, though, significantly outnumbers that originating from the scholarly community. Perhaps due to its long-standing status as a "necessary evil" to maintain the all-volunteer force, military recruiting discourse has remained nearly untouched as an area of rhetorical inquiry, a circumstance that only reinforces the need for further study into this unique discourse.

One of the only pieces of rhetorical criticism concerning military recruiting discourse focuses on the language of the very first recruiting discourse supporting the all-volunteer force. James Kimble's article on the Russian Communication Association (RCA) website, "Text and Context in 'This is the Army,'" explores one of the first Army ad campaigns from 1979, and its rhetorical strategies and effects. Kimble's paper explores military recruiting from the perspective of Lloyd Bitzer's theory of rhetorical situation, and so is not directly critical of the rhetor behind these advertisements, but the

study does identify that one of the strategies used to overcome the constraints is omission. His example concerns the presence in the ad of language referring to combat:

> Similarly, combat and the possibility of war do not appear in the ad. Yet the skills in which *all* Army soldiers train include the use of rifles, grenades, and other weapons—in other words, every Army enlistee trains to fight in combat. The advertisement, however, fails to indicate this possibility; even the pictures surrounding the text show soldiers smiling, jogging, and talking to relatives (4).

It is also difficult to ignore the significance of Kimble's analysis when he states why this early recruiting discourse did not mention Vietnam, a costly experience that was still fresh in the minds of Americans when "This is the Army" was published:

> Obviously, it would be an odd strategy for the rhetors to mention … a negative (and relatively recent) emotional issue when they are re-framing the topic, but the obvious nature of the omission [of Vietnam] makes even clearer its strategic nature (4).

In these conclusions Kimble recognizes that such "strategic omissions" can and do appear in even the earliest Army recruiting discourses, and that the omissions in "This is the Army" are generally in the Army's interest. These are discursive and social

analyses that I believe also apply to language in today's recruiting discourse, as my later discussion of manipulation will explain.

Some scholarly criticism supports similar assertions with empirical survey-driven data on service members' attitudes toward Army recruiting discourse. Before writing "The Army's 'Be All You Can Be' Campaign," a study on the effects of military recruiting rhetoric on a critical but often-overlooked audience, Leonard Shyles and John E. Hocking interviewed active-duty soldiers in the mid-1980s with the intention of finding out how they felt about the Army's now-iconic (but then-new) recruiting program. Most of the respondents' comments were openly critical of the questionable nature of Army's recruiting language:

> Results of focus group interviews with 87 male and 27 female soldiers indicate soldiers believe there is a wide gap between the promises of Army advertising and the actual performance of the Army in keeping its promises. (369).

The implications were equally damning, as the authors state: "Ethically, it is simply wrong to induce young Americans to join in the service of their country with misleading claims that are likely to be true for only a small portion of those who enlist" (379). Such a conclusion evokes the social exigency of the situation, and provides a strong rationale for further critical analysis of Army recruiting discourse.

9

A third source of criticism aimed at military recruiting rhetoric comes from the field of advertising. Richard Linnett's *Advertising Age* article, "Reaching 'Generation Kill': Army fails to battle new recruit reality," shares some unique insights concerning the nature of military advertising, most notably from Evan Wright, a *Rolling Stone* journalist who was embedded with an Army unit in Afghanistan and a Marine reconnaissance unit in Iraq. Wright's gritty and deeply critical account of his time in Iraq was published and made into a popular cable television series. Years later, in Linnett's article, Wright admonishes the Army and gives a sobering warning on the matter of military advertising:

> …the Army has to be careful, because it really damages morale if they do
> a bait and switch...The Army sells 'kids on this idea of playing with really
> cool guns, machines, tanks, radios and computers, that they have so much
> high technology they'll be an 'Army of One.' But the dominant images of
> the war, said Mr. Wright, 'are burning Army Humvees. In the field, the
> technology doesn't seem so cool (3).

This criticism condemns the persuasive appeals that the Army uses in its recruiting discourse as manifestly deceptive, where a focus on technology and job skills are primary elements during the recruitment of a soldier, but often take the form of the horrors of modern warfare once that recruit has taken the oath of service.

Despite the variety of perspectives and foci, each of these authors notes some element that is significantly critical of the Army's representations of the soldiering experience in its recruiting discourse. The media, as one source, has repeatedly criticized the Army's advertising, most notably its recruiting campaigns, for being at best misleading concerning the details of modern military life, and at worst dishonest to the point of deception. Limited scholarly discussions of the Army's recruiting discourse have identified similar issues throughout the advertising the all-volunteer force and the messages and materials that the Army has used. This criticism spans the earliest instance of this particular recruiting discourse, where "strategic omission" served the social interests of the Army, and the opinions of active-duty service members highlighted a gap between the Army's promises about its lifestyle and the realities of that lifestyle. Likewise, advertisers have warned that the Army stands to risk much with the kind of "bait and switch" tactics they see in the service's highest levels of recruiting discourse. Together, this body of criticism sets an important precedent concerning the US Army's recruiting discourse, an underdeveloped conversation to which this study aims to contribute.

CRITICISM OF RECRUITING WEBSITES

Just as the previous accounting of critical discussion has illuminated the need for further research into the Army's use of language in a recruiting context, the scholarly discussion surrounding the rhetoric of recruiting websites, and specifically those sites

controlled by the recruiting organization, provides conceptual resources for examining the language choices the Army makes in its own similar discourse. Specifically, the conclusions at which Jun Young and Kirsten Foot arrive in their textual analysis of *Fortune* 500 corporate recruiting websites sets the tone and agenda for most analyses of its type, and can help guide a textual analysis of GoArmy.com's combat career-related pages.

Young and Foot are interested in the ways that organizations appeal to potential employees, and specifically the rhetorical strategies employed in these appeals. The authors first take note of the unique discursive power conferred when organizations host their own recruiting sites, and how these sites "provide organizations the freedom to present information and recruiting strategies in their own way" (45). This study of so-called "e-cruiting" also describes the characteristics and functions of these types of sites, including how they can act as "windows into how organizations construct work for the purpose of employee recruitment" (50). This rhetorical construction of "work" in the Army's descriptions of combat jobs is no different, in that their purpose is also to "induce cooperation from an audience of potential job applicants who visit the Web site" (50). Young and Foot's ideas concerning the rhetorical aspects of recruiting websites as discursive modes are not the only similarity to be noted between corporate recruiting sites and GoArmy.com. The study's conclusions are also applicable, most notably that "Career sites construct idealized images of work."

Just as the job sites of *Fortune* 500 companies do not present work as "the factory

line or office cubicle with alienated workers each doing their part (tediously) to build a

widget or push paper" (62), the GoArmy.com website does not present "work" in the

combat specialties as 3 a.m. guard duty shifts or forced marches in freezing weather

under heavy loads, all of which nearly every combat soldier will endure at some point in

his enlistment. Like Young and Foot found with corporate sites, work on the

GoArmy.com career site "instead, transcends anything laborious, mundane or trite" (62).

The GoArmy.com in general similarly employs "aggrandizing metaphors and

euphemisms" (63), in attempts "to attract potential applicants through enticing utopian

images of the workplace" (63). And, perhaps most importantly to my own analysis,

Young and Foot postulate that "in doing so, companies may also be concealing the

darker, less than ideal aspects of labor..." (63).

A final corollary to Young and Foot comes in the conclusion to their analysis,

which draws upon related discussions surrounding Realistic Job Projections (RJPs--a

subject which has its own deep discourse in organizational psychology) to find that job

sites can constitute a sort of "psychological contract" made to potential applicants, the

nullification of which (by any number of means) could lead to myriad negative

consequences for the recruiting organization, namely employee dissatisfaction, low

performance, and voluntary termination (Young & Foot's short discussion refers the

reader to Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004, for more on these potential consequences. I will use

them only as far as Young and Foot do: as assumptions.). I apply this assumption to

Army service only as far as the first two results (dissatisfaction and low performance), because the third (quitting) is strongly discouraged in the military structure in general, if not impossible, given the often rigid indentured nature of enlistment and the negative social consequences of anything less than an "honorable" discharge. This is of course to say nothing of the recent phenomenon of the "stop-loss," where soldiers' enlistments (and often their combat tours) are involuntarily extended to maintain staffing levels in certain specialties (such as many combat jobs) that the Army deems critical to the war effort.

What is left is the undeniable assertion that the career pages of the GoArmy.com recruiting site correspond in rhetorical mode to the *Fortune* 500 job sites in Young & Foot's study. This assumption, and all its related assumptions, will form the lens through which I view a sampling of job descriptions on the GoArmy.com website.

3. APPROACH

In this study, I adopt the methodology of critical discourse analysis (CDA), along with its assumptions about the relationship between language and power, in a textual analysis examining key linguistic constructions and concepts as they apply to the representations of the combat soldier's work in modern Army recruiting discourse. This specific discourse comprises the "combat" job descriptions that appear on the "Careers and Jobs" pages of GoArmy.com. I will analyze these texts to identify how the Army's use of language foregrounds the potentially positive elements of the combat soldier's work and obscures other, negative elements—physical, psychological and moral hazard. I will then argue that this discourse contains euphemistic language that contributes to its function as manipulation, in accordance with Teun van Dijk's ideas about manipulation as one form of power abuse.

As a former enlisted infantryman (1992-1999), I believe I am in a position to critique the Army's representations of the combat soldier in its recruiting discourse as a former recruit and active-duty soldier. While it is true that the threats facing the modern combat soldier serving in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere abroad under the umbrella of the Global War on Terror far outweigh any that I personally experienced, I believe the increased risk inherent in modern military service should only serve to cement the social

exigency of the matter, as the hazards seem greater than ever for those currently serving in these occupations.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

My study aims to illuminate how US Army recruiting discourse constructs the work of the combat soldier. Discourse analysis is a way of studying language-in-use, or discourse, and the ways that it simultaneously shapes and is shaped by the world. Barbara Johnstone describes this relationship in her book *Discourse Analysis*:

> The consensus among discourse analysts is that discourse is both shaped by and helps to shape the human lifeworld, or the world as we experience it. In other words, discourse both reflects and creates human beings' "worldviews." (30)

Johnstone is careful to qualify, however, that the world is not the only element that shapes discourse, but that existing discourse, language, participants, medium, and purpose also shape it. Language, for example, reflects social relationships, including power and identity, between participants in discourse. It is this reflective nature of discourse that makes it such a useful tool in describing the relationship between language and the world it describes. My study focuses on how the US Army's recruiting discourse constructs the work of the combat soldier, by shaping the aspect of the combat soldier's

worldview that has to do specifically with his work (despite recent calls to reverse this trend, all combat jobs remain closed to women).

Largely because it can address questions of language, culture, and power, DA is a methodology employed by numerous disciplines. As the name suggests, the primary method of DA involves a close scrutiny of language-in-use, with a specific focus on the text and context involved in the discourse under examination. The ties between language in practice and how meaning is derived from it is the focus of DA scholars like Gillian Brown and George Yule, whose monograph *Discourse Analysis* makes this connection clear:

> …discourse analysis on one hand includes the study of linguistic forms and the regularities of their distribution and, on the other hand, involves a consideration of the general principles of interpretation by which people normally make sense of what they hear and read" (Preface, X).

Johnstone also sees this "analysis of discourse" as necessarily a thorough examination of the language constituting the discourse:

> Discourse analysis…is rigorous to the extent that it is grounded in the closest possible attention to linguistic and contextual detail. Discourse analysis starts in linguistic analysis… (238).

My approach will involve such close linguistic analysis to gain a better understanding of the Army's recruiting discourse and the language it uses to construct the combat soldier's work. DA examines the myriad contextual elements in discourse, and likewise the many effects it can have. One form of discourse analysis, though—critical discourse analysis (CDA)—specifically focuses its analysis on the context of power relations between rhetor and audience. Because of this focus on power, I use CDA to illuminate the exigency of the social iniquity represented in the combat job descriptions on GoArmy.com.

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Sometimes described as a more socially aware form of DA, CDA uses the methods of DA, but with a focus on the social elements and implications of discourse. There exist several lengthy and detailed accounts of the history of CDA, and all give credit to scholars such as Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak, and Teun van Dijk for framing and developing CDA as a form of analysis with a specific social focus and function. CDA scholar Jan Blommaert notes in his monograph *Discourse: a Critical Introduction* that CDA has its foundations in European scholarly tradition, and was instrumental in "establishing the legitimacy of a linguistically oriented discourse analysis firmly anchored in social reality and with a deep interest in actual problems and forms of inequality in societies" (6).

18

The practice of analyzing live discourse instead of contrived examples at once separates CDA from DA as analysis rooted in reality and the effects of language on reality, and as a specific form of social activism, where analysts identify and tackle real problems with the interest of foregrounding some of the otherwise normalized and hidden ills of society. In their seminal piece "Critical Discourse Analysis," as it appears in van Dijk's anthology *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, Vol. 2. Discourse as Social Interaction*, Fairclough and Wodak describe CDA as having a distinct form and spirit of social activism:

> CDA sees itself not as dispassionate and objective social science, but as engaged and committed. It is a form of intervention in social practice and social relationships....What is distinctive about CDA is both that it intervenes on the side of dominated and oppressed groups and against dominating groups, and that it openly declares the emancipator interests that motivate it (59).

Blommaert, in his further explication of CDA, reinforces this concept of CDA as focused upon social action, and not simply discovery of social context:

> It is not enough to uncover the social dimensions of language use. These dimensions are the object of moral and political evaluation, and analyzing them should have the effects in society: empowering the powerless, giving voices to the

voiceless, exposing power abuse, and mobilizing people to remedy social wrongs

(25).

Fairclough and Wodak explain in van Dijk's *Handbook of Critical Discourse Analysis* how scholars of the CDA methodology view the ties between society and language:

> CDA sees discourse – language use in speech and writing – as a form of 'social
> practice'….Since discourse is so socially consequential, it gives rise to important
> issues of power. Discursive practices may have major ideological effects – that
> is, they can help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between (for
> instance) social classes, women and men, and ethnic/cultural majorities and
> minorities through the ways in which they represent things and position people
> (258).

This "critical" distinction of CDA from DA is meant to draw attention to hidden connections among language and social sources of power, according to Fairclough's canonical *Language and Power*:

> Critical is used in the special sense of aiming to show connections which may be
> hidden from people – such as the connections between language, power and
> ideology…Critical language study analyses social interactions in a way which

focuses upon their linguistic elements, and which sets out to show up their generally hidden determinants in the system of social relationships, as well as hidden effects they may have upon that system. (5)

CDA is not just concerned with the exercise of power through language, but specifically with abuses of power. These power abuses are not nebulous, but, as van Dijk believes, most often conform to a set of criteria that can be applied to any discourse in question. Among the questions that van Dijk says CDA can ask is how discourse controls the decisions and actions of less-powerful groups, and what the social consequences of this control are (258). I use the concepts at the heart of CDA—that discourse, and language are socially constructed while simultaneously constructing social reality—to answer these types of questions in my investigation into how the language employed in the combat job descriptions on the GoArmy.com website constitute one specific type of power abuse—manipulation.

MANIPULATION

As explained earlier, CDA takes DA's attitude that discourse shapes readers' worldviews, but, going further, examines exactly how those world views (and the discourses shaping them) also reinforce unequal power relations, such as domination and manipulation. Van Dijk's essay, "Discourse and Manipulation" explains discursive manipulation as a specific type of power abuse:

21

Manipulation not only involves power, but specifically *abuse* of power, that is, *domination*. That is, manipulation implies the exercise of a form of *illegitimate* influence by means of discourse: manipulators make others believe or do things that are in the interest of the manipulator, and against the best interests of the manipulated (3).

In this essay, van Dijk proposes an approach to analysis that departs slightly from the core ideas of CDA. His manipulation thesis proposes that, in addition to examining and accounting for the discursive and social facets of language (those facets generally covered by DA and CDA, respectively), research into manipulation must also include a cognitive facet:

…manipulation is a social phenomenon – especially because it involves interaction and power abuse between groups and social actors – a cognitive phenomenon because manipulation always implies the manipulation of the minds of participants, and a discursive–semiotic phenomenon, because manipulation is being exercised through text, talk and visual messages (361).

This "triangulated" approach, according to van Dijk, is necessary to any discussion of manipulative language, and the only comprehensive analysis is the one that takes all three perspectives into account, without exception.

The cognitive facet of manipulation, van Dijk explains, has directly to do with the way textual features of discourse "may specifically affect the management of strategic understanding in short-term memory, so that readers pay more attention to some pieces of information than others" (van Dijk, 365). In short, manipulative discourse features aim to affect the audience's beliefs in such a way that members of the (manipulated) audience act in a manner that is simultaneously in the interests of the manipulator and against the interests of the manipulated. I will show later how the job descriptions on the GoArmy.com site meet the discursive, cognitive and social criteria outlined in van Dijk's ideas about manipulation.

4. METHOD

As a method, discourse analysis focuses on the linguistic features of discourse that construct the world around us. In this case, I will focus on the linguistic features of the job descriptions on the GoArmy.com website, and discuss how they construct the combat soldier and his work, including representations of the enemy. In this section, I will outline my sample, give some explanation as to the jobs included in it, provide some context surrounding the job descriptions in general, and, finally, outline what I believe is a distinct focus on technology contained within the discourse.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study examines the language constructing the combat soldier's work, paying attention to how the Army uses that language to emphasize positive aspects of that work and de-emphasize the negative aspects. This study also examines how this emphasis and obfuscation reproduce unequal relations of power and domination, and how they specifically constitute manipulation according to van Dijk's theory. It will do so by analyzing the job descriptions to identify key language features within the texts comprising the occupational specialty descriptions on the GoArmy.com "Careers" page, with the purpose of answering the following questions:

24

- How do combat job descriptions on GoArmy.com construct the combat soldier's work?

  - What types of work do combat job descriptions on GoArmy.com describe?

  - Who does the work in the combat job descriptions on GoArmy.com?

  - What do they use to do the work?

  - How do combat job descriptions on GoArmy.com construct the "enemy?"

The overall question asks how the Army's language in these job descriptions constructs the work of the soldier, including the core concepts of attacking and possibly killing an enemy combatant, and the possibility of danger and harm to the potential recruit. In the course of asking this question, this study asks several related questions of this language, such as "who does the work?," "how do they do the work?," and "what are they using to accomplish the work?," among others. Also, if we are examining lingual representations of the combat soldier's work, it seems also appropriate to identify language describing the unique patient of the combat soldier's "work" as represented in this discourse: the "enemy." My analysis will therefore also look specifically for the presence of, and use of language surrounding, the enemy combatant, as it contributes to representations of the combat soldier's work.

SAMPLE: COMBAT JOBS ON GOARMY.COM

As part of its "Careers and Jobs" content, which is meant to give potential enlistees information on the various military occupational specialties (MOSs) available to them, the GoArmy.com site provides a formally structured descriptions of each of its job categories. This study specifically examines the "combat" category, which, as the site describes, "Involves Army reconnaissance, security, and other aspects of both offensive and defensive combat situations. Jobs include artillery specialists, infantry, special operations and tank crew. All combat MOSs are closed to women."

I will focus my analysis only on descriptions relevant to the typical first-time enlistee, because this demographic is the largest and seems the most likely to take the discourse at face value when making a decision whether to enlist. This demographic also holds little social power compared to the Army, mostly due to a general lack of knowledge about military service or a combat soldier's lifestyle. Some jobs within the "combat" category are more applicable than others, for various reasons. For example, of those jobs described on the "Combat" page, I have chosen to exclude occupations that are not within the scope of opportunity for the average first-time enlistee, such as occupations in the US Army Special Forces, and all officer jobs, as these jobs have specialized training and entry requirements. For instance, Special Forces candidates must typically serve at least one full enlistment before applying for training, and officers have an educational prerequisite of at least two years of college. None of the other combat jobs

require anything even similar, and so this sample will not include Special Forces or

officer occupational descriptions.

ARMY COMBAT JOBS

The following table outlines Army combat jobs, as applicable to this study:

Figure 1: Army Combat Jobs and Descriptions

Branch	Branch Description	Combat Jobs	Job Description
Air Defense Artillery	Attack enemy aircraft with guns or missiles	Air Defense C4I Tactical Operations Center Enhanced Operator Maintainer (14J)	Tracks Air Defense Artillery units and coordinates command and control of air defense artillery operations
		Air and Missile Defense (AMD) Crewmember (14S)	Fires anti-aircraft guns and missiles to destroy enemy aircraft
		PATRIOT Fire Control Enhanced Operator /Maintainer (14E)	Launches ballistic missiles at enemy targets in the air
		PATRIOT Launching Station Enhanced Operator/Maintainer (14T)	Maintains and operates PATRIOT missile-launching station
Artillery	Attack enemies with powerful long-range weapons (cannon, missiles, etc.)	Cannon Crewmember (13B)	Fires long-range cannon at enemy soldiers
		Field Artillery Automated Tactical Data System Specialist (13D)	Plots targets for long-range cannon fire
		Field Artillery Firefinder RADAR Operator (13R)	Operates radar stations to target enemy soldiers
		Fire Support Specialist (13F)	Calls for and adjusts artillery barrages from the front lines
		Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS/ HIMARS) Crewmember (13M)	Drives and fires mobile missile launcher

Armor	Attack enemies with armored vehicles (tanks, armored personnel carriers, etc.)	Cavalry Scout (19D)	Scouts enemy targets for heavy tanks and attacks as vehicle-borne infantry
		M1 Armor Crewman (19K)	Attacks enemy soldiers with heavily armored tanks
Infantry	Ground soldiers who attack enemies with portable weapons (rifles, machineguns, etc.)	Indirect Fire Infantryman (11C)	Fires portable mortar artillery at enemy soldiers
		Infantryman (11B)	Attacks enemies on foot with portable weapons
		Infantryman (11X)	Unassigned infantry-trained soldier

A TYPICAL COMBAT JOB DESCRIPTION

A typical job description on the GoArmy.com recruiting site comprises a series of formalized, uniform sections, each of which has a specific purpose, tone, format and way of addressing the reader. At this point, I will present a typical description text, using the description for "Infantryman (11B)" as an illustration.

Title

This portion of the description contains the official job title, including the "job code" by which the Army classifies its personnel and their skills and responsibilities. In the case of the Infantryman, this code is "11B," a combination of the code number for the branch (11=Infantry), and the sub-code for the specialty itself (B="Light" infantryman). These "job codes" are not just for administrative classification, but are used within the military community as forms of identity that carry meaning, such as social and occupational

priority. The result of this classification system is such that an infantryman is more likely to identify himself to other members of the Army as an "eleven bravo" rather than with his formal job title.

Introduction

The introduction section is not labeled as such in these descriptions, but serves as an overview of the job description. In general, the introduction section includes references to the overall purpose of the respective job, and provides some insight into the role and what might be expected, including a set of bullet points that present possible duties that a holder of that particular job might experience. It should be noted that none of the introductions for combat job descriptions on GoArmy.com are uniform in their informational elements, even among similar jobs, as seen in the differences in the descriptions for Infantryman (11B) and Indirect Fire Infantryman (11C). The introductory section of the job description for "Infantryman," for instance, includes statistical appeals, an element that does not appear in any other description. The introduction to the job description for "Infantryman (11B)" follows:

> The infantry is the main land combat force and backbone of the Army. It's equally important in peacetime and in combat. The Infantryman's role is to be ready to defend our country in peacetime and to capture, destroy and repel enemy ground forces during combat. Out of several million people who live in the United States, there are now less than 49,000 enlisted Infantrymen. An Infantry soldier is

special: he must be able to shoot better, perform better under extreme physical duress, and fit into an Infantry squad upon graduation. He must have discipline and high morale and understand the core values that make our Army great and the Infantry the 'Queen of Battle.' He must have heart and he must not quit. He is not inherently superior, he is not born with these things, he must be taught. The education of a man is more than a piece of paper; we teach lessons in life as well as lessons in combat. We demand that Infantrymen be led to a higher standard. We do not let men join our ranks who are weak or faint of heart.

Some of your duties as a Infantrymen [sic] may include:

- Perform as a member of a fire team during drills and live combat

- Perform hand-to-hand combat

- Aid in the mobilization of vehicles, troops and weaponry

- Assist in reconnaissance missions

- Operate two-way radios and signal equipment

- Process prisoners of war and captured documents

- Learn to use, maintain and store various combat weaponry (rifles, machine guns, anti-tank mines, etc.)

Requirements

This section sets forth various criteria for enlistees seeking training in a given specialty, such as the requirement for color vision. It is generally formatted as a bulleted list, with

very little explanation of the criteria, and little, if any, distinction between actual

requirements (e.g., good hearing and vision) and examples of the types of activities a

recruit can expect (digging foxholes, climbing over obstacles, etc.). This at times

overlaps with the "duties may include" content from the introduction, and the content

available in other sections, such as "Helpful Skills" below. The "Requirements" section

of the job description for "Infantryman (11B)" follows:

> Infantryman (sic) must perform strenuous physical activities, such as marching
>
> while carrying equipment, digging foxholes and climbing over obstacles. Being in
>
> top physical condition is a plus. Infantrymen need good hearing and vision.

Training

The section on training contains general information on the types and lengths of job

training (including Basic Training) required for a recruit to qualify for a given job.

The "Training" section of the job description for "Infantryman (11B)" follows:

> Job training for Infantryman requires 14 weeks of One Station Unit Training
>
> (OSUT), which includes Basic Training and Advanced Individual Training. The
>
> training will take place primarily in the field, with some classroom training. The
>
> reality is, though, that infantry training never really stops. Whether taking part in
>
> squad maneuvers, target practice or war games, Infantrymen are constantly
>
> working to keep their skills sharp and are in a constant state of preparedness.

Helpful Skills

Another bulleted list that speaks to those attributes, propensities and strengths that the Army feels would be helpful to those seeking specialization in a given occupation. As stated earlier, the content of this section can and does overlap with content in the introduction and Requirements sections, as with the "top physical …shape" requirement, which is noted in both "helpful attributes" and as a "plus" in the "requirements" section. The "Helpful Skills" section of the job description for "Infantryman (11B)" follows:

Helpful attributes include:

- Readiness to accept a challenge and perform well under stress
- Top physical and mental shape
- Ability to work as a team member

Advanced Responsibilities

This section addresses the possible responsibilities and advanced roles of senior members of the specialization, generally meaning leaders and experienced workers in that specialty. This section is unlike any other section, in that it does not address the job with regard to entry-level elements of the occupation, but instead speaks to what the prospective recruit can expect at higher levels of the job, even though it is so brief as to be of little use to anyone making a decision to enter into a given specialty for the first

time. The "Advanced Responsibilities" section of the job description for "Infantryman (11B)" follows:

> Advanced level Infantrymen (sic) supervise subordinates in peacetime and combat operations, providing them with tactical and technical guidance.

Related Civilian Jobs

This section notes generally the various benefits of a given MOS when applied to work outside the military. Most of the information in this section is presented with little evidence as to its veracity, and is brief and vague. The "Advanced Responsibilities" section of the job description for "Infantryman (11B)" follows:

> The job skills you learn as an Infantryman such as teamwork, discipline and leadership will help you with any career you choose.

These sections range in content from narrative-style paragraphs to simple bulleted lists. All are brief, and not entirely consistent in their presentation of information. The combat job descriptions contain a considerable number of typographical errors and grammatical problems, leading to the initial conclusion that the Army applied little quality assurance to this portion of the site's content. There also exists some overlap of content among descriptions, most notably between the 11B and 11X "Infantryman" descriptions, which contain nearly identical language.

33

5. ANALYSIS

Two major linguistic moves characterize the combat job descriptions on the GoArmy.com website, each of which involves a number of its own linguistic strategies. These include, most notably, a focus on the technological aspects of the combat soldier's work, and a relative absence of reference the intended patient of that work: the enemy. The technological focus that these job descriptions contain can be characterized by distinct linguistic choices, such as deceptive euphemism, formatting order, and nominalization and passivization of verbs, to obscure the potential physical, psychological and moral hazards of the combat soldier's work. Discursive treatment (or lack thereof) of the combat soldier's "enemy" not only contributes to the technological focus and obfuscation of the patient of combat work, but by association also obscures the agency of the combat soldier in the act of killing, a lack of agency that subtly transfers to the potential recruit when using these texts to make a decision whether or not to enlist. The following analysis highlights the major discursive elements that appear in these texts.

A FOCUS ON TECHNOLOGY

These texts use linguistic techniques to focus on the technological aspects of the combat soldier's work, a focus that casts all other experiential aspects into obscurity. The

techniques include using verbs that emphasize interactions with things rather than conflicts between people—the main idea behind the concept of combat. In addition, these descriptions place technology-focused language in a more prominent physical position on the page than any language describing attacking and killing. The use of nominalization and passive language, and selective inclusion of concepts contributes strongly to this focus, which has the effect of emphasizing technical skill over other more applicable attributes such as bravery, physical and psychological strength, or a willingness to kill and possibly die in the course of working as a combat soldier. Finally, language surrounding the combat soldier's work creates a sense that the combat soldier has full control of that technology, and through that technology full control of combat. Such a sense belies the truth that combat is chaotic, and that technology can prove useless, or worse, kill the wrong humans.

Linguistically, these descriptions contain few if any references to danger, killing, the enemy or even combat itself. Recruiting is normally a discourse with people at its very heart, but here things supersede people. Even the core skills of the "close" combat specialties (the infantryman, cavalry scout and armor crewman) are constructed to foreground the tools, technologies and systems in the hands of the combat soldier, rather than the experiences one might expect when serving in such a role today, such as kicking down doors to civilian houses or enduring daily mortar attacks. The following analyses illustrate this technological emphasis, and the elements that contribute to it.

These texts use verbs that describe tasks of the combat soldier in terms of interaction with objects rather than people:

- Adjust
- Apply
- Broadcast
- Carry
- Clear
- Collect
- Construct
- Designate
- Detect
- Determine
- Direct
- Distribute
- Drive
- Employ
- Enter
- Establish
- Evaluate
- File
- Fire
- Handle
- Identify
- Indicate
- Initiate
- Inventory
- Lift
- Load
- Locate
- Maintain
- Make
- Mount
- Observe
- Operate
- Perform
- Place
- Position
- Prepare
- Process
- Read
- Receive
- Reload
- Report
- Request
- Resupply
- Secure
- Select
- Serve
- Set
- Set Up
- Test
- Track
- Transmit
- Use

This object-focused description has the effect of emphasizing this interaction rather than the result of this interaction.

The introduction of the Infantryman (11B) description, for instance, includes, "Learn to use, maintain and store various combat weaponry (rifles, machineguns, anti-tank mines, etc.)." This language does not clearly describe what it means to "use" a machine gun or explosive mine for its intended purpose—killing—but instead stops short, effectively obscuring the act, along with both the recipient of the interaction (other humans), and, perhaps more importantly, the agent of the act.

36

Further, this example illustrates another aspect of a focus on technology, namely that the parallel juxtaposition of these verbs suggests that the actions are comparably benign. The verbs "operate" and "use" are linguistically similar, but that similarity all but vanishes when they are used to describe interactions with radio equipment on one hand, and rifles, machine guns or anti-tank mines on the other. This dissimilarity is even more pronounced when considering the very different results of these specific interactions. By using verbs in this way, the authors have essentially obscured what it means to use a rifle in the context of being a combat soldier, leaving the impression that the radios and rifles are somehow equal in their use and result.

The language in the "Infantryman" description contributes to a technological focus by reducing active, strongly personal actions to passive generalizations. The description claims that the prospective recruit can expect to "perform hand-to-hand combat." The verb "perform," used instead of more descriptive and evocative verbs such as "fight" or "pummel," works to downplay the very idea the sentence describes. This is unique in comparison with other Army discourse surrounding Army martial arts training. The Army's training manual on martial arts, US Army Field Manual FM 3-25.150 (FM 21-150), "Combatives," a publication used for training soldiers, introduces students to basic "ground-fighting techniques" by stating matter-of-factly that "before any killing or disabling technique can be applied, the soldier must first gain and maintain dominant body position." The dissonance in these two discourses between "performing" and

"killing or disabling" illustrates the impersonal nature of the language in these job descriptions, a nature that better enables the technological focus that other elements build.

Another linguistic technique that foregrounds technological interaction involves the order of tasks associated with fighting and killing as compared to other, more mundane tasks and skills. The description for Cavalry Scout describes several duties using language that foregrounds the technology involved by offering vague descriptions of the soldier's tools and the possible encounters with them, including, "Load, clear and fire individual and crew-served weapons," when describing an essential part of the scout's combat function as vehicle-mounted infantry. The order of bulleted points here is also notable:

- Secure and prepare ammunition on scout vehicles

- Load, clear and fire individual and crew-served weapons

- Perform navigation during combat

- Serve as member of observation and listening posts

- Gather and report information on terrain, weather and enemy disposition and equipment

- Collect data to classify routes, tunnels and bridges

- Employ principles of concealment and camouflage

The primary task of attacking an enemy is innocuously lumped with other, less central tasks. Instead of putting the wounding or killing of a human target (threatening or

otherwise) at the forefront of the "skill set" of this particular specialty, other seemingly less-consequential tasks are described: "Secure and prepare ammunition on scout vehicles"; "perform navigation during combat"; and "employ principles of concealment and camouflage." The result is a sense that these tasks are somehow more important, and conversely that the task of killing is less important.

Nominalization and other types of "soft" language also contribute to a focus on technology in the combat job descriptions on GoArmy.com. The language describing the M-1 Crewman (19K) naturally has a strong technological focus, given its central element of the high-tech heavily armored tank, but even so, the language almost completely obscures the singular purpose of this occupation: to kill the enemy and obliterate structures and other vehicles using the large and powerful cannon and machineguns mounted on the tank. The following descriptions stand out as vague and non-committal:

- Target detection and identification
- Place turret into operations
- Operate two-way radios and signal equipment
- Operate tracked and wheeled vehicles over varied terrain

This language also sets a muted tone in which the blunted "load and fire guns" and redundant "operate main gun controls and firing controls," and sharply contrast with

earlier, more active language, such as that describing the purpose to "extinguish enemy forces" in the previous paragraph.

In a similar way, the description for "Cannon Crewmember" (13B) leaves much out of its description of someone who fires enormous cannons primarily to kill enemy soldiers. The Cannon Crewmember description displays the following possible duties:

- Start and maintain wire and radio communications
- Identify target locations
- Operate self-propelled howitzers, ammunition trucks and other vehicles
- Participate in reconnaissance operations
- Use computer generated fire direction

This description seems uniquely obfuscated, in that it not only avoids entirely the discussion surrounding the effects of the artillery shells the cannons fire, and at whom, but it avoids entirely any credible or recognizable description of actually firing them. The odorless "operate self-propelled howitzers, ammunition trucks, and other vehicles" specifically masks the "operation" of those heavy guns beneath the sub-task of driving vehicles. Likewise, "participate in reconnaissance operations," a staple of many of these descriptions, fails utterly to invoke the precarious position of spying on one's enemies.

These texts emphasize a focus on the technological aspects of the combat soldier's work by avoiding most, if not all, reference to those tasks or aspects of the job that

involve hazard, physical or otherwise. Even if they exemplify a focus on technology, the four job descriptions mentioned previously (Infantryman, Cavalry Scout, M1 Tank Crewmember, and Cannon Crewmember) actually contain the weakest technological focus of the 14 texts analyzed in this study. On the other side of the spectrum, it is questionable by the language used whether some should even be described as "combat" jobs, an observation based on the lack of distinctly "combative" language in their descriptions. The "PATRIOT Fire Control Enhanced Operator/Maintainer" (14E) claims that enlistees in this specialty can expect to have the following possible duties:

- Responsible for placement of the PATRIOT system in the field

- Perform real-time status reporting during combat

- Operate specific PATRIOT coordinate and target identification systems

- Perform maintenance on coordinate, communication and target identification systems

- Evaluate target data and identifies and engages targets

- Perform operation and intelligence duties

- Establish radio and wire communications in the field

Save for "engages targets," there is little information as to the conditions that qualify this as a "combat" job or reflect that someone with this job is expected to kill human beings with 17-foot explosive missiles. Even the title, most notably the "operator/maintainer" qualification, seem to raise the question of what exactly makes this a combat job.

Language involving weaponry, a core element in all of the combat specialties, contributes to the technological focus. In almost all instances, attacking and killing with weapons is described with the detached verb "use," and is often lumped in with other, administrative or maintenance-related weapon tasks, or is constructed in such a way as to obscure even the idea of killing with a weapon:

- Missile and rocket system operations (14J)

- Prepare, operate and fire the Avenger and Man Portable Air Defense System weapons systems (14S)

- Operating gun systems (13B)

- Load, clear and fire individual and crew-served weapons (19D)

- Gun, missile and rocket system operations (13D, 13F)

- Set up, Load and Fire any of three types of Mortars: 60mm, 81mm or 120mm (11C)

- Employ crew and individual weapons in offensive, defensive and retrograde ground combat (11C)

- Perform hand-to-hand combat drills that involve martial-arts tactics (11C)

- Employ, fire and recover anti-personnel and anti-tank mines (11C)

- Operate, clean and store automatic weapons (11C)

- Learn to use, maintain and store various combat weaponry (rifles, machine guns, anti-tank mines, etc.) (11B)

- Load and fire guns (19K)

- Operate main gun controls and firing controls (19K)

- Operating gun, missile and rocket systems specific to the MLRS (13M)

- Operating missile and rocket systems specific to the PATRIOT (14E)

Terms like "operate," "employ," and "fire," as related to the duties of a combat soldier, are euphemisms for "attack with the intent to kill," and especially so when considering the combat soldier's primary work. Even though the so-called "close" combat specialties (infantryman, cavalry scout and M-1 armor crewman) use less-euphemistic terms for killing (such as "extinguish" or the apt "destroy"), these are still not strong enough to properly evoke the power of the idea they should signify to the reader. These phrases omit why weapons are employed, and against whom, while effectively obscuring the patients of the actions.

The language constructing the combat soldier's work also contributes to the idea that the combat soldier has full control of the technology he uses, and that such control gives him control in combat. This stands in opposition to the truth that combat is chaotic, and that a combat soldier's technology can often prove useless, or worse, kill the wrong human beings. The "Fire Support Specialist" (13F) description, for example, identifies tasks such as the following:

- Establish, maintain and operate communications systems

- Encode and decode messages

- Assist in preparing and disseminating fire support plans, coordinate documents and target lists

- Assist in the operation of laser range finders, target designation and night observation devices

- Determine target location using computers or manual calculations

- Assist in the set up and operation of advanced computer systems used to plan and execute fire missions

The technological focus here is strong, as the first three bullets involve largely non-combat tasks, instead describing electronics, cryptography and document-related duties. The combat tasks described in the second three bullets distinctly present a picture where the combat soldier is able to control precisely where large artillery shells will land, killing only whom he wants killed. The technological focus is also used here, chiefly in the use of terms related to precision (laser, computers, calculations, advanced computer systems, and plan) to give the reader and potential candidate comfort that these bombs will never kill the wrong humans—innocent civilians, or worse, his comrades-in-arms. This comfort is deceptive, as the plethora of historical and modern examples to the contrary attests.

A focus on the technological aspects of the combat MOSs foregrounds technical training and experience as a product of enlistment in these specialties, and simultaneously backgrounds the personal nature of the job: killing other human beings. Foregrounding the role of technology as situated between the soldier and the enemy depersonalizes the concept of killing to the reader and obscures the act of killing, as most references to the

enlistee and his specialty are often tied to the employment of equipment or the functions of that equipment. Given the specific purpose of these texts to convince a reader to take the next steps toward enlistment, the implications are that these descriptions do not adequately address the dangerous and violent aspects of being a combat soldier, and instead may have the effect of lulling the reader into a sense of false of what is truly expected of them upon enlisting.

A MISSING ENEMY

The very definition of "combat" implies two conflicting parties, and one cannot be "in combat" without opposition. Combat also implies the likelihood that either combatant might be the victor, a concept that is noticeably absent from this discourse. Given the idea that this discourse contains language that obscures the harsher aspects of the combat soldier's work, it seems important to examine the few notable mentions of "the enemy" and the language surrounding them.

Direct reference to the patient of the combat soldier's work—the enemy—is noticeably spare in the combat job descriptions in GoArmy.com. The word "enemy" appears only 12 times in the entire sample, and, more notably, it only ever appears in three of the 14 total descriptions (five times in "Cavalry Scout, four times in "M1 Armor Crewmember," and three times in "Infantryman"). That this term appears only in the three "close" combat specialties, identified earlier in this analysis, seems to speak to the

degree to which the authors are reluctant to emphasize the "combative" nature of those specialties.

Although the enemy does seem to have somewhat adequate representation in these three descriptions, the language surrounding this term nearly neutralizes the concept of a human adversary. Verb substitutes for "kill," such as "extinguish," "engage" and "destroy" precede the term, and suggest a patient that is other than human, such as a flame, animal, or structure. The effect is to depersonalize the act of killing another human being by avoiding verbs that imply a human patient.

That language that does describe the enemy suggests his utter helplessness against the US combat soldier. In the combat job descriptions on the GoArmy.com website, the US Army combat soldier is always the one engaging, extinguishing, destroying, and targeting the enemy. Nowhere in this discourse does the combat soldier become even a potential recipient of similar actions at the hands of the enemy. This myth is one that is omnipresent in Army recruiting discourse, but also one which has not held up to history.

One alternate term used to describe the enemy—"target"—is a little more common in this sample, but this term is always paired with verbs that have technical associations (processing, computing, detecting, calculating, evaluating, etc.), contributing further to similar to the technological focus. Just the use of the term "target" obscures the fact that those at whom the guns and missiles are pointed are humans. This euphemistic

treatment of the patient of the combat soldier's work effectively depersonalizes the act of killing them, and avoids altogether the questions of moral, psychological and physical hazard that even the existence of an enemy should pose to a reader.

EUPHEMISM

Writing about what he saw as the general decay of the English language in his 1946 essay "Politics and the English Language," George Orwell reflected astutely that "political speech and writing are largely the defence of the indefensible…. Thus political language has to consist largely of euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness" (7). Euphemism is a well-established rhetorical figure, appearing in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* alongside similar concepts as *periphrasis*, *tapinosis*, and other forms of understatement, and in contrast to *litotes*, which has the intent of emphasis. Rhetoric sees euphemism as a deliberate practice, with more of an emphasis on obscuring some uncomfortable, or inconvenient, truth. I will now briefly explore the concept before applying this lens to the aforementioned sample and describing with some observations and conclusions with regard to this project's main research concerns.

Euphemism has a long history, and scholars have tackled the linguistic and social aspects of its use. Keith Allen and Kate Burridge, in their work *Euphemism and Dysphemism: Language Used as Shield and Weapon*, highlight the universality of euphemism throughout both recorded time and human language. Euphemisms for death,

47

sex, and bodily functions and parts all appear in almost every documented non-English language in some form or another, and for one reason or another. This could be because these concepts have deep roots in the religious or cultural heritage of the speakers. Allen and Burridge cite various examples from Middle Dutch and Gullah as a small sample, where speakers in specific situations (funerals, courtrooms) use euphemism to avoid taboos surrounding the culture of the speaker and audience:

> To speak euphemistically is to use language like a shield against the feared, the disliked, the unpleasant; euphemisms are motivated by the desire not to be offensive, and so they have positive connotations; in the least euphemisms seek to avoid too many negative connotations. (221-222)

Euphemism as a defensive rhetorical move is a common theme among the sources gathered for this study. In Twentieth-Century America the technological age of mass media gave citizens, and most importantly the bodies that govern them, new opportunities and problems managing national sentiment as wars like the one in Vietnam were broadcast directly into millions of homes. To adapt, the military formed its own public relations arm, and soon the euphemisms filled the air. One astute group, themselves raised on the euphemism of corporate love and government vigilance, awoke to the true nature of these communications and recognized that they construed a negative and possibly even harmful rhetoric, and that something had to be done about it.

DOUBLESPEAK

In 1971, the resolution committee at the annual convention of the National

Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) passed a pair of resolutions aimed at combating

deceptive and distorted language used by public officials and "all those who transmit

through the mass media" (Gibson 6). They proposed a new name for such language, a

term coined from a combination of similar terms from Orwell's *1984*. That day, the

words "doublethink" and "newspeak" merged into "doublespeak." The NCTE felt so

strongly about the need to combat this particular sort of "public lying" that they soon

proposed an annual award (which the committee admits is a significantly ironic move)

for the most egregious uses of doublespeak. In the years between that conference and the

seminal Doublespeak Award, given in 1974, this newly formed Doublespeak Committee

took special notice of the prominence of this phenomenon in the hearings surrounding the

1973 Watergate break-ins:

> The vagueness and the evasive euphemizing of the witnesses were a
>
> striking lesson to us all. Those witnesses never reported that anyone <u>said</u>
>
> anything, they testified that someone <u>indicated</u> something. An act clearly
>
> against the law was called <u>inappropriate</u>. It was during these hearings that
>
> we became freshly aware of the way in which the passive voice of the verb
>
> can be employed to avoid responsibility. (Gibson 8)

Of course, to give such an award requires not only a definition of "doublespeak" but also criteria for use in identifying and characterizing its use. William Lutz, Rutgers University English professor and NCTE officer, wrote several articles and monographs surrounding doublespeak throughout the 1980s and 90s, and was among the first to identify and describe the four primary categories of doublespeak, of which euphemism, he says, is the first. In his latest work on the subject, *The New Doublespeak*, Lutz explains the term:

> Doublespeak is language that pretends to communicate but really doesn't. It is language that makes the bad seem good, the negative appear positive, the unpleasant appear attractive or at least tolerable. Doublespeak is language that avoids or shifts responsibility, language that is at variance with its real or purported meaning. It is language that conceals or prevents thought; rather than extending thought, doublespeak limits it. (4)

In earlier works, Lutz accepts the reality that humans use euphemism to navigate sensitive contextual and social implications of our communications: "When a euphemism is used out of sensitivity for the feelings of someone or out of concern for a social or cultural taboo, it is not doublespeak" (18). He is quick, however, to qualify that "when a euphemism is used to mislead or deceive it becomes doublespeak" (18).

The language in the combat job descriptions of the GoArmy.com website (most notably surrounding the element of killing and dying), in addition to an overall strategy of foregrounding technology while backgrounding some experiences central to these roles, creates a question whether euphemism in this case is meant to avoid a taboo (but necessary) social subject, or to avoid facing the reader with an immediate moral dilemma that might alter that reader's propensity to pursue enlistment in these specialties. The first case seems plausible, and even excusable to a certain degree, but only so long as propriety is the only purpose—and potential result.

The latter case, however, creates a situation inexorably related to Lutz's concept of doublespeak as euphemism that "conceals or prevents thought." The euphemism in these job descriptions falls all but neatly into this second category, as they do not seem to completely obscure the truth, but attempt to soften or make less apparent the harshness and hazard of the occupations in question. Regardless of the intent of the authors of these texts, the potential for preventing thought is strong in these strategies. For example, as described earlier, a focus on technology interaction instead of personal conflict has the effect of avoiding the idea that the potential recruit may have to attack and wound or kill another human being. Euphemism here is used on one hand to avoid direct reference to a taboo subject in most of the civilized world—murder—which places it in line with the desire to avoid offending an audience. On the other hand, it has the undeniable effect of

51

obscuring thought about murder in the context of state-sponsored violence, and therefore avoids any conflicts with the Army's requirements of its combat soldiers and any preconceived notions in the audience (the potential recruit) about the morality of state-mandated killing or the natural fear of death. As stated earlier, when such obfuscation of thought may affect a decision that not only should require direct confrontation with these possibilities, but one that may place an ignorant decision-maker in a position to compromise his beliefs or instincts of self-preservation, there can be no doubt that language strategies that result in such obscurity of rational thought are deceptive and therefore constitute doublespeak instead of simple euphemism.

COMBAT JOB DESCRIPTIONS AS MANIPULATION

With the major discursive strategies outlined, I will now elaborate upon the social and cognitive dimensions of these strategies according to Teun van Dijk's theory of manipulation. I will use these ideas to show how the combat job descriptions on GoArmy.com meet the criteria for manipulation, namely that:

> ...manipulation is a social phenomenon – especially because it involves interaction and power abuse between groups and social actors – a cognitive phenomenon because manipulation always implies the manipulation of the minds of participants, and a discursive–semiotic phenomenon, because manipulation is being exercised through text, talk and visual messages. (361)

SOCIAL DIMENSIONS

The social facet of the discourse in question presents a model of domination involving a rhetor that sits at one of the highest seats of social and discursive power possible: a government agency. Van Dijk notes that social power often comes in this form of control over discourse:

> Obviously, in order to be able to manipulate many others through text and talk, one needs to have access to some form of public discourse, such as parliamentary debates, news, opinion articles, textbooks, scientific articles, novels, TV shows, advertising, the internet, and so on. (362)

After all, for all of its adoption of corporate style and message, the US Army is a formal entity in one of the most powerful governments in the world, with accordant near-limitless access to media, capital and collective ethos that places it clearly in the role of manipulator in this case. On the other end of the spectrum is the manipulated audience of potential recruits, whose main demographic (high-school-educated 18-year-olds) are in almost the exact opposite position, with very little access to, much less control, over the level of assets of the US government.

Aside from the social position of the participants in this specific discourse, there lies the means by which the manipulator reinforces and reproduces its domination over the manipulated audience. The dominant attitude in the US Army is that conscription is unnecessary and unpopular as a means to fill the military ranks, as history has shown. To accomplish its recruiting goals to maintain the current missions abroad, it must instead convince potential recruits that it is in their best interests to enlist in the Army. It is clearly in the Army's best interests if the recruit does not question the information in these job descriptions, and indeed, it is preferred that he use them to form his mental models of what a combat soldier's work is like.

The Army's ethos as a dominant historical figure that touts honor and duty and loyalty is used to omnipresent effect, such that it is likely taken for granted by most who would consider service. Indeed, such a level of perceived reliability is essential to the manipulative operation at hand in these descriptions. It goes without saying that military lifestyle is centered around control, and this need for control extends to its discourse, to the degree that it seeks to control its audiences' knowledge while simultaneously purporting to inform. In this light, there can be no doubt as to the socially manipulative nature of the major discursive elements of the combat job descriptions.

COGNITIVE DIMENSIONS

Cognitive manipulation, as van Dijk explains, involves affecting in some way the minds of the audience such that their attitudes and ideas coincide with the interests of the manipulators. The way that discourses affect audience attitudes concerns affecting, simply put, memory models in short- and long-term memory that people create about the world. Manipulative discourses manipulate cognitively in that they speak to these models and influence them such that they conform to the models that the manipulator prefers. These "preferred' models are the result of manipulation and can be used to influence decisions and ultimately actions based on those decisions:

> More generally the strategy is to discursively emphasize those properties of
> models that are consistent with our interests (e.g. details of our good deeds), and
> discursively de-emphasize those properties that are inconsistent with our interests
> (e.g. details of our bad deeds). (368)

Classical evidence exists to explain the cognitive effects of euphemism and such euphemistic strategies as a focus on technology and obfuscation of the patient of combat. Christopher Johnstone's article, "An Aristotelian Trilogy: Ethics, Rhetoric, Politics, and the Search for Moral Truth," opens with a contextual synopsis of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, and makes a seemingly critical connection between the concepts of pathos and *logos*. He claims that Aristotle saw choice as a rational act consisting of an integration of reasoned and emotional deliberations:

Virtue signifies *logos* and appetite (orexis) or passion (pathos) functioning in some sort of balance or harmony: 'For virtue, we say, is found only when rational principle, rightly conditioned, is in harmony with the passions possessing their own proper excellence, and they in turn with it. Thus conditioned, they agree with one another, so that Principle (logos) always enjoins what is best, and the passions, being in right condition, readily execute its behests.' (3)

This idea of decisions being necessarily a balance of the proper reasoned and emotional appeals suggests much, considering that euphemism's cognitive effect seems to be specifically to avoid engaging the passions. Given such logic, it seems clear that, since doublespeak seeks to conceal the true nature of something important (such as danger), it also deliberately seeks to avoid arousing the proper emotional states associated with that truth (such as fear). Van Dijk says manipulation is often the result of situations where information that could be used to develop the knowledge needed to resist manipulation is held back from the manipulated by the manipulator, and that this withholding of information need not be simple omission, but can take a number of discursive forms, including euphemism:

Information that may lead to knowledge that may be used critically to resist manipulation, for instance about the real costs of the war, the number of deaths, the nature of the 'collateral damage' (e.g., civilians killed in massive bombing and

other military action), and so on, will typically be hidden, limited or otherwise made less risky, and hence discursively de-emphasized, for instance by euphemisms, vague expressions, implicitness, and so on. (371)

By presenting only certain facts in its recruiting discourse, and by engaging some emotional appeals to the cognitive models of the audience, but not others, the Army employs deceptive euphemism, or doublespeak, breaking this critical link between logos and pathos, thereby cognitively reinforcing the effects of social and discursive manipulation. Here, since the total nature of the combat soldier's work is obscured, the passions of the potential recruit are not in their right condition, since details concerning the moral and physical hazard of combat jobs are specifically avoided, when and where they are needed more than ever in the decision-making process. This, in turn, affects the reader's beliefs about the work expected of the combat soldier such that the negative aspects are obscured. This manipulative language hopes to convince a reader to take action (enlisting or recommending enlistment) that is not in his best interests, and simultaneously in the interests of the manipulator.

Many of the employed linguistic strategies in these texts constitute evidence of manipulation by the US Army, as they take advantage of otherwise legitimate language elements and capabilities to affect actions that are in the interest of the Army as manipulator (the enlistment of young men in the combat branches of the service) and simultaneously not in the interests of the manipulated audience (who stand to risk liberty,

life and limb, literally, in a decision to volunteer for an enlistment in a combat job). The focus on technology and all of the linguistic moves that contribute to it, in addition to a lingual absence of the enemy, act as linguistic tools that reinforce the dominance of the manipulator—the Army—over the manipulated potential recruit.

6.   CONCLUSIONS

In the course of this study, I have examined one facet of the US Army's recruiting discourse—the combat job descriptions on the GoArmy.com recruiting website—to examine the ways that these texts construct the combat soldier's work. Through analysis of this discourse, I argued that the language constructing the combat soldier's work was characterized by several themes—primarily, a distinct focus on the technological aspects of the jobs and the obfuscation of the enemy—to create a world view that obscures the myriad physical, psychological and moral hazards associated with and evidenced by combat in the US military occupations of Iraq and Afghanistan, the wars for which GoArmy.com seeks recruits. I also contend that these strategic foci of the language in these texts constitutes not sensitive euphemism, but its darker cousin, deceptive euphemism, or doublespeak. This specific type of unethical rhetoric reinforces the unequal relations of power between the US Army and those citizens it would recruit for service in its combat jobs, both today and in the future. By examining social, cognitive and discursive elements of this discourse and its social contexts, I show that this language, despite its intended purpose, constitutes manipulation, a specific type of power abuse. The combat job descriptions use doublespeak and strategic omission to influence their readers into action that is at once in the best interests of the Army and not in the best interests of the potential recruit. This is not a new phenomena to recruiting discourses in

59

general, military recruiting discourse, or the Army's specific recruiting discourse, as media, scholarly and industry sources of criticism have noted since the inception of the all-volunteer Army itself.

If the Army's recruiting language is euphemistic with regard to hazards of Army combat service, and that euphemism can be seen as deceptive (as doublespeak), the conclusion by association is that the Army, in presenting euphemistic content with the purpose of inducing enlistments in those jobs, is acting unethically. This not only contradicts the Army's purported values of honor and integrity (which appear on other, juxtaposed pages of the same website), but also the ancient ethical codes of Aristotilean rhetoric. While the US Army is certainly not the only military service that employs forms of deceptive language in its recruiting discourse (the US Navy's latest tagline, "A Global Force for Good" comes to mind), it does stand as the only party able to halt and even reverse the historical precedent of doublespeak in its own recruiting discourse. Should it choose to adopt an ethical alternative to manipulative recruiting (which has not happened as of this writing), the Army stands poised to reverse a long-running trend of deception and misrepresentation in its recruiting rhetoric, and perhaps even the downward trend in wartime recruiting.

APPENDIX: COMBAT JOB DESCRIPTION TRANSCRIPTS FROM GOARMY.COM

Air Defense C4I Tactical Operations Center Enhanced Operator Maintainer (14J)

An Air Defense C4I Tactical Operations Center Enhanced Operator is a member of the Army's air defense artillery team. The air defense tactical operations center operator supervises or serves as a member of a manual early warning network (MEWN) section, team, or platoon in operations and intelligence functions.

Some of your duties as a Air Defense C4I Tactical Operations Center Enhanced Operator Maintainer may include:

- Detect, track and identify aircraft
- Broadcast early warning information
- Perform operation and intelligence duties in Air Defense units
- Evaluate tactical electronic intelligence data

61

Requirements

Air Defense C4I Tactical Operations Center Enhanced Operators must have the physical stamina to perform strenuous activities for long periods without rest. They're also required to have normal color vision in order to read color-coded ammunition, maps, and charts.

Training

Job training for an Air Defense C4I Tactical Operations Center Enhanced Operator requires nine weeks of Basic Training, where you'll learn basic Soldiering skills, and 10 weeks of Advanced Individual Training and on-the-job instruction. Part of this time is spent in a classroom and part in the field under simulated combat. Some of the skills you'll learn are:

- Methods of computing target locations
- Ammunition-handling techniques
- Missile and rocket system operations
- Artillery tactics

Helpful Skills

Helpful attributes include:

- Ability to think and remain calm under stress
- An interest in mathematics
- Ability to work as a member of a team
- Interest in missile and rocket operations
- Ability to perform a wide variety of duties

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced level Air Defense C4I Tactical Operations Center Enhanced Operators provides guidance, supervises and trains other Soldiers within the same discipline. As an advanced level Air Defense Tactical Operations Center Operator, you may be involved in:

- Inventory and destroy classified material
- Perform security functions
- Operate over radio nets

Related Civilian Jobs

The skills you'll learn as an Air Defense C4I Tactical Operations Center Enhanced Operator such as teamwork, discipline and leadership, will help you in any civilian career you choose.

Air and Missile Defense (AMD) Crewmember (14S)

An Air and Missile Defense Crewmember is a member of the Army's air defense artillery team using the AVENGER system. The AVENGER system is a lightweight, highly mobile and transportable surface-to-air missile/gun weapon system. It provides mobile, short-range air defense protection against air and land attacks. The Air and Missile Defense Crewmember serves as a member of the highly mobile Avenger operations team.

Some of your duties as a Air and Missile Defense Crewmember may include:

- Prepare, operate and fire the Avenger and Man Portable Air Defense System weapons systems
- Establish and maintain radio and wire communications
- Assist in maintaining situation maps
- Perform target engagement evaluations
- Apply infrared techniques to detect and engage targets
- Operate 'friend or foe' identification equipment
- Resupply ammunition
- Prepare systems for firing

Requirements

Air and Missile Defense Crewmembers must have the physical stamina to perform strenuous activities for long periods without rest. They're also required to have normal color vision in order to identify color-coded ammunition and to read maps and charts.

Training

Job training for an Air and Missile Defense Crewmember requires nine weeks of Basic Training, where you'll learn basic Soldiering skills, and 10 weeks of Advanced Individual Training and on-the-job instruction. Part of this time is spent in a classroom and part in the field under simulated combat. Some of the skills you'll learn are:

- Methods of computing target locations
- Ammunition-handling techniques
- Gun, missile and rocket system operations
- Artillery tactics

Helpful Skills

Helpful attributes include:

- Ability to think and remain calm under stress
- An interest in mathematics
- Ability to work as a member of a team
- Interest in rocket operations
- Ability to perform a wide variety of duties

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced level Air and Missile Defense Crewmembers provides guidance, supervises and trains other Soldiers within the same discipline. As an advance level Air and Missile Defense Crewmember, you may be involved in:

- Supervise, prepare and fire of the Avenger/Man Portable Air Defense System weapons systems
- Collect and consolidate intelligence information
- Process special and periodic reports
- Prepare and maintain situation maps
- Transmit intelligence and grid locations of incoming targets
- Designate fighting positions

Related Civilian Jobs

The skills you will learn as an Air and Missile Defense Crewmember, such as teamwork, discipline, leadership and a strong background in surveillance techniques, will help you in any civilian career you choose.

Cannon Crewmember (13B)

A Cannon Crewmember is an important part of the Army's success on the battlefield. Artillery teams are used to support infantry and tank units in combat, but also have responsibilities during peacetime. Cannon Crewmembers work on cannons known as 'howitzers,' a heavy artillery machine piece with single-barrel firing capability.

Some of your duties as a Cannon Crewmember may include:

- Start and maintain wire and radio communications
- Identify target locations
- Operate self-propelled howitzers, ammunition trucks and other vehicles
- Participate in reconnaissance operations
- Use computer generated fire direction data to set elevation of cannon tube for loading and firing

Requirements

Cannon Crewmembers constantly lift heavy objects and perform strenuous activity for long periods without rest. Being in top physical and mental shape is definitely a plus. Normal color vision is required. This helps by being able to distinguish between Red/Green in order to read color-coded ammunition, maps, and charts.

Training

Job training for a Cannon Crewmember requires nine weeks of Basic Training and seven weeks of Advanced Individual Training and on-the-job instruction. Part of this time is spent in a classroom and part in the field under simulated combat conditions. Some of the skills you will learn are:

- Methods of calculating targets electronically and manually
- Handling ammunition
- Operating gun systems
- Artillery tactics and battle strategy

Helpful Skills

Helpful attributes include:

- Interest in cannon operations
- Ability to take on challenges and remain calm under stress
- Top physical and mental shape
- Ability to work as a team member

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced Level Cannon Crewmembers provides guidance, supervises and trains other Soldiers within the same discipline. As an advanced level Cannon Crewmember, you may be involved in:

- Supervise and direct the construction, camouflage, and defense of the section position
- Train, instruct, and supervise section personnel in cannon gunnery procedures and firing
- Direct and supervise movement emplacement of the howitzer section
- Responsible for the verification of safe firing data
- Supervise the handling, storage, accountability, and distribution of ammunition
- Supervise the performance of operator, crew, and organizational maintenance on section vehicles

Related Civilian Jobs

While there is no job equivalent to Cannon Crewmember in civilian life, the skills you learn such as teamwork, discipline and leadership, will help you in any civilian career you choose.

Cavalry Scout (19D)

The Cavalry Scout is the commander's eyes and ears on the battlefield. When information about the enemy is needed, they call on the Scouts. They are responsible for reconnaissance and you will learn about various weapons to include explosives and mines. Cavalry Scouts engage the enemy with anti-armor weapons and scout vehicles in the field, track and report enemy movement and activities, and will direct the employment of various weapon systems onto the enemy.

Some of your duties as a Cavalry Scout may include:

- Secure and prepare ammunition on scout vehicles
- Load, clear and fire individual and crew-served weapons
- Perform navigation during combat
- Serve as member of observation and listening posts
- Gather and report information on terrain, weather and enemy disposition and equipment
- Collect data to classify routes, tunnels and bridges

- Employ principles of concealment and camouflage

Requirements

Cavalry Scouts are required to constantly lift heavy objects and endure many stressful situations in combat. Being in top physical and mental shape for this job is crucial.

Training

Job training for Cavalry Scout requires 16 weeks of One Station Unit Training (OSUT), which includes Basic Training, where you learn basic Soldiering skills, and Advanced Individual Training. The training will take place primarily in the field with some classroom training. Cavalry Scout training never really stops. Whether it's taking part in squad maneuvers, target practice or war games, Cavalry Scouts are constantly working to keep their skills sharp and are in a constant state of readiness.

Helpful Skills

Helpful attributes include:

- Readiness to accept a challenge and face danger
- Top physical and mental shape
- Ability to work as a team member

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced level Cavalry Scouts provide guidance, supervise and train other Soldiers within the same discipline. As an advanced level Cavalry Scout, you may be involved in:

- Supervise scout vehicle crews and scout vehicle recovery operations
- Supervise maintenance of wheeled or tracked scout vehicles
- Operation assistant at a brigade or squadron level
- Select, organize, and supervise operation of observation/listening posts
- Report, collect, report data for route classification, fords tunnels, and bridges
- Use all the prior data to request, adjust, and execute indirect fire

Related Civilian Jobs

The skills you learn as a Cavalry Scout, such as teamwork, discipline and leadership, will help you in any career you choose.

Field Artillery Automated Tactical Data System Specialist (13D)

A Field Artillery Automated Tactical Data Systems Specialist (FAATDS) is an important member of the Army's field artillery team. FAATDS Specialists are primarily responsible for operating the Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data Systems for both Cannon and Multiple Launch Rocket Systems (MLRS). Field Artillery Automated Tactical Data Systems Specialists play a critical role in the safe, accurate, and lethal delivery of the Field Artillery's various fire support systems. Both cannon and MLRS systems are used to support infantry and tank units in combat.

Some of your duties as a Field Artillery Automated Tactical Data Systems Specialist may include:

- Establish, maintain and operate communications systems
- Assist in the preparation of computer centers for operation
- Prepare field artillery tactical data systems for operation
- Determine target location using computers or manual calculations

Requirements

Field Artillery Automated Tactical Data Systems Specialists must have the physical stamina to perform strenuous activities for long periods without rest. Normal color vision is a requirement in order to read maps and charts.

Training

Job training for a Field Artillery Automated Tactical Data Systems Specialist requires nine weeks of Basic Training, where you'll learn basic Soldiering skills, and seven weeks of Advanced Individual Training and on-the-job instruction. Part of this time is spent in a classroom and part in the field under simulated combat. Some of the skills you'll learn are:

- Methods of computing target locations
- Gun, missile and rocket system operations
- Artillery tactics

Helpful Skills

Helpful attributes include:

- Ability to think and remain calm under stress
- Ability to work as a member of a team
- Interest in cannon and rocket operations
- Ability to perform multiple duties at one time

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced level Field Artillery Automated Tactical Data Systems Specialists provides guidance, supervises and trains other Soldiers within the same discipline. As an advanced Field Artillery Automated Tactical Data Systems Specialist, you may be involved in:

- Assist in the supervision of all fire control operations
- Perform computer operations, fire mission processing, fire plan schedules and database construction
- Initiate computer center operations
- Perform maintenance on section equipment

Related Civilian Jobs

The skills you will learn as a Field Artillery Automated Tactical Data Systems Specialist, such as teamwork, discipline and leadership, will help you in any civilian career you choose. The experience you gain from dealing with various computer and communication systems can also be used in jobs such as computer programmer or telecommunication specialist.

Field Artillery Firefinder RADAR Operator (13R)

A Firefinder Radar Operator is crucial to the Army's field artillery radar team. 'Firefinder' is the name given to highly specialized machines that detect mortars, planes and other objects by using radio or sound waves to determine their location. The Firefinder Radar Operator uses radar to detect opposing forces and alert units in the Army.

Some of your duties as a Firefinder Radar Operator may include:

- Operate Firefinder Radar and other systems
- Establish and maintain radio and wire communications
- Construct fortification like bunkers and areas for other field artillery
- Maintain Firefinder Radar with scheduled check-ups

Requirements

The ability to see colors is a plus in this job because you will need to be able to decipher different objects on a radar display screen.

71

Training

Job training for Firefinder Radar Operators requires nine weeks of Basic Training, where you learn basic Soldiering skills, and eight weeks of Advanced Individual Training and on-the-job instruction. The training will take place partly in the classroom and partly on Firefinder equipment. Training will typically cover these topics:

- Operating Firefinder Radar equipment
- Basic workings of radar and identifying specific objects
- Field tactics and combat communications strategy
- Calculating and recording speed, direction and altitude through radar

Helpful Skills

Helpful attributes include:

- Interest in working with radar and electronic equipment
- Good with calculations, geometry and math
- Ability to concentrate for long periods
- Good listening skills

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced level Firefinder Radar Operators provides guidance, supervises and trains other Soldiers within the same discipline. As an advance level Firefinder Radar Operator, you may be involved in:

- Manage other Soldiers in operating and maintaining the Firefinder systems
- Reconnaissance and select sites for placing the radar systems in the field

Related Civilian Jobs

The skills you will learn as a Field Artillery Firefinder RADAR Operator, such as teamwork, discipline and leadership, will help you in any civilian career you choose.

Fire Support Specialist (13F)

A Fire Support Specialist is a member of the Army's field artillery team. Artillery are weapons that fire large ammunition, rockets or missiles to support infantry and tank units in combat. The Fire Support Specialist is primarily responsible for leading, supervising or serving in intelligence activities such as target processing for artillery units and maneuver brigades.

Some of your duties as a Fire Support Specialist may include:

- Establish, maintain and operate communications systems
- Encode and decode messages
- Assist in preparing and disseminating fire support plans, coordinate documents and target lists
- Assist in the operation of laser range finders, target designation and night observation devices
- Determine target location using computers or manual calculations
- Assist in the set up and operation of advanced computer systems used to plan and execute fire missions

Requirements

Fire Support Specialists must have the physical stamina to perform strenuous activities for long periods without rest. They're also required to have normal color vision.

Training

Job training for a Fire Support Specialist requires nine weeks of Basic Training, where you'll learn basic Soldiering skills, and six weeks of Advanced Individual Training and on-the-job instruction. Part of this time is spent in a classroom and part in the field under simulated combat. Some of the skills you'll learn are:

- Methods of computing target locations
- Ammunition techniques
- Gun, missile and rocket system operations
- Artillery tactics, techniques and procedures

Helpful Skills

Helpful attributes include:

- Ability to think and remain calm under stress
- Ability to work as a member of a team
- Interest in cannon and rocket operations
- Ability to perform a wide variety of duties

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced level Fire Support Specialists provides guidance, supervises and trains other Soldiers within the same discipline. As an advanced Fire Support Specialist, you may be involved in:

- Assist the Fire Support Sergeant in the training of subordinates in fire support tactics, techniques, and procedures
- Prepare observer target lists
- Initiate suppressive and screening fire
- Select and occupy observation posts

Related Civilian Jobs

There's not a civilian organization in existence today that doesn't rely on computer and information technology to conduct business and operate more efficiently. As a Fire Support Specialist, you'll learn skills that will help you pursue a career in computer consulting, information technology support or data processing, to name a few.

Indirect Fire Infantryman (11C)

As the main land combat force of the Army, Infantrymen capture or destroy opposing ground forces, repel enemy attacks and operate weapons and equipment in order to engage and eliminate the enemy. During peacetime, it's the Infantry's job to be ready to jump to the defense of our country. The Indirect Fire Infantryman specifically supervises or is a member of a mortar squad, section or platoon. The Mortar has the longest range and is the most devastating of any weapon system organic to any Infantry unit on the battlefield.

Some of your duties as an Indirect Fire Infantryman may include:

- Set up, Load and Fire any of three types of Mortars: 60mm, 81mm or 120mm
- Employ crew and individual weapons in offensive, defensive and retrograde ground combat
- Perform hand-to-hand combat drills that involve martial-arts tactics
- Employ, fire and recover anti-personnel and anti-tank mines
- Locate and neutralize mines
- Carry out scout missions to spot enemy troop movements and gun locations
- Operate two-way radios and signal equipment to relay battle orders
- Construct and camouflage mortar firing positions
- Operate, clean and store automatic weapons
- Parachute from troop transport airplanes while carrying weapons and supplies

Requirements

Infantrymen must perform strenuous physical activities, such as marching while carrying equipment, digging foxholes and climbing over obstacles. Being in top physical condition is a plus. Infantrymen need good hearing and vision.

Training

Job training for an Indirect Fire Infantryman 14 weeks, three days of One Station Unit Training (OSUT), which includes Basic Training and Advanced Individual Training. Part of this time is spent in a classroom and part in the field under simulated combat. You'll keep your Infantry Soldier skills sharp and fresh through frequent squad maneuvers, target practice and war games.

Helpful Skills

Helpful attributes include:

- Readiness to accept a challenge and face danger
- Interest in various types of ammunition and/or weaponry
- Ability to stay in top physical condition
- Interest in working as a member of a team

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced level Indirect Fire Infantrymen provides guidance, supervises and trains other Soldiers within the same discipline. As an advanced level Indirect Fire Infantryman, you may be involved in:

- Lead and control mortar squads
- Provide tactical and technical guidance to subordinates
- Supervise the construction of mortar positions
- Record operational information on maps
- Receive and implement combat orders
- Direct Soldiers in offensive, defensive and retrograde operations
- Request, observe and adjust indirect supporting fire

Related Civilian Jobs

- The skills you'll learn as an Infantryman, such as teamwork, discipline and leadership, will help you in any civilian career you choose.

Infantryman (11B)

The infantry is the main land combat force and backbone of the Army. It's equally important in peacetime and in combat. The Infantryman's role is to be ready to defend our country in peacetime and to capture, destroy and repel enemy ground forces during combat.

Out of several million people who live in the United States, there are now less than 49,000 enlisted Infantrymen. An Infantry soldier is special: he must be able to shoot better, perform better under extreme physical duress, and fit into an Infantry squad upon graduation. He must have discipline and high morale and understand the core values that make our Army great and the Infantry the "Queen of Battle." He must have heart and he must not quit. He is not inherently superior, he is not born with these things, he must be taught. The education of a man is more than a piece of paper; we teach lessons in life as well as lessons in combat. We demand that Infantrymen be led to a higher standard. We do not let men join our ranks who are weak or faint of heart.

Some of your duties as a Infantrymen may include:

- Perform as a member of a fire team during drills and live combat

- Perform hand-to-hand combat
- Aid in the mobilization of vehicles, troops and weaponry
- Assist in reconnaissance missions
- Operate two-way radios and signal equipment
- Process prisoners of war and captured documents
- Learn to use, maintain and store various combat weaponry (rifles, machine guns, anti-tank mines, etc.)

Requirements

Infantryman must perform strenuous physical activities, such as marching while carrying equipment, digging foxholes and climbing over obstacles. Being in top physical condition is a plus. Infantrymen need good hearing and vision.

Training

Job training for Infantryman requires 14 weeks of One Station Unit Training (OSUT), which includes Basic Training and Advanced Individual Training. The training will take place primarily in the field, with some classroom training. The reality is, though, that infantry training never really stops. Whether taking part in squad maneuvers, target practice or war games, Infantrymen are constantly working to keep their skills sharp and are in a constant state of preparedness.

Helpful Skills

Helpful attributes include:

- Readiness to accept a challenge and perform well under stress
- Top physical and mental shape
- Ability to work as a team member

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced level Infantrymen supervise subordinates in peacetime and combat operations, providing them with tactical and technical guidance.

Related Civilian Jobs

The job skills you learn as an Infantryman such as teamwork, discipline and leadership will help you with any career you choose.

M1 Armor Crewman (19K)

The Armor Crewman works as part of a team to operate armored equipment and fire weapons to destroy enemy positions. During peacetime, tank and armor units must stay ready to defend our country anywhere in the world. During combat, their role is to operate tanks and amphibious assault vehicles to engage and destroy the enemy. Tanks like the M1A2 Abrams use mobility, firepower and shock effect to close with and extinguish enemy forces.

Some of your duties as an Armor Crewman may include:

- Assist in target detection and identification
- Load and fire guns
- Operate two-way radios and signal equipment to receive and relay battle orders
- Place turret in operations
- Operate main gun controls and firing controls
- Operate tracked and wheeled vehicles over varied terrain
- Secure battle positions
- Operate internal communications equipment
- Select tank routes
- Position vehicles in firing positions

- Read maps, compasses and battle plans

Requirements

Armor Crewmen must be in good physical condition and have exceptional stamina. They must be able to work inside the confined area of a tank for long periods of time. Good vision and normal color vision are required in order to read maps, drive vehicles around obstacles and locate targets.

Training

Job training for an Armor Crewman requires 15 weeks of One Station Unit Training (OSUT), which consists of Basic Training, where you'll learn basic Soldiering skills, and Advanced Individual Training. Part of this time is spent in a classroom and part in the field under simulated combat. Tank crews take part in war games, which simulate combat conditions. Some of the skills you learn are:

- Tank operations
- Armor offensive and defensive tactics
- Map reading
- Scouting techniques
- Field combat strategy

Helpful Skills

Helpful attributes include:

- Ability to work as a team member
- Readiness to accept a challenge and face danger
- Ability to stay in top physical condition
- Interest in medicine and science
- Ability to remain calm in stressful situations

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced level Armor Crewmen provides guidance, supervises and trains other Soldiers within the same discipline. As an advanced level Armor Crewman, you may be involved in:

- Assist tank commander in training tank crew
- Prepare, file and distribute operations maps, situation maps and overlays
- Read and interpret maps and aerial photographs
- Indicate location, strength, tactical deployment and emplacement of friendly and enemy units
- Assist in maintaining the gunnery proficiency of subordinate gunners and loaders

Related Civilian Jobs

The skills you learn as an Armor Crewman, such as teamwork, discipline and leadership, will help you in any civilian career you choose. The experience you gain from operating and servicing the tanks and their equipment will no doubt prepare you for a future in the mechanics repair industry.

Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS/HIMARS) Crewmember (13M)

A Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) Crewmember is an important part of the Army's combat team. MLRS teams are used to support infantry and tank units while supplementing cannon artillery in combat, but they also have responsibilities during peacetime. The MLRS launches various missiles and ammunition in quick strikes during combat. The crewmembers are responsible for operating and maintaining the entire MLRS system.

Some of your duties as a MLRS Crewmember may include:

- Drive self-propelled MLRS launcher and re-supply vehicles
- Perform maintenance on MLRS launcher and re-supply vehicles
- Reload ammunition on launcher and re-supply vehicles
- Test and maintain the fire control system as needed
- Mount radio sets and communication systems in all MLRS vehicles

Requirements

MLRS Crewmembers constantly lift heavy objects and perform strenuous activity for long periods without rest. Being in top physical and mental shape is definitely a plus in this job. Normal color vision is a requirement and helps to distinguish between red/green in order to identify color-coded ammunition.

Training

Job training for an MLRS crewmember requires nine weeks of Basic Training, where you learn basic Soldiering skills, and four weeks of Advanced Individual Training and on-the-job instruction. Part of this time is spent in a classroom and part in the field under simulated combat conditions. Some of the skills you will learn are:

- Methods of calculating targets electronically and manually
- Handling ammunition
- Operating gun, missile and rocket systems specific to the MLRS
- Artillery tactics and battle strategy

Helpful Skills

As your MLRS Crewmember career continues, you will have the opportunity to take more advanced courses and have more in-field training.

- Interest in rocket and cannon operations
- Ability to take on challenge and remain calm under stress
- Top physical and mental shape
- Ability to work as a team member

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced level MLRS Crewmembers provides guidance, supervises and trains other Soldiers within the same discipline. As an advanced level MLRS Crewmember, you may be involved in:

- Assist in management and supervision of all MLRS operations, maintenance and training
- Lead the reconnaissance team in combat to determine routes and firing locations
- Make manual fire control entries
- Enter weather data into the fire control system

Related Civilian Jobs

While there is no direct job equivalent to MLRS Crewmember in civilian life, the skills you learn such as teamwork, discipline and leadership will help you in any civilian career you choose.

PATRIOT Fire Control Enhanced Operator/Maintainer (14E)

A PATRIOT Fire Control Enhanced Operator is an important part of the Army's air defense artillery team. The PATRIOT missile system teams are used to launch advanced-technology ammunition capable of neutralizing multiple air targets. The PATRIOT missile system consists of a control station, power plant, communication relay group and up to eight launching stations.

Some of your duties as a PATRIOT Fire Control Enhanced Operator Maintainer may include:

- Responsible for placement of the PATRIOT system in the field
- Perform real-time status reporting during combat
- Operate specific PATRIOT coordinate and target identification systems
- Perform maintenance on coordinate, communication and target identification systems
- Evaluate target data and identifies and engages targets
- Perform operation and intelligence duties
- Establish radio and wire communications in the field

Requirements

83

PATRIOT Fire Control Enhanced Operators constantly lift heavy objects and perform strenuous activity for long periods without rest. Being in top physical and mental shape is definitely a plus in this job. Normal color vision is also required in order to read color-coded ammunition, maps, and charts.

Training

Job training for a PATRIOT Fire Control Enhanced Operator requires nine weeks of Basic Training, where you learn basic Soldiering skills, followed by 20 weeks, four days of Advanced Individual Training and on-the-job instruction. Part of this time is spent in a classroom and part in the field under simulated combat conditions. Some of the skills you'll will learn are:

- Operating technologies specific to the PATRIOT system
- Methods of calculating targets electronically and manually
- Operating missile and rocket systems specific to the PATRIOT
- Artillery tactics and battle strategy

Helpful Skills

Helpful attributes include:

- Interest in missile and rocket operations
- Ability to take on challenges and remain calm under stress
- Interest in plotting and reading maps
- Top physical and mental shape
- Ability to work as a team member

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced level PATRIOT Fire Control Enhanced Operators provides guidance, supervises and trains other Soldier within the same discipline. As an advanced level PATRIOT Fire Control Enhanced Operator Maintainer, you may be involved in:

- Provide guidance on technical issues
- Supervise placement of the engagement control station of the PATRIOT system and associated equipment

Related Civilian Jobs

The skills you will learn as a PATRIOT Fire Control Enhanced Operator such as teamwork, discipline and leadership, will help you in any civilian career you choose.

PATRIOT Launching Station Enhanced Operator/Maintainer (14T)

A PATRIOT Launching Station Enhanced Operator is an important part of the Army's air defense artillery team. The PATRIOT missile system teams are used to launch advanced-technology ammunition capable of neutralizing multiple air targets. The PATRIOT missile system consists of an engagement control station, electronic power plant, communication relay group and up to eight launching stations. The PATRIOT Launching Station Operator works directly with the PATRIOT launching stations.

Some of your duties as a PATRIOT Launching Station Enhanced Operator Maintainer may include:

- Place the PATRIOT launching system in the field
- Supply launching station with PATRIOT missiles
- Operate specific PATRIOT launcher electronic systems
- Perform preventative maintenance on PATRIOT launching stations
- Handle PATRIOT ammunition
- Establish and maintain radio and wire communications

Requirements

PATRIOT Launching Station Enhanced Operators constantly lift heavy objects and perform strenuous activity for long periods without rest. Being in top physical and mental shape is definitely a plus in this job. Normal color vision is also required in order to read color-coded ammunitions, maps and charts.

Training

Job training for a PATRIOT Launching Station Enhanced Operator requires nine weeks of Basic Training, where you learn basic Soldiering skills, and 13 weeks of Advanced Individual Training and on-the-job instruction. Part of this time is spent in a classroom and part in the field under simulated combat conditions. Some of the skills you'll learn are:

- Operating technologies specific to the PATRIOT system
- Operating gun, missile and rocket launching systems specific to the PATRIOT
- Artillery tactics and battle strategy

Helpful Skills

As your PATRIOT Launching Station Enhanced Operator career continues, you will have the opportunity to take more advanced courses and have more in-field training.

- Interest in missile and rocket operations
- Interest in electronics and electronic systems
- Ability to take on challenges and remain calm under stress
- Top physical and mental shape
- Ability to work as a team member

Advanced Responsibilities

Advanced level PATRIOT Launching Station Enhanced Operators provides guidance, supervises and trains Soldiers within the same discipline. As an advanced level PATRIOT Launching Station Enhanced Operators, you may be involved in:

- Provide guidance on technical issues
- Supervise placement of the launching station of the PATRIOT system and reloading of ammunitions

Related Civilian Jobs

The skills you will learn as a PATRIOT Launching Station Enhanced Operator, such as teamwork, discipline and leadership, will help in any civilian career you choose. You will also gain knowledge about electronics systems that can help you become an Electrician in the civilian world.

U.S.ARMY
ARMY STRONG®

Careers & Jobs

Overview
Help Choosing a Career
Search Careers & Jobs
> Browse Career & Job Categories
Specialized Careers
Become an Officer

SEARCH GOARMY.COM
[   ] GO
more search options

Log In   Register

TALK WITH US >

Discussion Board
Request Info Pack
Learn How To Join
Locate A Recruiter
Apply Online

Find Us:

Infantryman (11X)

○ Enlisted   ○ Officer   ○ Active Duty   ○ Army Reserve

⊘ Closed to Women

The infantry is the main land combat force and backbone of the Army. It's equally important in peacetime and in combat. The Infantryman's role is to be ready to defend our country in peacetime and to capture, destroy and repel enemy ground forces during combat.

Out of several million people who live in the United States, there are now less than 49,000 enlisted Infantrymen. An Infantry soldier is special: he must be able to shoot better, perform better under extreme physical duress, and fit into an Infantry squad upon graduation. He must have discipline and high morale and understand the core values that make our Army great and the Infantry the "Queen of Battle." He must have heart and he must not quit. He is not inherently superior, he is not born with these things, he must be taught. The education of a man is more than a piece of paper; we teach lessons in life as well as lessons in combat. We demand that Infantrymen be led to a higher standard. We do not let men join our ranks who are weak or faint of heart.

Infantry is the starting point for many advanced schools such as:

- Special Forces
- Airborne School

PaYS PROGRAM
You may be able to receive preferential hiring at civilian companies.
★ Learn More ★

Chat with our Virtual Guide
► ASK SGT STAR

Infantryman (11X)

The infantry is the main land combat force and backbone of the Army. It's equally important in peacetime and in combat. The Infantryman's role is to be ready to defend our country in peacetime and to capture, destroy and repel enemy ground forces during combat.

Out of several million people who live in the United States, there are now less than 49,000 enlisted Infantrymen. An Infantry soldier is special: he must be able to shoot better, perform better under extreme physical duress, and fit into an Infantry squad upon graduation. He must have discipline and high morale and understand the core values that make our Army great and the Infantry the "Queen of Battle." He must have heart and he must not quit. He is not inherently superior, he is not born with these things, he must be taught. The education of a man is more than a piece of paper; we teach lessons in life as well as lessons in combat. We demand that Infantrymen be led to a higher standard. We do not let men join our ranks who are weak or faint of heart.

Infantry is the starting point for many advanced schools such as:

- Special Forces
- Airborne School
- Ranger School
- Sniper School
- Pathfinder School

Training

Infantry enlistees attend Infantry OSUT (One Station Unit Training), which combines Army Basic Training and Infantry AIT (Advanced Individual Training), all in one 13-week course. The training takes place primarily in the field, with some classroom training. The reality is, though, that infantry training never really stops. Whether taking part in squad maneuvers, target practice or war games, Infantrymen are constantly working to keep their skills sharp and are in a constant state of preparedness.

During that training, Infantry enlistees are allowed to list their specific infantry job preferences, but ultimate assignments are determined by the needs of the Army. Upon graduation from OSUT, Infantry enlistees are assigned to one of the following Infantry specialties:

- Infantryman (11B)
- Indirect Fire Infantryman (11C)

Helpful Skills

Helpful attributes include:

- Ability to work as a team member
- Readiness to accept a challenge and face danger
- Ability to stay in top physical condition
- Interest in light weapons and ground tactics
- Ability to remain calm in stressful situations

Related Civilian Jobs

The job skills you learn as an Infantryman are teamwork, discipline and leadership that will help you with any career you choose. The skills you acquire during your training will most certainly prepare you for a future civilian career in federal, state and local law enforcement. People depend on police officers and detectives to protect and defend their lives and property.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Allan, Keith., Burridge, Kate. *Euphemism & Dysphemism: Language Used As Shield and Weapon*. Oxford (Eng.): Oxford University Press, 1991. Print.

Blommaert, Jan. *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Print.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. Print.

Cave, Damien and Laura Cummins. "Growing Problem for Military Recruiters: Parents." *New York Times*. 3 June 2005: 1A. Print.

Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Boston: Addison Wesley, 1995. Print.

Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. London: Longman, 1989. Print.

Fairclough, N. L. and Wodak, R. "Critical discourse analysis." T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, Vol. 2. Discourse as Social Interaction.* (pp. 258-84). London: Sage, 1997. Print

Gibson, Walker and William Lutz. *Doublespeak a brief history, definition, and bibliography, with a list of award winners, 1974-1990*. Salem, MA: National Council of Teachers of English, 1991. Print.

Howard, Philip. "At times like these, language suffers collateral damage from clusters of euphemisms." *The Times* (London), March 21, 2003. A15-16. Print.

Johnstone, Barbara. *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. Print.

Johnstone, C. L. "An Aristotelian Trilogy: Ethics, Rhetoric, Politics, and the Search for Moral Truth." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 13: 1-24, 1980. Print.

Kimble, James. "Text and Context in 'This is the Army.'" Russian Communication Association (RCA) website. Accessed 13 April 2009.Web. http://www.russcomm.ru/eng/rca_biblio/k/kimble.shtml

Leo, John. "One Tin Slogan." *U.S. News & World Report*. 22 Jan. 2001: 13. Print.

Linnett, Richard. "Army Fails to Battle New Recruit Reality." *Advertising Age*. 26 July 2004: 3-5. Print.

Lutz, William. *The New Doublespeak: Why No One Knows What Anyone's Saying Anymore*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, 1996. Print.

Orwell, George. "Politics and the English Language." *Horizon.* April 1946. 5-13. Print.

Shyles, L., & Hocking, J. E. "The Army's 'Be All You Can Be' campaign." *Armed Forces & Society,* 16 (1990)*,* 369-383. Print.

Siegel, J. What Army ads don't say. *The Washington Post*, January 18, 1991. p. A31.

Unknown.*Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 1954. Print.

Van Dijk, Teun A. "Critical Discourse Analysis" D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. (pp. 352-371). Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. Print.

Van Dijk, Teun A. "Discourse and Manipulation." *Discourse & Society*. 2006 17: 359. Print.

Young, J., and Foot, K. (2005). "Corporate E-Cruiting: The construction of work in Fortune 500 recruiting Web sites." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication,* 11 (1), Print.

Primary Sources

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Combat: Air and Missile Defense (AMD) Crewmember (14S)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/air-and-missile-defense-crewmember.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Combat: Air Defense C4I Tactical Operations Center Enhanced Operator Maintainer (14J)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/air-defense-c4i-tactical-operations-center-enhanced-operator-maintainer.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Combat: Cannon Crewmember (13B)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/cannon-crewmember.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Combat: Cavalry Scout (19D)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/cavalry-scout.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Combat: Field Artillery Automated Tactical Data Systems Specialist (13D)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/field-artillery-automated-tactical-data-system-specialist.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Field Artillery Firefinder RADAR Operator (13R) " GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/field-artillery-firefinder-radar-operator.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Fire Support Specialist (13F)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/fire-support-specialist.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Combat: Indirect Fire Infantryman (11C)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/indirect-fire-infantryman.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Combat: Infantryman (11B)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/infantryman-11b.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Combat: Infantryman (11X)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/infantryman-11x.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Combat: M1 Armor Crewman (19K)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/m1-armor-crewman.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Combat: Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS/HIMARS) Crewmember (13M)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/multiple-launch-rocket-system-crewmember.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Combat: PATRIOT Fire Control Enhanced Operator/maintainer (14E)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/patriot-fire-control-enhanced-operator-maintainer.html

"Careers & Jobs: Browse Jobs: Combat: PATRIOT Launching Station Enhanced Operator (14T)" GoArmy.com. March 9, 2011. Web. http://www.GoArmy.com/careers-and-jobs/browse-career-and-job-categories/combat/patriot-launching-station-enhanced-operator-maintainer.html

VITAE

James Graham served as an enlisted US Army infantryman from 1992 to 1996 with the 3rd Battalion, 14th Infantry Regiment of the 10th Infantry Division (Mountain), and deployed to Somalia (1992-3) and Haiti (1994). He also served with the 3rd Battalion, 116th Infantry Regiment (Virginia Army National Guard) of the 29th Infantry Division (Light), and deployed to Bosnia-Herzegovina (1997-8). He received his Bachelor of Arts in English with departmental honors from George Mason University in 2003, and his Master of Arts in English from George Mason in 2011. He resides in Northern Virginia with his wife and daughters and works as a professional technical writer, editor and manager.