



Foreign Affairs Panelists' Construction of a Scholarly Identity

The purpose of this study is to shed light on the ways in which experts in foreign affairs project their scholarly identities on panel presentations. While previous research has focused on the ways in which researchers in various disciplines assert their scholarly identities in written discourse and in conference presentations, no study has focused on how experts in foreign affairs build credibility when speaking on panel presentations. From a qualitative analysis of 30 panel presentations held at the Brookings Institution, the findings reveal the extensive array of rhetorical strategies panelists in foreign affairs use which appear to build credibility. The study also draws attention to the syntactic, lexical, and register choices the panelists make. Based on these findings, the study offers pedagogical recommendations to help learners make the identity shift from a student to a scholar and become competent members of their discourse communities.

Within English for Academic Purposes scholarship, academic speaking has received less attention than academic writing has (Barrett & Liu, 2016; Lee, 2016), despite the importance of presentation skills for learners' academic and professional success (Evans, 2013; Kim, 2006). However, in recent years, the academic oral communication needs of non-native speakers

of English has garnered more substantial research interest. Prior studies have investigated non-native speakers' academic oral presentation self-efficacy (Amirian & Tavakoli, 2016; Zhang et al., 2020); communication apprehension and anxiety (Radzuan & Kaur, 2011; Sabri & Qin, 2014); perception of the qualities of an effective presentation (Otoshi & Heffernan, 2008); use of linking adverbials in academic presentations (Zareva, 2011); and discourse socialization (Zappa-Hollman, 2007). Moreover, a growing body of research has focused on oral genres (Morell, 2015), such as Three Minute Thesis competitions (Hu & Liu, 2018), university lectures (Lee, 2016; Yaakob, 2013), peer seminars (Aguilar, 2004), introductions of conference presentations (Rowley-Jolivet & Carter Thomas, 2005), TED talks (Chang & Huang, 2015), and PhD defenses (Mezek & Swales, 2016).

With English as the lingua franca of academia (Barrett & Liu, 2016; Hyland, 2018), the ability to deliver strong oral presentations in English is critical for non-native English speaking aspiring scholars (Zareva, 2009), yet non-native speakers find it linguistically, culturally, and cognitively challenging to deliver oral presentations (Barrett & Liu, 2016; Kaur & Ali, 2018; Morell, 2015; Morita, 2000). In particular, studies reporting on the challenges undergraduate and graduate students face with academic oral presentations have found that students' difficulties stem from a variety of factors, including a lack of specialized or technical knowledge (Chou, 2011; Radzuan & Kaur, 2011); difficulty selecting appropriate language (Chou, 2011), formal register, and academic English (Morita, 2000; Zappa-Hollman, 2007); insufficient academic or research training (Radzuan & Kaur, 2011), and inadequate presentation skills training (Stapa et al., 2014; Zareva, 2011). Moreover, non-native English speakers find it particularly challenging to respond spontaneously to the audience's questions (Prima et al., 2010; Yang, 2010), especially if they are asked questions they might not know the answer to (Alwi & Sidhu, 2013). To address these challenges, more research is needed on oral presentation skills instruction (Evans, 2013) and the linguistic features of academic oral presentations (Barrett & Liu, 2016; Zareva, 2009), particularly in fields outside science and engineering (Swales, 2004).

Oral presentations are powerful tools for language socialization (Weissberg, 1993; Yang, 2010). As emerging scholars within their discourse

communities, students must strike a delicate balance between showcasing credibility and seeking solidarity in academic oral presentations (Morita, 2000). Previous studies have investigated native English speaking TESOL graduate students' projection of scholarly identity in academic oral presentations (cf Zareva, 2013), as well as the extent to which both native and non-native speaking TESOL students cast themselves as experts in academic oral presentations (Morita, 2000). In Zareva (2013), TESOL students asserted their scholarly identities more subtly than assertively in most cases. Morita (2000) found that TESOL graduate students conveyed their relative expertise in academic oral presentations by communicating the reasons they chose the presentation topic and by recounting personal experiences.

However, the existing research does not shed light on how professionals, within different disciplines, showcase their credibility through strategies which are likely quite different than those used by TESOL graduate students. In conference presentations, experts tend to communicate the motivations that led to their research by highlighting gaps in knowledge or flaws with current methods, technologies, or in accepted theories. Experts may also underscore a practical need or show how the topic connects to their previous research (Rowley-Jolivet & Carter-Thomas, 2005). Moreover, seasoned professionals are expected, at least in writing, to display an authoritative stance, speak as insiders within their discourse communities, contribute new knowledge to the discipline (Hyland, 2001) and promote the novelty of their research (Harwood, 2005b). In fact, it is critical for scholars to position themselves at the vanguard of their disciplines (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995).

There is a distinction between portraying *scholarly* expertise which requires adopting the rhetorical conventions of the discipline and creating new knowledge and *school-based* expertise which entails representing knowledge created by others who have more expertise (Geisler, 1994). This difference is evidenced in the rhetorical techniques professionals and master's degree students in educational philosophy use in journal articles and in thesis writing, respectively (Peters, 2011). Moreover, the portrayal of scholarly expertise may depend in part on discipline: graduate students in the hard sciences are expected to demonstrate expertise in academic presentations,

even when they are just learning the subject material. Without proper instruction, learners may find the identity shift from a student to a scholar difficult to navigate (Chen, 2011).

Non-native English speakers need training to master the oral tasks within their disciplines (Yang, 2010). In particular, learners need scaffolded analysis of authentic models (Barrett & Liu, 2016; Yang, 2010) and specific, language-oriented guidelines (Barrett & Liu, 2016) to learn how professionals within their discourse communities convey credibility in panel presentations, a genre that has received little research attention within English for Academic Purposes. Although previous research has not explored strategies panelists use to underscore their credibility – despite the importance of conveying credibility in conference presentations in general (Fernández-Polo, 2014) – existing research has shed light on some strategies experts use to promote their research and assert themselves as members of a disciplinary community in journal articles. These include the use of inclusive and exclusive pronouns (Harwood, 2005b), self-citation (Hyland, 2001), personal pronouns and their cotext involving boosters and attitude markers (Harwood, 2005a), and compelling research titles (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995). Studies investigating academic oral discourse have shed light on how the discourse marker “I mean” helps speakers underscore the strength and importance of their findings (Fernández-Polo, 2014), how pronoun choices convey speaker identity and engagement with the audience (Rowley-Jolivet & Carter Thomas, 2005), as well as how the use of hedges, self-mention, pronouns, and boosters shows subtle disciplinary variation in the hard and soft sciences (Yang, 2014). However, the strategies panelists use to position themselves as experts remain under-studied.

From a qualitative analysis of panel presentations held at the Brookings Institute, I aim to highlight the strategies experts in the field of foreign affairs use to project their scholarly identities in panel presentations and draw pedagogical implications from these findings. Specifically, I aspire to shed light on the following research question: What do professionals in foreign affairs at the Brookings Institution do to position themselves as experts on panel presentations?

In the remaining sections, I describe the collection and analysis of the

corpus materials, highlight the strategies foreign affairs experts use for building credibility in panel presentations, make pedagogical recommendations, and elaborate upon the implications of the research findings.

Method

Context

The study was conducted to inform the teaching of English presentation skills to master's degree-seeking international students aspiring to work in an international field such as policy, development, or nuclear nonproliferation. Students enrolled in the credit-bearing Professional Presentation Skills course, which met face-to-face twice weekly for 4 hours over 15 weeks, had attained at least an 80 (though often higher) on the Internet-based TOEFL exam to be admitted to their graduate program. The primary goal of the course was to enhance students' ability to deliver a range of professional presentations in English, including informative, persuasive, panel, interactive training, and commemorative presentations. In the panel presentation, students were expected to demonstrate their credibility as expert panelists discussing a pressing global issue. The findings from this study were intended to reveal what professionals in the field of foreign affairs "do" as expert panelists so students could learn, through carefully scaffolded activities, how they might become competent members of their discourse community.

Procedure

I qualitatively analyzed and manually coded thirty transcripts of panel discussions from the foreign policy sector of the Brookings Institution to identify strategies panelists used which appeared to portray credibility of themselves and of the topics they were addressing. Foreign policy was chosen because of its relevance to the international graduate students who aspire to work in international fields.

I collected the transcripts by searching brookings.edu for events, applying foreign policy as a filter for the research program, and organizing the events by date. I selected the 30 most recent panel presentations held in the United States between March 13, 2019 and October 7, 2019. When a keynote presentation preceded a panel, only the panel discussion was

included in the corpus data.

I carefully analyzed the transcripts, looking for patterns in the ways in which panelists demonstrated expertise. As no study to date has examined panelists' strategies for building credibility, the categories were not replicated from any prior study; however, some strategies (e.g., self-citation) were influenced by findings about credibility in written discourse (Hyland, 2001).

Corpus

The corpus totaled 356,434 words, with 11,881 as the mean number of words for each panel discussion transcript, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Description of the Brookings Corpus

| <i>Number of transcripts</i> | <i>Number of words</i> | <i>Mean transcript length</i> |
|------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 30 | 356,434 | 11,881 |

The panels represented a range of topics such as U.S. and other countries' foreign policies, diplomacy, security, trade, politics, and the environment. Panelists were native and non-native English speaking professionals working as professors, fellows, scholars, managing and deputy directors, CEOs, and ambassadors for organizations such as The Brookings Institution, the U.S. Department of State, Congressional Research Services, The Heritage Foundation, Peterson Institute for International Economics, the U.S. Department of Defense, and The Atlantic Council.

Results

Twenty-five categories emerged from the analysis of 30 foreign policy panel discussions at the Brookings Institution. Though categories were not always mutually exclusive, the aim in identifying these categories was to provide the most comprehensive overview of the strategies panelists use to build credibility about themselves and the topics they address. Tables 2 and 3 include the definition of each strategy, an illustrative example drawn from one of the transcripts, and brief commentary about the strategy.

Table 2. Building Credibility about Oneself

| Strategy | Definition | Source and date of example | Example | Commentary |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Prestigious affiliation | States affiliation or collaboration with a prestigious organization or group | Ms. Hicks, The future of U.S. extended deterrence , April 24, 2019 | “I don't want to undersell what the Department is doing, but the conclusion of the commission on which I served, the National Defense Strategy Commission, and certainly the work I do in my job at CSIS, is trying to point repeatedly to this is where the problem is.” | Ms. Hicks reveals that she has served on the National Defense Strategy Commission and worked at CSIS, a well-known, reputable organization . |
| Prestigious title | Names past or current prestigious | Ms. Tamir, Democracy, | “Every -- I was a minister of immigration | Ms. Tamir demonstrates stature by highlighting |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | position titles | nationalism and populism: The U.S., Israel, and beyond, October 7, 2019 | about 12 years ago and we thought we had brought in the last Jews from Ethiopia.” | her former role as minister of immigration . |
| Disciplinary expertise | Highlights area(s) of professional or scholarly expertise | Ms. Maloney, Constraining Iran’s nuclear and missile capabilities, March 28, 2019 | “From my perspective as someone who works on Iranian internal politics and economics and on the U.S.-Iran relationship, we are coming at the end of a long period of limbo.” | Ms. Maloney shares her informed perspective as an expert on Iranian internal politics and economics. |
| Professional identity | Claims membership in a professional discourse community | Ms. Tamir, Democracy, nationalism, and populism: The U.S., Israel, and | “Well, it all starts with the definition as we know, as we political theorists know, and depending how you | Identifying as a political theorist, Ms. Tamir recounts the shared perspective among her |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | beyond, October 7, 2019 | define something, you can refer to it as more adventurous or less.” | professional community. |
| Professional experience | Underscore s the breadth, depth, duration, or impact of one’s professional experience | Ms. Scott, U.S. Voting and U.S. foreign policy: Regional focus, April 5, 2019 | “If you’ve engaged with the Continent as I have for over 30 years now, I think we see maturation of governments, as you say, in the democratic process, I think you see maturation of markets, I think you see the rise of a middle class.” | Ms. Scott indicates that she has had extensive experience working on matters pertaining to the [African] Continent for over 30 years. |
| Professional accomplishments or engagements | Highlights activities demonstrating stature | Ms. Rusten, The end of an era?: The INF treaty, New START, | “So I just want to say, so we first saw this. I mean, what’s interesting is the original START | Ms. Rusten indicates that she helped negotiate a treaty, a notable |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | and the future of strategic stability, March 22, 2019 | Treaty, which I also helped negotiate, had an Article V prohibition on some of the types of systems that we're now seeing prohibited: underwater- and air-based strategic range nuclear systems or ballistic missiles I think.” | achievement . |
| Educational experience | Mentions educational institution attended, area(s) studied, or degree earned | Mr. La Reau, A legacy of service: 9/11 veterans continuing the tradition of George H.W. Bush and John McCain, April 9, 2019 | “But I grew up in New Jersey and I went to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and I got my commission from there...” | Mr. La Reau describes his educational credentials. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Self-citation | Cites one's own public comments | Mr. McGurk, The counter-ISIS coalition: Diplomacy and security in action, September 10, 2019 | “I mean I was on record in 2013 about this rising threat and I testified, and you can kind of see it coming, and the foreign fighters flowing into Syria, the fact that the moderate opposition was very quickly co-opted by these jihadist extremist groups, who kind of rode the back of what was a legitimate revolution against the Assad regime, and just taking it (inaudible).” | Mr. McGurk shares public testimony he gave previously about the rising threat in Syria. |
| Prominent connections | Mentions conversations or | Mr. McGurk, The | “And walking into a meeting with | Mr. McGurk claims affiliation |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | collaboration with prominent individuals | counter-ISIS coalition: Diplomacy and security in action, September 10, 2019 | President Obama and the national security team, I got a phone call from a very senior Iraqi official who said hundreds of ISIS gun trucks were entering Baghdad, and Baghdad is falling.” | with prominent individuals: he communicated personally with President Obama, the national security team, and a very senior Iraqi official. |
| Professional reputation | Shows one’s expertise is sought after by others | Ms. Pak, U.S. voting and U.S. foreign policy: Regional focus, April 5, 2019 | “During the Fire in Fury days I got lots of phone calls from friends from New York, to the Midwest, to L.A. wondering about whether they should go on their business trip to South Korea, or to China, or to Taiwan, or to Japan, and it really | Ms. Pak’s professional opinion was sought after by her friends and associates, showing they put great trust in her. |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>highlighted how much our economies and our -- and how the international had fused with the domestic. Third, what happened in Hawaii, and these phone conversations that I've had with friends and colleagues who are asking me whether it was safe to go to the region really reminded -- reminded me that America is a Pacific Nation.”</p> | |
| Personal background | Reveals religion, nationality, ethnicity or other | Mr. Hamid, The impact of militias on | “Now, the obvious disclaimer is that this was a very | Mr. Hamid reveals his religious identity as a Muslim |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | personal characteristics relevant to the topic | governance and geopolitics in the Middle East and North Africa, June 28, 2019 | minoritarian take on Islam, and in my view as a Muslim myself, a perverted one.” | which lends credibility to his perspective on Islam. |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Table 3. Building Credibility about the Topic

| Strategy | Definition | Source and date of example | Example | Commentary |
|------------|---|---|--|--|
| Statistics | Shares figures, percentages, and other numerical data | Mr. Signé, The state of African security: Six critical countries, August 12, 2019 | “By 2030, Africa will have 1.7 billion people, which is important, and about 80 percent of the growth will be in cities, major cities. This is important because more than 60 percent of the African population is below the age of 30 and we have an important shortage in terms of | Mr. Signé shares extensive numerical data about the population trends and economic conditions in Africa. |

| | | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>employment, so unemployment is very high. So first off, Nigeria is the most prosperous African country and also has about 20 percent of the GDP of the continent and 75 percent of the GDP of the West African region. So Nigeria has about 94 million people living below the extreme poverty line, which represents over 47 percent of the population.”</p> | |
| Facts | States general truths or non-numerical information which can be proven | Mr. Feltman, The impact of militias on governance and geopolitics in the Middle East and North | “So, Hamas and Hezbollah do not appear on the UN terrorist list. They do appear on the U.S. and other countries terrorist list.” | Mr. Feltman relays factual information about whether Hamas and Hezbollah are classified as terrorist groups. |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | Africa, June 28, 2019 | | |
| Current information | Highlights current trends or events | Mr. Temin, The state of African security: Six critical countries, August 12, 2019 | “Just quickly on the very important issues on gender dynamics, I want to highlight what’s going on in Sudan right now, which has not been a country of focus for us, but which also is undergoing a remarkable change, one that is very much driven by women who have been leading the protest movement, who have been taking great risks, and who have really been out in front in the change that we’re seeing.” | Mr. Temin highlights current trends about women leading social change movements in Sudan. |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Historical information | Highlights past trends or events | Ms. Polyakova, Putin's world, March 13, 2019 | <p>“If you look again at Russian history over the centuries, change doesn't tend to happen from the bottom up in Russia, it tends to happen from the top down. We've seen this in the collapse of the Soviet Union, we saw in the Bolshevik Revolution. This is the tendency. It doesn't mean it will always be like this, but if we kind of take Putin as returning Russia to its historical roots, if you will, we talked about the expansion and contraction patterns that have been part of Russian identity and Russian history for so long, this could go on for</p> | Ms. Polyakova speaks about trends which have defined the trajectory of Russian history. |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | a very, very long time.” | |
| Expert testimony | Quotes or paraphrases the words of individual experts, scholars, or political leaders | Mr. Vaishnav, Assessing India’s 2019 election results, May 24, 2019 | <p>“And this is something that was encouraged by the Prime Minister himself, who was very clear in 2019 saying, a vote for the BJP is a vote for me, right. And that’s the most important thing.</p> <p>And this is actually something that he said back in Gujarat. I remember being in Gujarat in 2012, which is his last re-election, where he said the person on the ballot is irrelevant. It’s really about who you get to lead the government.”</p> | Mr. Vaishnav recounts the words of the Indian Prime Minister. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Perspective-taking | Highlights the views of a group (e.g., the general public, a group of professionals, an organization, a political party, or a government administration) | Mr. Vertin, Red Sea rivalries: The Gulf, The Horn, and the new geopolitics of the Red Sea, April 18, 2019 | “Turkey figures in almost all of these conversations. And yet, you know, this is an issue lamented by many of its diplomats because they would argue that they’ve been in the region longer and their engagement has been more nuanced.” | Mr. Vertin brings forth the perspective of Turkish diplomats. |
| Observation | States firsthand eyewitness accounts or on the ground experience | Mr. Vertin, Red Sea rivalries: The Gulf, The Horn, and the new geopolitics of the Red Sea, April 18, 2019 | “And I visited all three of Djibouti’s ports, including the port in question that got so much attention on Capitol Hill. And despite fears that it had already been taken over and asserted control by the Chinese of its 700 employees, there wasn’t a single | Mr. Vertin shares firsthand information from visiting Djibouti’s ports. |

| | | | | |
|------------|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | Chinese employee on site.” | |
| Definition | Defines a term or concept | Ms. Petkova, Digital technology in the age of artificial intelligence: A comparative perspective, March 29, 2019 | “So, let me start with federalism. First of all, what do we understand by federalism? This is not a term explicitly enshrined in the U.S. Constitution. I’ll bet it is a concept that has had a tremendous doctrinal impact. As such, federalism remains a disputed notion. While it was associated with centralization, when the U.S. Federation was still young, more recently, federalism comes to be understood in the U.S. as preserving, or even enhancing, | Ms. Petkova offers a nuanced understanding of federalism and how it is interpreted in the U.S. and in the E.U. |

| | | | | |
|----------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>local autonomy. Conversely, in the context of the European Union, federalism tends to be used synonymously with directing more power to the U.S. -- sorry -- to the E.U. institutions, and, now, of course, with looming Brexit, the vote is happening as we speak, it is not a term of art preferred on the other side of the pond.”</p> | |
| Examples | Names specific anecdotes or points, often describing situations in other countries or referring to legislation, policies, acts, bills, | Mr. Stromseth, A retrospective on a changing East Asia: The first twenty years of CEAP, | “Right now I think the conventional wisdom is that democracy has been declining in Southeast Asia for several years, people point to the military coup in Thailand in | Mr. Stromseth pinpoints several threats to democracy in Southeast Asia, as well as several promising indicators of its growth. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|--|--|
| | <p>treaties, strategies, or other government initiatives</p> | <p>May 1, 2019</p> | <p>2014, Duterte's drug war and extrajudicial killings in the Philippine, Hun Sen's disillusion of other political parties and muzzling of the media, for instance, in Cambodia; and concerns about rise of religious and political intolerance in Indonesia. And even the glow of sort of Aung San Suu Kyi's historic victory in 2015, in Myanmar is dimming as, you know, nearly 800,000 Rohingya refugees have escaped into Bangladesh to escape ethnic cleansing.</p> <p>But there are still conspicuous examples of</p> | |
|--|--|--------------------|--|--|

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>democratic practice. We saw for instance that UMNO, the ruling party since 1957 in Malaysia lost power in 2018. Also importantly, Indonesia just conducted its fourth direct presidential election since the country democratized in 1999, and that, in itself I think, should give some hope for what looks to be an increasingly consolidated and maturing democracy.”</p> | |
| Primary research | Refers to one’s own publications , research, work in progress, or proposed research | Mr. Farrell, The U.S.-China technology relationship in flux, October 4, 2019 | “So, this is something that Abe and I described in a recent article that was published in the journal <i>International</i> | Mr. Farrell refers to an article he and his co-author had published in <i>International Security</i> , a prominent |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>Security, on a topic that we call ‘Weaponize Interdependence’. And here, applying the insights that we have come up with there to this situation, what we would say is that the current fight over Huawei is really a kind of a marker of how it is that old notions about how globalization and the globalized economy worked, that these ideas have, for better or for worse, been to a great extent, abandoned.”</p> | <p>journal, about how the struggle over Huawei is linked to the functioning of the globalized economy.</p> |
| Secondary research | Refers to research or publications by others | Mr. Signé, The state of African security: Six critical countries, | “And there may have been some kind of an understanding for all I know, but I’m still | Mr. Signé highlights the perspective of his colleague in |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | August 12, 2019 | hopeful because, as Jon wrote in his <i>Foreign Affairs</i> article about Angola, even when there's an effort to sort of control a progression, there's an opportunity for a new president to break from the past, at least to an extent, at least to begin to reform human rights practices.” | a <i>Foreign Affairs</i> article about how incoming presidents may change the way human rights practices are addressed. |
| Insider information | Cites information not accessible to the layperson, drawn from conferences, forums, professional connections, or other sources of occluded information | Ms. Stent, Putin's world, March 13, 2019 | “And I mean anyone who was at the Munich Security Conference a few weeks ago saw that in action. It's essentially Europe, Germany, whatever, between Trump and Putin and how do they possibly manage | Ms. Stent describes how the relationship between Presidents Trump and Putin is affected by European actors, a view highlighted at the Munich Security Conference |

| | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | both of those challenges.” | she attended. |
| Theory | Provides conceptual information or framing for the topic | Ms. Petkova, Digital technology in the age of artificial intelligence: A comparative perspective, March 29, 2019 | “Vogel’s theory of a race to the top, the “California effect”, based on California’s first mover, high environmental standards for car manufacturers, is based on the premise that trade liberalization triggers stricter standards, developed in jurisdictions with a large market share, to force private companies in other jurisdictions, with weaker standards, either to meet the higher standard, or sacrifice a large portion of their exports.” | Ms. Petkova describes Vogel’s “California effect” theory whereby strict standards arising from trade liberalization force private companies to either rise to this higher standard or forgo a significant percentage of their exports. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|---|--|
| Critical stance | Underscores one's own arguments or critical view of the subject | Ms. Maloney, Constraining Iran's nuclear and missile capabilities, March 28, 2019 | "I can tell you that from all of the tea leaf reading today, Iran is not moving in a more open direction, at least with respect to the government, and the successor to the supreme leader is likely to be less well disposed toward international negotiations, less trusting of the international community, and frankly less well informed about the nuclear program and about the history of where we have come from here." | Ms. Maloney offers her expert position that Iran's next leader is likely to be less cooperative in international negotiations, more skeptical of the international community, and less knowledgeable about the history of the nuclear program. |
|-----------------|---|---|---|--|

The results reveal that panelists in foreign affairs may build credibility about themselves and the topics they address by using a myriad of strategies.

Panelists may build credibility about themselves primarily by demonstrating their stature – through their professional achievements, prominent connections, prestigious institutional affiliations, or esteemed reputation, for example. Panelists may build credibility about the topic by using a wide variety of support which demonstrates their explicit knowledge of the topic, such as statistics, expert testimony, examples, and primary as well as secondary research. Thus, strategies for building credibility about oneself are construed more broadly to demonstrate expertise in general, whereas strategies for building credibility about the topic are construed more narrowly to focus explicitly on the issue under discussion.

Panelists often used strategies for building credibility about themselves when sharing their perspective, as opposed to facts or other verifiable information, as shown in this excerpt in which Ms. Maloney highlights her disciplinary expertise [in bold], “From my perspective **as someone who works on Iranian internal politics and economics and on the U.S.-Iran relationship**, we are coming at the end of a long period of limbo” (March 28, 2019). For the *perspective* to hold merit, it should come from an authority, which is perhaps why panelists used strategies for building personal credibility frequently when expressing their views. However, when verifiable information such as facts was shared, it was already credible; adding information about the panelist would not typically enhance the credibility of the facts or other verifiable information presented.

Panelists also seemed to build credibility by creating a division between insiders and outsiders. One such example is when Mr. Carotenuto stated, “And so if you read the press, much of the external threat come from issues that are developing in relationship to Somalia, particularly the Al-Shabaab insurgent group that formed in 2006” (August 12, 2019). In this excerpt, Mr. Carotenuto shares current information to build credibility about the topic. The phrase “if you read the press” draws a distinction between people, like him, who stay abreast of current events, and people who do not. This technique of drawing a distinction between those who are well-informed versus those who are not well-informed was used by other panelists with the following phrases: “if you’ve been following the news,” (Mr. Vertin, April 18, 2019); “if you’re watching the news from the country,” (Ms. Maloney, March

28, 2019); and “if you watch some of the Russian media narratives in the Russian language of the U.S. President” (Ms. Polyakova, March 13, 2019). Panelists also created a divide between insiders and outsiders based on other factors, including professional experience (e.g., “if you’ve engaged with the Continent as I have for over 30 years now” from Ms. Scott, April 5, 2019) and familiarity with external sources (e.g., “if you read the National Security Strategy, the Military Doctrine, the writings of the chiefs of general staff, et cetera” from Mr. Giles, March 13, 2019). As shown in these examples, panelists seemed to build credibility through exclusivity: either by claiming membership in a discourse community to which not everyone belonged or by claiming to have knowledge that not everyone had.

The rhetorical and syntactic structure of sentences tended to vary depending on whether the panelist was building credibility about him or herself as opposed to the topic. When the panelist was building personal credibility, ancillary information was frequently added in a clause, without which the sentence would still make rational sense. For example, if “as I have for over 30 years now,” which shows the panelist’s extensive professional experience, were cut from this sentence, the main point would still remain intact. The sentence reads, “If you’ve engaged with the Continent **as I have for over 30 years now**, I think we see maturation of governments, as you say, in the democratic process, I think you see maturation of markets, I think you see the rise of a middle class” (Ms. Scott, April 5, 2019). That such information about the panelist would be embedded in a clause is logical, because the main point of the discussion is not about the panelist’s professional experience but rather about economic changes in Africa. Were the panelist to separate that information about herself in another sentence, such as, “I have worked on the African Continent for over 30 years now,” it might have sounded pretentious to the audience. In contrast, when panelists were building credibility about the topic, such information often appeared not in clauses within a sentence but in complete sentences, as Mr. Feltman showed when sharing these facts, “So, Hamas and Hezbollah do not appear on the UN terrorist list. They do appear on the U.S. and other countries terrorist list” (June 28, 2019). The facts represented the principal focus of the panel discussion, thereby making it logical that they would be foregrounded

in separate sentences rather than embedded in clauses as ancillary information.

Although rhetorical, rather than lexical, choices were the focus of this study's investigation for building credibility, it is notable that panelists frequently used the expressions "we see," and to a lesser extent, "you see." One such example is when Ms. Polyakova cited historical information, "If you look again at Russian history over the centuries, change doesn't tend to happen from the bottom up in Russia, it tends to happen from the top down. **We've seen** this in the collapse of the Soviet Union, **we saw** in the Bolshevik Revolution" (March 13, 2019). In another example drawn from the corpus, Mr. Wise stated, "**We also see** this ambition colliding with the reality of political military space, particularly related to militias in the eastern Congo, where efforts to control Ebola have been undermined by militia activity and insecurity in those areas" (June 28, 2019). In Hyland's (2005) stance and engagement model, pronoun choice is one way in which engagement is expressed. Panelists appeared to draw upon this phrase "we see" to build inclusivity with their audience and express shared knowledge with members of their discourse communities. The expression "we see" reinforces the credibility of the message by making the observations appear less biased since they are commonly held perceptions.

Given that academic writing is often associated with formal register (Liardét, Black, & Bardetta, 2019), there may be an underlying assumption that academic speaking would use formal register also. It is worth noting that panelists mixed elements of formal and informal register. At times this register variation occurred within a single sentence, as this example from Mr. Signé shows, "So let's say that many of the critical factors affecting the overall economic performance and political and (inaudible) performance for the continent include the rapid urbanization and population growth" (August 12, 2019). The connector "so," (Giménez Moreno, 2010), the ordinary reporting verb "say" (Giménez Moreno, 2010), the contraction "let's" (Giménez Moreno, 2010; Liardét, Black, & Bardetta, 2019) as well as the personal pronoun "us" in that contraction (Liardét, Black, & Bardetta, 2019) which shows involvement and interactiveness (Heylighen & Dewaele, 1999) are all signs of informal register. However, the abstract subject "factors" (Biber et

al., 1999), the nominalizations “performance,” “urbanization,” and “growth,” (Fang et al., 2006), nonfinite relative clause “affecting the overall economic performance and political and (inaudible) performance” (Biber & Gray, 2010), and post-modifying prepositional phrase in the noun phrase “for the continent” (Biber & Gray, 2010) are all indicative of formal register. Moreover, the use of “and” to link nominal elements with “the rapid urbanization and population growth” is more likely to occur in formal as opposed to informal register (Liardét, Black, & Bardetta, 2019). Students should be aware that panelists did not rely on a single register when delivering their panel presentations, and thus, the linguistic flexibility to understand register variation may be critical (Hinkel, 2003; Hyland, 2002) so they can adapt their speech appropriately for their audience and context.

Pedagogical Implications

Both awareness-raising and performance-based activities, such as those suggested below, may be used to teach students how to project their scholarly identities in panel presentations.

Through a process resembling language socialization (Ochs, 1988) whereby learners become socialized through interaction with experts (and in this case, through interaction with authentic expert input), the proposed classroom activities are intended to help novices become competent members of their discourse community. Learning is facilitated through the instructor’s careful modeling and scaffolding in accordance with the sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978). The instructional activities are intended to help address students’ self-reported challenges with academic oral presentations: presenting specialized knowledge (Chou, 2011; Radzuan & Kaur, 2011), using appropriate language and formal register (Chou, 2011; Morita, 2000; Zappa-Hollman, 2007), and showcasing their credibility even when speaking spontaneously or responding to the audience’s questions (Prima et al., 2010; Yang, 2010).

Analyzing Authentic Panelist Input

The goal of this activity is for students to learn, from analysis of authentic input, how panelists in foreign policy position themselves as experts. Authentic input is deemed essential for pragmatics instruction,

especially for awareness raising of syntactic forms and pragmatic strategies (Tateyama, 2019). Moreover, noticing activities have a long record of success in pragmatics instruction (Taguchi, 2015), and research shows that inductive instruction, whereby students derive the rules or principles themselves, leads to better retention of learning gains than deductive instruction does (Glaser, 2014; Takimoto, 2009).

In this awareness-raising activity, learners analyze authentic excerpts from the panel transcripts to determine what makes them sound credible. If they cannot determine the principles of credibility themselves, the instructor scaffolds instruction with guiding questions. After analyzing several authentic lines, learners derive the categories for building credibility which are listed in Tables 2 and 3.

For example, in this line, “For the nearly six years I worked on peace and security matters at the United Nations from inside the Secretariat, this was one of the most vexing questions we dealt with,” Mr. Feltman uses a number of strategies to build credibility: he states the duration of his professional experience [six years], mentions a prestigious affiliation [with the Secretariat of the United Nations], and reveals his disciplinary expertise [on peace and security matters] (June 28, 2019).

Revising Lines for Greater Credibility

The goal of this activity is for learners compare their own pragmatic choices with authentic input (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). They apply the expert principles for building credibility when revising lines from their own recorded presentations.

In addition to revising their own lines from previous presentations, students may also revise authentic panelist lines which fall short of demonstrating credibility and explain the revisions they made. For example, in one of the Brookings panels in the corpus, the moderator Ms. Solis asks the panelist Mr. Chen whether he has any last words, and he responds, “I’m a little bit nervous on this stage so maybe I (off mic) ---” She continues, “Is it working? I’m sorry, I think again – do you want to borrow?” Mr. Chen responds, “It’s okay now. Yeah, I’m little bit nervous on this stage, so maybe we discuss later. Thank you.” Students analyze why full disclosure of one’s nervousness may diminish credibility, and how it might be preferable to leave

the audience with a parting point.

Another variation of this activity is for students to revise panelist lines in which the instructor has omitted some information the panelist used for building credibility. Students share their revisions and then compare their revisions with the original versions to observe similarities and differences with how they and the expert panelists built credibility. For example, students might revise this modified line from Ms. Zeya, “Now, if you were to double that amount in the most conflicted afflicted and fragile countries, you would have a cost savings.” Students would then compare their revisions with the original version in which secondary research is cited and precise statistics are provided, “Now, studies have shown if you were to double that amount in the 31 most conflicted afflicted and fragile countries, you would have a cost savings over 10 years of nearly \$3 trillion” (April 5, 2019).

Role-playing Experts and Speaking Extemporaneously

The goal of this activity is for students to apply the strategies they learned for building credibility in a role-play in which they perform as expert panelists. This opportunity to role-play experts may allow students to try out new forms of academic discourse (Cannon, 2017).

Students choose their professional identity (e.g., a policy analyst, diplomat, professor, or economist) and the topic (e.g., climate change, cyber security, terrorism, or food security). All students are randomly assigned one strategy for building credibility (e.g., prestigious affiliation, self-citation, or primary research). They are to feature that credibility strategy most prominently in a one- to two-minute response to the question, “Why is this issue so important or concerning?” The class guesses which strategy for building credibility is used and peers provide feedback on its effectiveness for building credibility.

As a more open-ended caveat to this activity, learners may respond extemporaneously to the prompt using any of the strategies for building credibility, and another student whose name is randomly drawn would have up to two minutes to state agreement or disagreement with the first student’s position while incorporating any of the strategies for building credibility in the response. Students would reflect on the strategies they used and receive peer and instructor feedback on their effectiveness. Students may even

transcribe their own extemporaneous speech and revise it for greater credibility if their interactions are recorded.

Conclusion

This research provides insight into the strategies professionals in the field of foreign affairs use in panel presentations, thereby contributing to a growing body of knowledge on effective presentations and providing essential guidance EAP students need for expressing themselves academically (Rowley-Jolivet & Carter-Thomas, 2005). The pedagogical activities described in this article help answer the call for the teaching of oral discourse skills and provide “specific, language-oriented guidelines” (Barrett & Liu, 2016, p. 1231) for the panel presentation.

The findings reveal that foreign affairs experts use a wide variety of strategies for building credibility about themselves and the topics they address. These include strategies emphasizing their professional experience, accomplishments, prominent connections, and prestigious affiliations for personal credibility; as well as citing facts, primary and secondary research, historical evidence, and expert testimony to showcase their depth of knowledge about the topic. The complete list of strategies can be found in Tables 2 and 3. At times panelists emphasized insider status to enhance their credibility. Panelists tended to use the strategies for building credibility about themselves when sharing their own perspectives, typically by adding that information in a non-essential clause in a sentence. Conversely, the strategies for building credibility about the topic were often featured more prominently in independent clauses. Panelists used both formal and informal register and key lexical expressions such as “we see” to build inclusivity with members of their discourse community.

One potential criticism of teaching non-native speakers these strategies is that it may uphold conformity to disciplinary norms and privilege a dominant or mainstream manner of expression (cf Benesch, 2001); however, this study included both native and non-native speaking expert panelists’ strategies for learners to be intentionally exposed to a wide variety of communicative strategies within their discourse community. Throughout the lesson’s activities, learners should be encouraged to reflect on their own scholarly identities and draw comparisons with the strategies in their native

languages or cultures, an approach recommended in teaching pragmatics (Cohen, 2019; Limberg, 2015). Students should be given a broad array of authentic examples to analyze and the liberty to determine which of the strategies they feel comfortable incorporating as part of their own scholarly identities rather than being compelled to follow any of them as prescriptive guidelines.

The research findings are relevant to EAP instructors who aspire to enhance students' understanding of the norms of their discourse communities. To address Spack's (1988) claim that EAP instructors are ill-equipped to teach outside their disciplinary communities, this research shows that EAP instructors can develop the expertise to teach their students to become competent members of discourse communities to which they do not belong (Hyland, 2018). Such instruction would equip even advanced learners with specific knowledge of the field which they may be lacking (Honga & Fong, 2012).

One limitation of the study is the relatively small size of the corpus, as it was under one million tokens which is the recommended size for producing the most helpful linguistic information (Sinclair, 1991). In addition to increasing the size of the corpus, the scope of strategies might be broadened in future studies to more thoroughly investigate presenters' lexical choices (Zareva, 2009), such as the inclusive "we" for self-promotion and solidarity (Harwood, 2005b) or the first-person pronoun "I" for projecting authority (Chen, 2020). Future studies might also investigate variation in the use of strategies to build credibility by discipline, among different oral presentation genres, and in oral versus written discourse. The extent to which the strategies outlined in this article build panelists' credibility could be further explored by investigating either the audience's or key informants' perception of the panelists' credibility. It is hoped that this study's initial findings will prompt future research into the ways in which speakers convey their scholarly selves in oral discourse.

Author

Lisa Leopold teaches English for Academic and Professional Purposes to international graduate students at the Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey. Her research interests include pragmatics and public speaking pedagogy.

References

- Aguilar, M. (2004). The peer seminar, a spoken research process genre. *Journal of English for Academic Academic Purposes*, 3(1), 55-72. doi: [10.1016/S1475-1585\(03\)00043-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(03)00043-2)
- Alwi, N.F. & Sidhu, G.K. (2013). Oral presentation: Self-perceived competence and actual performance among UiTM business faculty students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90, 98-106. doi: [10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.070](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.070)
- Amirian, S.M., & Tavakoli, E. (2016). Academic oral presentation self-efficacy: A cross-sectional interdisciplinary comparative study. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 35(6), 1-16. doi:[10.1080/07294360.2016.1160874](https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1160874)
- Barrett, N.E. & Liu, G. (2016). Global trends and research aims for English academic oral presentations: Changes, challenges, and opportunities for learning technology. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1227-1271. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316628296>
- Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for academic purposes: Theory, politics and practice*. Routledge.
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communities*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Biber, D., & Gray, B. (2010). Challenging stereotypes about academic writing: Complexity, elaboration, explicitness. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(1), 2-20.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Pearson Education.
- Cannon, A. (2017). When statues come alive: Teaching and learning academic vocabulary through drama in schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(2), 383-407.
- Carotenuto, M. (2019, August 12). In S. Maloney (Moderator), *The state of African security: Six critical countries* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-state-of-african-security-six-critical-countries/>
- Chang, Y., & Huang, H. (2015). Exploring TED talks as a pedagogical resource

- for oral presentations: A corpus-based move analysis. *English Teaching & Learning*, 39(4), 29-62. doi: 10.6330/ETL.2015.39.4.02
- Chen, C.W.Y. (2011). Evaluating one's own oral academic oral presentation. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 7(3), 5-28.
- Chen, J. (2019, September 17). In M. Solís (Moderator), *Japan, Taiwan, and the future of 'America First' trade policy* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/japan-taiwan-and-the-future-of-america-first-trade-policy/>
- Chen, R. (2020). Single author self-reference: Identity construction and pragmatic competence. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 45, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100856>
- Chou, M. (2011). The influence of learner strategies on oral presentations: A comparison between group and individual performance. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30(4), 272-285. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.04.003>
- Cohen, A.D. (2019). Strategy instruction for learning and performing target language pragmatics. In A.U. Chamot & V. Harris (Eds.), *Learning strategy instruction in the language classroom: Issues and implementation* (pp. 140-152). Multilingual Matters.
- Evans, S. (2013). "Just wanna give you guys a bit of an update": Insider perspectives on business presentations in Hong Kong. *English for Specific Purposes*, 32, 195-207.
- Fang, Z., Schleppegrell, M., & Cox, B. (2006). Understanding the language demands of schooling: Nouns in academic registers. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 28(3), 247-273.
- Farrell, H. (2019, October 4). In R. Hass (Moderator), *The U.S.-China technology relationship in flux* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-u-s-china-technology-relationship-in-flux/>
- Feltman, J. (2019, June 28). In S. Maloney (Moderator), *The impact of militias on governance and geopolitics in the Middle East and North Africa* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-impact-of-militias-on-local->

[governance-in-the-middle-east-and-north-africa/](#)

- Fernandez-Polo, F.J. (2014). The role of *I* mean in conference presentations by EFL speakers. *English for Specific Purposes*, 34, 58-67.
- Geisler, C. (1994). *Academic literacy and the nature of expertise: Reading, writing and knowing in academic philosophy*. Erlbaum.
- Giles, K. (2019, March 13). In S. Talbott (Moderator), *Putin's world* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/putins-world/>
- Giménez Moreno, R. (2010). English for higher education studies. In R. Giménez Moreno (Ed.), *Words for working: Professional and academic English for international business and economics* (pp. 295-334). PUV.
- Glaser, K. (2014). *The impact of method of instruction on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in EFL*. Cambridge Scholars.
- Hamid, S. (2019, June 28). In S. Maloney (Moderator), *The impact of militias on governance and geopolitics in the Middle East and North Africa* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-impact-of-militias-on-local-governance-in-the-middle-east-and-north-africa/>
- Harwood, N. (2005a). 'Nowhere has anyone attempted. In this article I aim to do just that': A corpus-based study of self-promotional I and we in academic writing across four disciplines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 1207-1231.
- Harwood, N. (2005b). 'We do not seem to have a theory. The theory I present here attempts to fill this gap': Inclusive and exclusive pronouns in academic writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(3), 343-375.
- Heylighen, F. & Dewaele, J.M. (1999). *Formality of language: Definition, measurement, and behavioral determinants*. Brussel: Interner Bericht. Vrije Universiteit: Center "Leo Apostel".
- Hicks, K. (2019, April 24). In F. Rose (Moderator), *The future of U.S. extended deterrence* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-future-of-u-s-extended-deterrence/>
- Hinkel, E. (2003). Simplicity without elegance: Features of sentences in L2 and

L1 academic texts. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 275-301.

- Honga, L. C., & Fong, N. S. (2012). Presenting a research proposal: The examiners' expectations. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 66, 537-543. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.298
- Hu, G., & Liu, Y. (2018). Three minute thesis presentations as an academic genre: A cross-disciplinary study of genre moves. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 35, 16-30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.06.004>
- Hyland, K. (2001). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 207-226.
- Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and researching writing*. Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365>
- Hyland, K. (2018). Sympathy for the devil? A defence of EAP. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 383-399. doi: 10.1017/S0261444818000101
- Ishihara, N. & Cohen, A. (2010). Discourse, interaction, and language corpora. In N. Ishihara & A. Cohen (Ed.), *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. (pp. 177-243). Pearson Longman.
- Kaur, K., & Ali, A.M. (2018). Exploring the genre of academic oral presentations: A critical review. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 7(1), 152-162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.1p.152>
- Kim, S. (2006). Academic oral communication needs of East Asian international graduate students in non-science and non-engineering fields. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25(4), 479-489. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.10.001>
- La Reau, A. (2019, April 9). In B.R. Stickles (Moderator), *A legacy of service: 9/11 veterans continuing the tradition of George H.W. Bush and John McCain* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/a-legacy-of-service-9-11-veterans-continuing-the-tradition-of-george-h-w-bush-and-john-mccain/>
- Lee, J.J. (2016). "There's intentionality behind it...": A genre analysis of EAP

- classroom lessons. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 23, 99-112.
- Liardét, C., Black, S., & Bardetta, V.S. (2019). Defining formality: Adapting to the abstract demands of academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 38, 146-158.
- Limberg, H. (2015). Principles for pragmatics teaching: Apologies in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal*, 69(3), 275-285.
- Maloney, S. (2019, March 28). In R. Einhorn (Moderator), *Constraining Iran's nuclear and missile capabilities* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/constraining-irans-nuclear-and-missile-capabilities/>
- McGurk, B. (2019, September 10). In S. Glasser (Moderator), *The counter-ISIS coalition: Diplomacy and security in action* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-counter-isis-coalition-diplomacy-and-security-in-action/>
- Mežek, Š., & Swales, J. (2016). PhD defences and vivas. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 361-375). Routledge.
- Morell, T. (2015). International conference paper presentations: A multimodal analysis to determine effectiveness. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37, 137-150.
- Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 279-310.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge University Press.
- Otoshi, J., & Heffernan, N. (2008). Factors predicting effective oral presentations in EFL classrooms. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 10(1), 65-78.
- Pak, J.H. (2019, April 5). In M. O'Hanlon (Moderator), *US voting and US foreign policy: Regional focus* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/women-of-diversity-in-national-security/>
- Peters, S. (2011). Asserting or deflecting expertise? Exploring the rhetorical

- practices of master's theses in the philosophy of education. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30, 176–185.
- Petkova, B. (2019, March 29). In N.T. Lee (Moderator), *Digital technology in the age of artificial intelligence: A comparative perspective* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/digital-technology-in-the-age-of-artificial-intelligence-a-comparative-perspective/>
- Polyakova, A. (2019, March 13). In S. Talbott (Moderator), *Putin's world* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/putins-world/>
- Prima, V., Wahab, N.M., Othman, A., & Awang, M.G. (2010). A research for identifying study anxiety sources among university students. *International Education Studies*, 3(2), 189-196.
- Radzuan, N.R., & Kaur, S. (2011). Technical oral presentations in English: Qualitative analysis of Malaysian engineering undergraduates' sources of anxiety. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1436-1445.
- Rowley-Jolivet, E. & Carter-Thomas, S. (2005). The rhetoric of conference presentation introductions: Context, argument, and interaction. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(1), 45-70.
- Rusten, L. (2019, March 22). In F.A. Rose (Moderator), *The end of an era?: The INF treaty, New START, and the future of strategic stability* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-end-of-an-era-the-inf-treaty-new-start-and-the-future-of-strategic-stability/>
- Sabri, U., & Qin, T.Y. (2014). Communication apprehension among Nilai college students. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 5(5), 46-49.
- Scott, J. (2019, April 5). In M. O'Hanlon (Moderator), *US voting and US foreign policy: Regional focus* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/women-of-diversity-in-national-security/>
- Signé, L. (2019, August 12). In S. Maloney (Moderator), *The state of African security: Six critical countries* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-state-of-african->

[security-six-critical-countries/](#)

- Sinclair, J. (Ed.). (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford University Press.
- Solís, M. (2019, September 17). In M. Solís (Moderator), *Japan, Taiwan, and the future of 'America First' trade policy* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/japan-taiwan-and-the-future-of-america-first-trade-policy/>
- Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly* 22(1), 29–52.
- Stapa, M., Murad, N.A. & Ahmad, M. (2014). Engineering technical oral presentation: Voices of the stakeholder. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 463-467. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.063>
- Stent, A. (2019, March 13). In S. Talbott (Moderator), *Putin's world* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/putins-world/>
- Stromseth, J. (2019, May 1). In R. Bush (Moderator), *A retrospective on a changing East Asia: The first twenty years of CEAP* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/asias-stability-glancing-back-looking-forward/>
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching*, 48, 1–50.
- Takimoto, M. (2009). The effects of input-based tasks on the development of learners' pragmatic proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 30, 1–25.
- Tamir, Y. (2019, October 7). In N. Sachs (Moderator), *Democracy, nationalism, and populism: The U.S., Israel, and beyond* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/democracy-nationalism-and-populism-the-u-s-israel-and-beyond/>

- Tateyama, Y. (2019). Pragmatics in a language classroom. In N. Taguchi (Ed.). *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics*. (pp. 400-412). Routledge.
- Temin, J. (2019, August 12). In S. Maloney (Moderator), *The state of African security: Six critical countries* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-state-of-african-security-six-critical-countries/>
- Vaishnav, M. (2019, May 24). In T. Madan (Moderator), *Assessing India's 2019 election results* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/assessing-indias-2019-election-results/>
- Vertin, Z. (2019, April 18). In M. O'Hanlon (Moderator), *Red Sea rivalries: The Gulf, The Horn, and the new geopolitics of the Red Sea* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/red-sea-rivalries-the-gulf-the-horn-and-the-new-geopolitics-of-the-red-sea/>
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Weissberg, B. (1993). The graduate seminar: Another research-process genre. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 23–36.
- Wise, P. (2019, June 28). In S. Maloney (Moderator), *The impact of militias on governance and geopolitics in the Middle East and North Africa* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/the-impact-of-militias-on-local-governance-in-the-middle-east-and-north-africa/>
- Yaakob, S. (2013). *A genre analysis and corpus-based study of university lecture introductions*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Birmingham.
- Yang, L. (2010). Doing a group presentation: Negotiations and challenges experienced by five Chinese ESL students of commerce at a Canadian university. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(2), 141–160. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168809353872>
- Yang, W. (2014). Stance and engagement: A corpus-based analysis of academic spoken discourse across science domains. *Language for Special*

Purposes, 5(1), 62-78.

- Zappa-Hollman, S. (2007). Academic presentations across post-secondary contexts: The discourse socialization of non-native English speakers. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(4), 455–485. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.63.4.455>
- Zareva, A. (2009). Informational packaging, level of formality, and the use of circumstance adverbials in L1 and L2 student academic presentations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8, 55–68.
- Zareva, A. (2011). ‘And so that was it’: Linking adverbials in student academic presentations. *RELC Journal*, 42(1), 5–15.
- Zareva, A. (2013). Self-mention and the projection of multiple identity roles in TESOL graduate student presentations: The influence of the written academic genres. *English for Specific Purposes*, 32, 72–83.
- Zeya, U. (2019, April 5). In L. Arias (Moderator), *U.S. voting and new national security issues* [Panel presentation] Washington, D.C., United States. <https://www.brookings.edu/events/women-of-diversity-in-national-security/>
- Zhang, X., Ardasheva, Y., & Austin, B.W. (2020). Self-efficacy and English public speaking performance: A mixed method approach. *English for Specific Purposes*, 59, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.02.001>