Membership Categorisation in Oral Academic Discourse: Strategies for Addressing International, Multidisciplinary Audiences in English as a Lingua Franca

Laurie Jane Anderson, Letizia Cirillo

Abstract
This contribution investigates how disciplinary identities are made relevant in research presentations addressed to a multidisciplinary audience using English as an academic lingua franca. The analysis is based on a corpus of 176 presentations given by international research fellows within an EU-funded programme for postdoctoral studies. It draws on Membership Categorisation Analysis (Sacks 1992) and on the notion of 'altercasting' (Weinstein and Deutschberger 1963) in order to identify the primary functions of explicit mention of self and of audience members in conjunction with academic categories. The analysis reveals that self-categorisation using 'I' involves explicit membershipping along the vertical axis of generalisation/specification and horizontal axis of contrast/co-categorisation (Bilmes 2009). Altercasting of the audience using 'we' (to co-categorise the speaker with part or with all of the audience) or 'you' (to address the whole audience or a part thereof) serves two main goals: a) signalling preceding or upcoming talk as addressed to a specific audience segment; b) establishing interdisciplinary ties/networks. Results indicate that membership categorisation devices contribute to recipient-designing talk for a multidisciplinary audience by invoking both disciplinary definitions and boundaries and locally relevant "relational pairs" (Sacks 1972b). A systematic use of such devices co-implicates the audience's perspectives in what is being said and done, thus conferring an interactive dimension on what may at first glance appear a relatively monologic genre.
Key-words: academic presentations, ELF, disciplinary identities, membership categorisation, academic networking.

1. Introduction: on constructing disciplinary knowledge and identity in academic discourse

Academic discourse has traditionally been viewed as the major locus for *knowledge construction*. As pointed out by Hyland (2009: 11-12),

ISSN 1824-3967
Textus 1-2022, pp. 141-162
© Carocci Editore S.p.A.

knowledge is created by people interacting within specific (academic) communities through processes involving the production of persuasive discourse. This involves guiding readers/listeners to a given interpretation of reality by "using language to relate independent beliefs to shared experience" (Hyland 2009: 13). In doing so, scholars refer to existing literature and anticipate other viewpoints (Hyland 2018: 31-32), thus engaging in the production of genres (research articles, conference presentations, etc.) that are intertextually and interdiscursively linked (see Fairclough 2003). Importantly, they also engage in *identity work* by claiming disciplinary membership for themselves and their audiences, in constant tension between individuality on the one hand and alignment with (or 'proximity' to) the goals, methods, and values of their community of reference on the other (Hyland 2018: 26) – a dynamic "positioning" (Hyland 2018: 39) that confers an inherently interactive dimension on academic discourse.

Research on English for Academic Purposes has acknowledged the centrality of knowledge and identity construction by looking at how the linguistic resources used by scholars to represent themselves, their positions, and their audience are deployed in various genres. One of the most widely investigated of these resources has been person pronouns, which have gained centre stage in studies exploring self-projection in both written and spoken academic texts (see, for instance, Tang and John 1999 on student academic writing; Harwood 2005 on research articles; Hyland 2011 on academic web pages; Zareva 2013; Nausa 2020 on, respectively, graduate and PhD student presentations). Pronouns are also the main object of investigation of work focusing on the interactive character of spoken academic discourse; this work has highlighted the audience engagement functions of we- and you-mentions (see, for instance, Okamura 2009; Yeo and Ting 2014 on university lectures; Fernández Polo 2018 on conference presentations).

All of these studies have drawn, more or less overtly, on the notions of *community* and *discipline*, not least because they have generally compared the rhetorical conventions of various discourse communities and discussed the use of self- and/or other-mentions across disciplines. However, while recurrently invoked by EAP/ESP genre research, the notions of community and discipline are not unproblematic, and have recently been to some extent reconceptualised. In an appreciation of Swales' later work (Swales 1998), Hyland (2015: 33) highlights a shift in his idea of communities "from a focus on goals to a way of 'being in the world', of interacting with colleagues and the acts which comprise the creation of community knowledge". In a similar vein, Kaufhold and McGrath (2019: 116) claim that the idea of disciplines as "relatively stable tribes and territories" no longer fits in with today's higher education scene, characterised by "merged departments and transdisciplinary research clusters"; citing Trowler (2014: 19), they reject rigid taxonomies and recast disciplines as "reservoirs of knowledge resources". Against this backdrop, one might expect interaction within multidisciplinary settings to require even more extensive identity work, in order to show epistemic authority and credibility and to have these acknowledged by other members of relevant networks.

This is precisely where the present study comes into play. In what follows we investigate identity construction in oral presentations given in English by an international and interdisciplinary group of early-career scholars in which self- and other-mentions tend to co-occur with mentions of disciplinary categories. In the above-cited and similar studies on identity work in academic discourse, pronoun use has been discussed using taxonomies like Tang and John's (1999) classification of identities according to authorial presence (from least to most powerful) and Lave and Wenger's (1991) classification of knowledge construction identities (i.e. learner, co-constructor, and provider). To the best of our knowledge, none of these studies has explored disciplinary categorisation, with the exception of Kaufhold and McGrath's (2019), in which, however, such categorisation is observed in elicited data, i.e. in semi-structured interviews. We argue that in a context like the one examined here, in which presenters are accountable to both the discourses of global disciplinary communities and to the institutional constraints and shared practices of a specific local community, self- and other- mention and categorisation are key resources for framing arguments in ways that are both epistemologically appropriate and interpersonally acceptable (Hyland 2018: 126-127). Looking at how this categorisation is done is thus crucial to understanding how to socialise early-career scholars into the discursive practices involved in the construction of knowledge in today's increasingly international and interdisciplinary academia.

2. Theoretical framework: membershipping and altercasting

In this study, we draw on Membership Categorisation Analysis (MCA) and on the concept of 'altercasting'. The former is an approach adopted by ethnomethodologists and conversation analysts to explore social interaction; the latter is a theory of persuasion developed by sociologists Eugene Weinstein and Paul Deutschberger.

MCA traces its beginnings to the work of Sacks (1972a; 1972b; 1992; see also Sacks and Schegloff 1979; Watson 1978; 1997), who observed how people recognise themselves and others as certain types of members of society and how such recognisability is talked into being in everyday life situations. The use of social categories is governed by a set of rules of application, such as the 'consistency rule' and its corollary 'the hearer's maxim':

> If two or more categories are used to categorize two or more members of some population, and those categories can be heard as categories from the same *collection*, then: hear them that way (Sacks 1992: 221; our emphasis).

Collections are groupings based on so-called 'relational pairs' such as 'baby' and 'mommy' (Sacks 1972b); these pairs belong to a given membership categorisation device (in the case of 'baby' and 'mommy', what we may term 'members of a family') and elicit each other, triggering inferences about activities that are typically associated with categories that are invoked. Clearly, members of society can be categorised in a virtually infinite number of ways; therefore, what counts as a correct categorisation can only be established based on the extent to which the categorisation is made relevant by the participants in talk-in-interaction. In other words, if it is true that some membership categorisation devices may be relevant to a whole interactional event because they are tied to a particular setting, i.e. they are 'omni-relevant' (Sacks 1992: 313), participants "may at any moment introduce any of a potentially large number of categories in which they could 'accurately' claim membership", i.e. 'contingently relevant' categories (Whitehead and Baldry 2018: 138).

The introduction of membership categories by a participant to describe individuals or groups and how such categorisation is responded to by her/his co-participants are key to shaping ongoing interaction. As noted by Schegloff (2007: 471):

> Having introduced me to one person at our first meeting as 'a sociologist', others are readily oriented to *disciplinary* categories, and the relevance of doing so is given by the prior bit of identifying. For some next person to be identified or to self-identify as 'Canadian' is then registerable as a 'departure' from the relevancies already introduced, and can prompt a search for what has occasioned that categorization ('why that now').

Academics often employ labels indicating disciplinary membership. In doing so, they construct taxonomies that place themselves and others either along the vertical axis of generalisation/specification or along the horizontal axis of contrast/co-categorisation (Bilmes 2009: 1602). Examples from our data include historian/early-modern historian (general/specific), and statements such as "I'm not a legal or a political philosopher, I'm a lawyer" (contrast) or "a bunch of other economic historians" (co-categorisation). Scholars may also describe themselves and their interlocutors by using 'predicates' of "motives, entitlements, obligations, knowledge, attributes and competencies" (Psathas 1999: 144); as we will show in section 4, while presented as more or less naturally related to one or more disciplinary categories ("Historians love to ask the so what question"; "Lawyers or philosophers or theoreticians [...] insist on the distinction between the principle and the rule"), such predicates are "*locally invoked* associated features" of those categories (Reynolds and Fitzgerald 2015: 99, our emphasis).

A second analytical framework that we employ in our analysis is altercasting, a technique defined by Weinstein and Deutschberger (1963: 454) as the projection of "an identity, to be assumed by other(s) with whom one is in interaction, which is congruent with one's own goals". In the authors' terminology, 'lines of action' on Ego's part are meant to trigger a response by Alter, called 'the interpersonal task'. Within a given encounter, the roles played by participants thus draw on repertoires of "lines of action structured around a specifiable set of interpersonal tasks" (Weinstein and Deutschberger 1963: 455). Inferences about the interpersonal tasks that may be pursued and the lines of action appropriate to these tasks are part of the process of defining the encounter. This process relies on cues whose manipulation may affect Alter's definition of the situation in such a way that Ego's task response becomes Alter's line of action (Weinstein and Deutschberger 1963: 455). Crucially, the projection of Ego's and Alter's identities and the mutual acceptance thereof constitute "a tacit agreement as to the roles the several participants will play out in the encounter" (Weinstein and Deutschberger 1963: 456).

The notion of altercasting has been fruitfully employed in work on speeches by business professionals addressed to other business professionals: drawing on Sacks' notion of 'relational pairs' (see above), Van De Mieroop (2008) shows how speakers in her data project the role of potential buyer onto their audience in order to present themselves and their companies as the seller. In work on academic presentations, Anderson (2015) illustrates how academics exploit membership categorisation and altercasting in geopolitical terms. The two studies are relevant to the present analysis not just because they focus on presentations, but also because they highlight that categories in relational pairs may be coextensive with groups rather than just individuals, as we will see in the examples presented in section 4.

3. Data and methodology

The 176 oral presentations given in English by international scholars analysed in this study were video-recorded at the European University Institute (EUI) in Fiesole (Florence, Italy). They involve four cohorts (2007-2010) of post-doc fellows within the Max Weber Programme (MWP) from four disciplines, namely economics, history and civilization, law, and political and social sciences. The presentations were held in front of the fellows' peers and, in rotation, departmental mentors at the beginning of each of the four one-year fellowship periods. In these "September presentations" (as they are commonly referred to within the Programme), presenters are required to introduce their academic background and briefly illustrate their research projects, seeking, wherever possible, collaboration opportunities with other fellows. The context in which the data were collected is unique for its being designed precisely to foster interdisciplinary work and, while the analysed presentations date back to a few years before the time of writing, they are still representative of the MWP context and of the requirements and constraints associated with it.

As a preliminary operation, the video-recordings were carefully viewed to identify explicit references to self and audience members in conjunction with academic categories and select the relevant portions to be transcribed. An orthographic transcription of these portions was then made and subsequently integrated with annotations about contextual information relevant to ongoing talk (e.g. people entering or leaving the room), as well as paralinguistic features of interest, such as pausing and laughter. The membership categorisation devices thus identified were coded as I-, you, and we-mentions and fed into an Excel spreadsheet for easier classification and quantitative analysis. A number of extended (mainly autobiographical) narrative sequences containing self- and other- academic designations were also transcribed for qualitative investigation.

Before moving on to describe the formats and functions of these academic categorisations in our data, a few words on the main characteristics of the presentations under scrutiny are in order. Academic presentations are, in fact, characterised by great variety; they may serve different communicative purposes, vary in length, be addressed to audiences of different sizes and levels of homogeneity, and involve a more or less formal delivery style. With respect to Fortanet-Gómez's (2005) taxonomy of spoken academic genres, the academic presentations we have examined fall within the category of *research genres* (as opposed to classroom and institutional genres), with presenters being mainly oriented to the illustration of ongoing research and the establishment of research networks. They are all of a similar duration (approximately ten minutes for the presentation proper and five minutes for question time) and are addressed to audiences that are relatively uniform in size (40-50 people) but include academics from different geographical and disciplinary backgrounds (see above). The speakers present both previous projects and work in progress, employing 'fresh talk' (as opposed to memorisation or reading aloud; see Goffman 1981: 171) and a 'conversational style' (as opposed to a reading or a rhetorical style; see Dudley-Evans 1994: 148). The need to establish a relation between themselves and their communities of reference, including their listeners (see sections 1 and 2), together with the immediacy in time and space of the latter, affects the actions of presenters, who 'recipient design' (Sacks *et al.* 1974) their talk in ways that display awareness of the presence and needs of their audience (see also Rendle-Short 2006: 6-13).

4. Results

In what follows we will discuss the forms and functions of self- and other-categorisation by means of examples taken from our September presentation corpus. The analysis focuses on explicit mentions involving disciplinary or other academic/professional categories in conjunction with person deixis. Instances of disciplinary/academic categorisation in conjunction with place and time deixis, as well as examples of implicit categorisation (i.e. use of disciplinary/academic labels with neither related person pronouns nor time/place adverbials in the immediately surrounding co-text) will also be discussed.

4.1. The syntax and pragmatics of self-categorisation

116 explicit self-mentions associated with a disciplinary group (73) or an academic or other professional role (43) were found in the data. Modes of self-mention can be grouped as follows:

Deictic mention by subject pronoun 'I' + copula/copular verb + noun(s)/noun phrase(s) indicating category(-ies):

(1) My name is J.K. and *I'm an economist* (D-11 ECO)
(2) As you can see *I'm a lawyer* (B-22 LAW)
(3) I'm an international law jurist and a political scientist (A-29LAW)
(4) I'm a historian of modern south eastern Europe and the late Ottoman empire (C-23 HEC)
(5) *I'm a microeconomist* by training (C-26 ECO)
(6) Primarily *I'm a qualitative researcher* (A-08 SPS)
(7) *I became a lecturer* in Bristol (A-40 LAW)

Deictic mention by subject pronoun 'I' + 'experiential verb' (Cook 1989) (with or without preceding (semi)modal) + object pronoun + noun(s)/noun phrase(s) indicating category(-ies):

(8) So by training *I call myself a social scientist* (B-06 SPS)
(9) So as maybe the majority of you *I would define myself as a scholar both as a teacher and a researcher* (B-04 LAW)
(10) I'm a lawyer. In fact *I could define myself a somewhat hybrid kind of lawyer or legal researcher* (C-08 LAW)
(11) I would primarily like to describe myself as a historian of migration (D-38 HEC)
(12) I'm an early modern historian. *I prefer to see myself as a cultural historian* (A-11 HEC)

Deictic mention by subject pronoun 'I' + (active/passive) 'process' or 'action verb' (Cook 1989) + noun(s)/noun phrase(s) indicating category(-ies):

(13) I qualified as a barrister in 2005 (C-40 LAW)
(14) I was trained as a philosopher (D-37 SPS)
(15) I began to work as an assistant professor (A-28 LAW)
(16) I served as a lawyer (B-18 SPS)
(17) I also worked as an academic consultant (B-30 ECO)

Self-categorisation may involve invoking taxonomies based on generalisation/specification, as shown in examples (4), (11), (12) above, and in (18)-(20) below:

(18) I'm a *political scientist*. A *comparativist* (B-20 SPS)
(19) I'm trained as *a historian of the Middle East*. As an *Arabist*. Some would say an *old-fashioned orientalist* as I was accused of last year in this very room during September presentations (D-31 HEC)
(20) I'm an *economic historian* which actually can mean two things. Either you're an *economist* or a *historian*. Normally if you are going to present yourself out in an economic history conference you always play a game. You figure out the opponent. Who is the economist and who is the historian among the two you're talking to? (A-05 ECO)

Interestingly, examples (19) and (20) show that presenters may be labelled or even label themselves in different ways based on contextual factors, particularly in relation to audience expectations.

In addition, (20) exemplifies not just categorisation along the vertical general vs. specific axis, but also membershipping along the horizontal axis of co-categorisation/contrast (see section 2); the latter taxonomic dimension is also invoked in (10), above, and in (21) and (22), below:

(21) So as you can see next to my name I'm affiliated to the SPS department here. But in contrast to all others who are affiliated with this department *I'm not a political scientist or theorist but a sociologist*. ((From the audience: not the only one)) there's one visiting fellow but I think that's S.? ((Same person from audience: go on)) ((laughter)) (C-38 SPS)

(22) Just to try to place my ideas for legal or political philosophers I think I think *I'm not a legal or political philosopher. I'm a lawyer*. I think I fit most comfortably with a crowd of culturalists liberal culturalists or accommodationists (C-22 LAW)

In both (21) and (22) presenters are doing epistemic positioning by accounting for their ideas to the members of their disciplinary community/department of reference; both claim membership therein and highlight how their approach differs from that of other members of the same local/global community (see section 1).

In some cases, person deictics are not followed by a defining label but by an indication of either the discipline within which presenters situate themselves or the EUI department they are affiliated with:

(23) As you can see it took me some time *to end up where I think I belong. Which is sociology* (D-16 SPS)

(24) So in terms of the name of the field *I would put myself in the macroeconomics sphere* (D-36 ECO)

(25) I'm from the law department (B-32 LAW)

(26) I'm affiliated to the SPS department here (C-38 SPS)

The self-mentions considered thus far occur at the beginning of the presentations, i.e. when speakers are introducing themselves to their colleagues and supervisors. However, references to self are not uncommon in the rest of the talk, although they display a different format. For instance, person deixis may occur after a disjunct that frames subsequent talk against the presenter's disciplinary viewpoint

– disciplinary membership having already been established in previous talk and being therefore formatted as given rather than new information:

(27) *As a sociologist I* do of course not agree with that. (C-38 SPS)
(28) What comes next? *As for a good historian I*'m supposed to write a book monograph (C-42 HEC)

As examples (27) and (28) show, once membership has been established, naming a disciplinary category can serve to topicalise one or more 'predicates' (Psathas 1999; see section 2 above) associated with that category, i.e. to indicate what the speaker is expected (not) to do as a member of that specific group.

In the intermediate and concluding stages of their talk, presenters may also identify with a given category by invoking/addressing *other* members of the same group. This may serve at least two distinct functions, namely supporting an argument by mentioning external authoritative sources of knowledge, e.g. scholars belonging to the same (sub)discipline, as in (29), and expressing alignment with the interests and goals of a local community of practice and a given subgroup thereof, as in (30)[1]:

(29) I claim and with me *a bunch of other economic historians* that there's been a structural change in the national innovation system (A-18 ECO)
(30) I look forward to having many conversations with economists and historians and lawyers *and other political scientists and sociologists* here in the room (B-21 SPS)

The sample further includes 16 instances of self-reference involving nouns indicating disciplinary categories in conjunction with an adjacent or anaphoric/cataphoric *we*. The use of the first-person plural pronoun in combination with associated predicates for the disciplinary category named – predicates that can be found in all sixteen examples – seems to be a rather clear indication of the presenter's alignment with the conventionally recognised

[1] Example (30) has in fact been counted as other-mention (cf. 4.2).

competencies of the members of that category. Such self-reference thus contributes to constructing a self that is both distinct from and similar to its co-members:

(31) *Economists* were actually the first ones who formally modelled form like this ((audience laughter)) and because *we* liked it *we* never stopped (D-11 ECO)
(32) *Historians* love to ask the so what question. Why do *we* care? (B-12 HEC)
(33) *We as political scientists we* like to think of political spaces (C-31 SPS)
(34) *We as historians* but also countries I think have a certain agenda (D-31 HEC)
(35) *We* insist. *Lawyers or philosophers or theoreticians*. They insist on the distinction between the principle and the rule (B-04 LAW)

Reference to disciplinary membership may be even implicit: there may be no I- or we-mention in the immediately surrounding co-text because reference is being made to either omni-relevant categories (see section 2) or to information that has either already been provided in previous talk or is traceable elsewhere (e.g. on the official presentation schedule or in biosketches uploaded to the EUI's website). Similarly to what has already been observed for examples (27)-(28) and (31)-(35), associated predicates abound in examples of this type of implicit membershipping:

(36) The problem of time is of utmost importance *for lawyers* (D-10 LAW)
(37) *Historians* as you probably know are always expected to declare their period (A-11 HEC)

If we were to classify the above examples in terms of strategies for self-categorisation, we would discern at least three macro groupings, i.e. what might be termed attributing to oneself a *fixed*, *evolving*, or *temporary* identity. All three types of self-attribution may be rather straightforward, but, given the heterogeneity of an audience whose members come from different disciplinary backgrounds and university systems, they may sometimes require extended identity work to explain membershipping criteria to non-members. This can be seen by comparing the following pairs of examples:

Attributing to oneself fixed identities:

(38) I'm happy to be the first *economist* to speak here (D-06 ECO)
(39) I'm M. L. and well first of all I'm an *econometrician* and this means that basically I deal with economic data. Usually econometricians do three things with data. The first one is to use them to verify or confute economic theories. The second one is to explore the data to see whether they can suggest anything about new possible theories. And the third is to exploit the information which is contained inside data to better forecast future possible values of the series we're interested in. Usually the third type of econometrician is the one that is less linked with economic theory and in actual facts *I was born as third type econometrician.* (A-37 ECO)

Attributing to oneself evolving identities:

(40) I also *worked as a research assistant* and *I've been a freelance consultant* (A-29 LAW)
(41) *I too am an escapee from the Italian university system* and for me too, like for S. this entails *being a postgraduate student* twice […] like G. *I started off as a philosophy student* and *I ended up as operating in a political science department*. I came here as a Max Weber fellow. […] *I am let's call it state based cosmopolitan. Moderate cosmopolitan* (C-47 SPS)

Attributing to oneself temporary identities:

(42) I'm a visiting Max Weber fellow this year (C-45 SPS)
(43) I would like to say that *I'm not only a Max Weber fellow* but also a big fan of Max Weber ehm not an expert as J. who's speaking after me but but *I'm let's say an interpretative sociologist interested in the: historical dimension of social phenomena* to to say it short (B-11 SPS)

In (43), similarly to what occurs in (21) above, identity is defined by reference to the context of situation in such a way as to claim both proximity to a group of peers (the SPS department in (21) and

Max Weber fellows in (43)) and difference from them (a sociologist in (21) and a big fan of Max Weber in (43)); these examples thus highlight the already-mentioned tension between conformity and individuality typical of academic knowledge making (see section 2). The presenter in (43), however, goes one step further: while creating a research space (Swales 1990), he also acknowledges greater authority by another fellow, thus implicitly opening up spaces for exchange.

In other examples, disclaiming or downplaying one's own epistemic authority is more overtly oriented towards inviting collaborations with other fellows. This is illustrated in (44)-(46), where presenters attribute a temporary working identity to themselves while engaging in implicit *altercasting* (see section 2). To be more precise, they single out one characteristic linked to their membership in a given disciplinary (sub)group – i.e. they selectively refer to predicates associated with that (sub)discipline – which casts them as the non-experts within the group of Max Weber fellows. In doing so, they seek help from those who are thereby implicitly cast as expert members:

(44) I'd really like to have feedback on this because *I'm not even a proper economist. So I'm good at doing this filtering stuff but not at doing this macroeconomic modelling.* (A-37 ECO; cf. (39) above)

(45) *I'm not an expert in these empirical questions* […] and so I will be in your hands from now on (D-06 ECO)

(46) *I'm an old-fashioned orientalist and I'm new to quantitative history* so I welcome assistance in cleaning my data (D-31 HEC; cf. (19) above)

Significantly, no instances in which presenters explicitly cast themselves as experts in a given area were found, a tendency which seems to be in line with prior research findings on the role of projecting modesty in presenting a discoursal self (e.g. Swales 1990: 175; Hyland 2018: 317-318). Even in the reverse move of offering help (rather than requesting it, as in (44)-(46)), self-citations are not employed. What is often explicit is you-mentions, as we will see in 4.2.

4.2. The syntax and pragmatics of other-categorisation

In our sample, explicit other-mentions used for disciplinary membershipping are far less frequent than self-mentions. We found 41 overall[2], which can be divided syntactically into the following groups:

Deictic mention by person pronoun 'you' + noun(s) indicating category(-ies). The reverse order (i.e. noun indicating category + deictic mention by person pronoun 'you') is also possible, as in (49), in which, in addition, the noun used for categorisation refers to a multidisciplinary group:

(47) This moves me closer to *you historians* (A-06 HEC)
(48) I'm sure there are some people among *you economists and sociologists* and so on who might be interested (C-22 SPS)
(49) The third thing that I share with most of *the visiting fellows among you* is that I came here as a Max Weber fellow. So here I am again (C-47 SPS)

Deictic mention by person pronoun 'you' (preceded by quantifier) + indication of discipline/research interests:

(50) There are *a bunch of you working on law and economics* (A-05 ECO)
(51) It might be possible that this subject will interest *some of you that are not specialised in economics* (B-40 ECO)

Noun(s) indicating category(-ies) (preceded by quantifier) + deictic mention by adverb/adverbial phrase of space (see also ex. (30) above):

(52) I'm actually really looking forward to talking to *a lot of the lawyers here* (B-19 HEC)
(53) I would like to have some suggestions from *the political scientists* who are *here* (B-47 LAW)

---

[2] The data, however, include 71 instances of citations of audience members through explicit mention of either their first (64) or full names (7). These are part of either intertextual references (i.e. to previous presentations) or collaboration proposals, in which case they tend to appear towards the end of the talk.

Deictic mention by adverbial phrase of place/time associated with a plural/collective noun + participle/relative clause with noun phrase(s) indicating research interests/methodological approaches:

(54) I hope that *in this audience* there will be *other people working either in the field of family dynamics or in the field of migration* (C-06 SPS)
(55) And I hope that *during this year at the EUI* I will have the possibility to discuss with *people who are more familiar with the empirical domain* (D-08 SPS)

Regarding the pragmatic role of other-mentions, references to the audience or groups thereof can be ascribed to two main functions, namely *managing the information flow* and *establishing research collaborations*.

Mentions relating to the first function occur throughout the presentations and are employed to recipient design talk for a diversified audience. Specifically, they mark shifts from talk addressed to experts to talk addressed to non-experts (or vice versa):

(56) Just to give *you* some background context *especially for the non-historians* (D-44 HEC)
(57) A contraction mapping which is very nice to have *for the experts among you*. And *for the non-experts* it means ((proceeds to give explanation)) (A-13 ECO)
(58) Ehm since maybe *most of you might not be familiar with quantitative methods* so I will be slow and let me first apologise to the economists and econometricians particularly ((pointing at supervisor in the audience)) H. thank you for coming (C-12 ECO)

Examples (56)-(58) show speakers' awareness of the multidisciplinary nature of their audience and of how other-mention and categorisation ensure accountability to the cognitive and normative expectations of different disciplinary groups. The predicates used help to distinguish experts from non-experts: for example, in (58) being familiar or unfamiliar with quantitative methods distinguishes the experts present – i.e. the economists and especially econometricians in the audience, including the speaker's supervisor and the speaker himself – from non-experts. Using predicates in this way makes it possible to establish locally relevant relational pairs (empiricists vs. theorists, researchers adopting quantitative approaches vs. researchers adopting qualitative approaches, etc.) and thus recipient design specific portions of talk. This use of other-mention is in line with some of the discourse functions identified in previous research, such as 'receiving or benefitting from the action performed by the speaker' or 'creating elaborate positive politeness' (see Fernández Polo 2018). In short, other-mentions with category naming and the use of associated predicates function as contextualisation cues that signal "how current speech is intended by the speaker and how the speaker intends the addressee to interpret it" (Gumperz 1992: 230).

As for mentions designed to establish research collaborations, they typically occur at the end of the presentation, in compliance with the guidelines provided for September presentations and probably as a way of inviting dialogue in the final question-and-answer slot (see section 3). Mentions of this kind can be further divided into two subgroups:

Establishing research collaborations by positing common ground:

(59) I hope this project will link with *other fellows who are dealing with religious matters but also identity and the idea of the myth* (D-46 HEC)

(60) What I wanted to do and I think it's quite new in Polish Jewish history work eh literature is *I introduce a comparative perspective* with Slovakia. And I know *many of you actually work on comparative studies and use a comparative approach* (B-05 HEC)

Establishing research collaborations through 'altercasting' by projecting complementary competences (requesting/offering help):

(61) I use time series progression which actually *one of the things I would like to work on are my time series progression skills* which I think probably *plenty of economists in the room could help me out* with (A-36 SPS)

(62) I think since *most of you are working on models or on simulations* for example computable models maybe *the possibility to*

transfer the legal knowledge inside the model can in some way enhance the way the models simulate the reality (D-10 LAW)

(63) Ehm lastly ehm so I think there's there's a lot of room for interactions here with with other fellows ehm in particular *something that I have a hard time with is all the empirical stuff* so eh *probably you know more about this than me especially the the political scientists and the historians* [...] and also so nowadays ehm political scientists and lawyers ehm very often also in the top journals at least have some eh some little Mickey Mouse models ehm for economists hh but that really helps you to publish in th- in the top journals. So if any of you want to ehm endeavour in that kind of direction I'm I'm *I will be happy to help* (B-43 ECO)

In examples (59)-(63), other-mention can be said to perform functions that previous research has described as 'creating dialogue' and 'emphasizing shared knowledge' (see Fernández Polo 2018). All five examples include displays of epistemic status whereby speakers recognise themselves and their addressees as more or less knowledgeable regarding a given domain, positioning themselves either symmetrically, as in (59) and (60), or asymmetrically, as in (61)-(63). In determining 'territories of knowledge' (Heritage 2012) and emphasising shared and/or complementary knowledge, presenters thus lay the foundations for collaborative work. The strategy employed in (63) is particularly revealing in this regard: the speaker (an economist) first refers to the difficulties he encounters with empirical research, then identifies part of his audience (political scientists and historians, to whom he adds lawyers at a later stage) as those "who know more about this"; this positive assessment allows him to subsequently cast them – although indirectly – as less knowledgeable than economists in constructing theoretical models, an aspect on which he then offers assistance.

5. Conclusions

The data analysed in section 4 reveal that modes of self- and other-mention in academic presentations are heavily dependent on audience composition. In the multidisciplinary context considered, membershipping through references to self and others involves a twofold positioning on the part of the speakers, who, in the process of maintaining and creating knowledge, must make themselves accountable to both global (disciplinary) discourse communities and a local (multidisciplinary) community of practice.

Self-reference in conjunction with the use of disciplinary categories is frequent and occurs not only in openings but throughout the presentations as a whole. Self-categorisation along the vertical axis (Bilmes 2009) is common and allows speakers to situate themselves, through the mention of both (sub)disciplinary and methodological categories, in ways that are comprehensible to both experts and non-experts. In addition, the predicates associated with I-mentions contribute to striking a balance between highlighting one's own contribution to a discipline and fulfilling the role of "the humble servant" (Hyland 2018: 317), thereby enhancing one's *academic credibility*.

While less frequent than self-reference, other-reference in conjunction with the use of disciplinary categories is key to marking portions of discourse as specifically addressed to variably large subgroups of listeners: by signalling that one is about to explain technicalities to non-experts or members of other disciplines, such other-reference enhances *content accessibility*. It therefore serves recipient design functions while at the same time preserving the speaker's status as a knowledgeable disciplinary insider.

Significantly, both self- and other-reference occur with disciplinary predicates in our data. Such predicates are locally invoked by speakers in order to project complementary competences based on relational pairs. Doing so not only contributes to enhancing the dialogic dimension of a genre that is often erroneously perceived as purely monologic, but also, by inviting cooperation, supports *academic networking.*

The scholars observed in this study show a considerable control of membershipping and altercasting practices and an ability to position themselves effectively in disciplinary terms. Their use of membership categorisation, in conjunction with self- and other-reference, allows them to display core academic values (such as honesty, humility, and solidarity) which contribute to projecting not just a disciplinary persona but also the public face of a discipline. Given the increasing fluidity of disciplinary communities and the growing importance of interdisciplinary collaboration, fostering competence in this area among early-career scholars should be a primary concern for EAP practitioners.

References

ANDERSON, LAURIE JANE, 2015, "'Internationality' as a Metapragmatic Resource in Research Presentations Addressed to *English as a Lingua Franca* Audiences", in P. Thompson and G. Diani (eds), *English for Academic Purposes: Approaches and Implications*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne, pp. 198-224.

BILMES, JACK, 2009, "Taxonomies are for Talking", *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, pp. 1600–1610.

COOK, WALTER ANTHONY, 1989, *Case Grammar Theory*, Georgetown U.P., Washington (DC).

DUDLEY-EVANS, TONY, 1994, "Variations in the Discourse Patterns Favoured by Different Disciplines and their Pedagogical Implications", in J. Flowerdew (ed.), *Academic Listening*, C.U.P., Cambridge, pp. 146-158.

FAIRCLOUGH, NORMAN, 2003, *Analysing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research*, Routledge, London-New York.

FERNÁNDEZ POLO, FRANCISCO JAVIER, 2018, "Functions of 'You' in Conference Presentations, *English for Specific Purposes* 49, pp. 14-25.

FORTANET-GÓMEZ, INMACULADA, 2005, "Honoris Causa Speeches: An Approach to Structure", *Discourse Studies* 7 (1), pp. 35-51.

GOFFMAN, ERVING, 1981, *Forms of Talk*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

GUMPERZ, JOHN, 1992, "Contextualization and Understanding", in A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds), *Rethinking Context*, C.U.P., Cambridge, pp. 229-252.

HARWOOD, NIGEL, 2005 "'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), pp. 343-375.

HERITAGE, JOHN, 2012, "The Epistemic Engine: Sequence Organization and Territories of Knowledge", *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45 (1), pp. 30-52.

HYLAND, KEN, 2009, *Academic Discourse. English in a Global Context*, Continuum, London.

HYLAND, KEN, 2011, "The Presentation of Self in Scholarly Life: Identity and Marginalization in Academic Homepages", *English for Specific Purposes* 30 (4), pp. 286-297.

HYLAND, KEN, 2015, "Genre, Discipline and Identity", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 19, pp. 32-43.

HYLAND, KEN, 2018, *The Essential Hyland. Studies in Applied Linguistics*, Bloomsbury, London.

KAUFHOLD, KATRIN and MCGRATH, LISA, 2019, "Revisiting the Role of 'Discipline' in Writing for Publication in Two Social Sciences", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 40, pp. 115-128.

LAVE, JEAN and WENGER, ETIENNE, 1991, *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, C.U.P., Cambridge.

NAUSA, RICARDO, 2020, "Identity Projection in the Oral Presentations of Colombian PhD Students: Disciplinary Differences", *System* 94, pp. 1-17.

OKAMURA, AKIKO, 2009, "Use of Personal Pronouns in Two Types of Monologic Academic Speech, *The Economic Journal of Takasaki City University of Economics* 52 (1), pp. 17–26.

PSATHAS, GEORGE, 1999, "Studying the Organization in Action: Membership Categorization and Interaction Analysis", *Human Studies* 22, pp. 139–162.

RENDLE-SHORT, JOHANNA, 2006, *The Academic Presentation. Situated Talk in Action*, Routledge, London-New York.

REYNOLDS, EDWARD and FITZGERALD, RICHARD, 2015, "Challenging Normativity: Re-appraising Category Bound, Tied and Predicated Features", in R. Fitzgerald and W. Housley (eds), *Advances in Membership Categorisation Analysis*, Sage, London-Thousand Oaks, pp. 99-122.

SACKS, HARVEY, 1972a, "An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Data for Doing Sociology", in D. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*, Free Press, New York, pp. 31–74.

SACKS, HARVEY, 1972b, "On the Analyzability of Stories by Children", in J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, pp. 325–345.

SACKS, HARVEY, 1992, *Lectures on Conversation*, Vols 1 and 2., ed. by G. Jefferson with introduction by E. A. Schegloff, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

SACKS, HARVEY and SCHEGLOFF, EMANUEL ABRAHAM, 1979, "Two Preferences in the Organization of Reference to Persons in Conversation and Their Interaction", in G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Irvington Press, New York, pp. 15–21.

SACKS, HARVEY, SCHEGLOFF, EMANUEL ABRAHAM, JEFFERSON, GAIL, 1974, "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-taking in Conversation", *Language* 50, pp. 696-735.

SCHEGLOFF, EMANUEL ABRAHAM, 2007, "A Tutorial on Membership Categorization", *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, pp. 462-482.

SWALES, JOHN MALCOLM, 1990, *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*, C.U.P., Cambridge.

SWALES, JOHN MALCOLM, 1998, *Other Floors, Other Voices*, Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.

TANG, RAMONA and JOHN, SUGANTHI, 1999, "The 'I' in Identity: Exploring Writer Identity in Student Academic Writing through the First Person Pronoun", *English for Specific Purposes* 18 (1), pp. 23-39.

TROWLER, PAUL, 2014, "Disciplines and Interdisciplinarity: Conceptual Groundwork", in P. Trowler, M. Saunders and W. Bamber (eds), *Tribes and Territories in the 21st Century: Rethinking the Significance of Disciplines in Higher Education*, Routledge, London, pp. 5-29.

VAN DE MIEROOP, DORIEN, 2008, "Co-Constructing Identities in Speeches: How the Construction of an 'Other' Identity is Defining for the 'Self' Identity and Vice Versa", *Pragmatics* 18 (3), pp. 491–509.

WATSON, ROD, 1978, "Categorisation, Authorisation and Blame-Negotiation in Conversation", *Sociology* 12 (1), pp. 105–113.

WATSON, ROD, 1997, "Some General Reflections on 'Categorization' and 'Sequence' in the Analysis of Conversation", in S. K. Hester and P. Eglin (eds), *Culture in Action*, University Press of America, Washington (DC), pp. 49–75.

WEINSTEIN, EUGENE A. and DEUTSCHBERGER, PAUL, 1963, "Some Dimensions of Altercasting", *Sociometry: Journal of Interpersonal Relations* 26, pp. 454–466.

WHITEHEAD, KEVIN A. and BALDRY, KIM, 2018, "Omni-relevant and Contingent Membership Categories in Research Interview and Focus Group Openings", *Qualitative Research* 18 (2), pp. 135–152.

YEO, JIIN-YIH and TING, SU-HIE, 2014, "Personal Pronouns for Student Engagement in Arts and Science Lecture Introductions", *English for Specific Purposes* 34, pp. 26-37.

ZAREVA, ALLA, 2013, "Self-mention and the Projection of Multiple Identity Rolesin TESOL Graduate Student Presentations: The Influence of the Written Academic Genres", *English for Specific Purposes* 32, pp. 72-83.