

## Critical Discourse Analysis of Students' Academic Speeches: Power, Ideology, and Identity in Higher Education

*Tirsa Cristiani<sup>1</sup>, Nur Aina<sup>2</sup>, Yohana Patricia<sup>3</sup>*

Email: [tirsacristiani@gmail.com](mailto:tirsacristiani@gmail.com)

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Faculty of Islamic Education and Teacher Training, Sultan Aji Muhammad Idris State Islamic University, Samarinda, Indonesia

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received: 21/10/2025

Revised: 27/11/2025

Accepted: 20/12/2025

Available online: 30/12/2025

#### Keywords:

Critical Discourse Analysis;  
Academic Speeches;  
Student Identity;  
Power and Ideology;  
Higher Education.

### ABSTRACT

This study examines students' academic speeches through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to explore how spoken academic discourse functions as a site of power, ideology, and identity construction in higher education. Employing a qualitative research design, the study analyzes academic speeches produced by university students in formal academic contexts, such as seminar and thesis proposal presentations. The data were collected through audio and video recordings and transcribed verbatim. Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA framework was used to analyze the data at the levels of textual features, discursive practice, and social practice. The findings reveal that students' academic speeches are characterized by distinct discursive patterns, including the strategic use of authoritative and tentative language, reliance on established academic authorities, and adherence to institutional genre conventions. These linguistic choices reflect the reproduction of dominant academic ideologies such as objectivity, impersonality, and hierarchical knowledge production. At the same time, students negotiate legitimacy and credibility by balancing compliance with limited critical engagement, constructing academic identities as legitimate yet subordinate members of the academic community. The study contributes theoretically by extending the application of CDA to spoken academic discourse produced by students, an area that has received less attention than written academic texts. Pedagogically, the findings highlight the importance of integrating critical academic speaking skills and critical language awareness into higher education to empower students in navigating academic power relations.

© 2025 L'Geneus. All rights reserved.

### 1. Introduction

Academic speeches such as classroom presentations, seminars, thesis defenses, and conference talks play a crucial role in higher education, functioning not only as means of knowledge dissemination but also as key sites where academic competence, credibility, and identity are constructed. Through academic speaking, students are expected to demonstrate mastery of disciplinary knowledge, adherence to scholarly conventions, and the ability to engage critically with existing research. As such, academic speeches are central to students' academic success and professional socialization within university contexts.

However, academic communication is not merely a neutral transmission of information. Language used in academic settings is deeply embedded in relations of power, ideology, and identity. Choices of words, forms of argumentation, modality, and rhetorical structure often reflect institutional expectations and dominant academic norms (Hyland, 2011). In academic speeches, students must position themselves in relation to authoritative knowledge, lecturers, examiners, and disciplinary communities. This positioning reveals how students negotiate legitimacy, expertise, and authority, often reproducing hierarchical power relations within

academia. Consequently, students' academic speeches are shaped by institutional discourse practices, disciplinary traditions, and implicit expectations about what counts as "appropriate" academic language.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provides a theoretical and methodological framework for examining these dynamics (Lin, 2014). CDA views language as a form of social practice and emphasizes the dialectical relationship between discourse and social structures. It assumes that discourse both reflects and reproduces power relations, ideologies, and social inequalities. Rather than focusing solely on linguistic form, CDA seeks to uncover how language is used to construct meaning, maintain dominance, and legitimize particular worldviews. In this study, CDA is employed to analyze students' academic speeches by drawing on established frameworks such as Fairclough's three-dimensional model, which examines discourse at the levels of text, discursive practice, and social practice. This framework enables a systematic exploration of how linguistic features in academic speeches are connected to broader institutional and ideological contexts.

Several studies in the field of discourse analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provide foundational insights for exploring the linguistic and ideological dimensions of spoken academic communication. Rosi Wahyuni and Kastam Syamsi (2021) conducted a Critical Discourse Analysis of the speeches of Nadiem Makarim and Muhadjir Effendy delivered on Teacher's Day, employing Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA framework (micro, mezzo, and macro levels). Their study revealed how language use in speeches reflects varying communicative strategies and ideological positioning by the speakers, illustrating how CDA can unpack the relationship between language, power, and social context in speech texts.

Pipih Nofitasari (2017) applied CDA to speaking classroom discourse in a senior high school setting using Fairclough's model. The study analyzed interactions between a teacher and students to reveal how power relations and classroom practices were linguistically constructed, showing the usefulness of CDA for examining spoken educational interactions.

Though not focused explicitly on students' academic speeches, spoken discourse research such as Patil et al. (2020) highlights the complexity of spoken communication. Their work on modelling coherence in spoken discourse underscores the need to consider prosodic and communicative features in spoken language analysis, which is relevant for future CDA studies that deal with spoken academic presentations rather than written texts.

Beyond direct studies of academic speech, a range of CDA research on spoken and written political speeches provides methodological context. For example, Wahyuni and Syamsi's (2021) use of Fairclough's framework to analyze political speeches affirms CDA's capability to reveal hidden ideological structures and power relations embedded in speech acts. Research such as Achmad Komaruddin's (2014) thesis on Critical Discourse Analysis of a speech by Hillary Rodham Clinton also demonstrates how CDA can uncover semantic, lexical, and structural meanings in political speech, linking language choices to ideological goals.

In addition to individual case studies, foundational theoretical works by Teun A. van Dijk (2015) and Norman Fairclough provide crucial frameworks for CDA research. Van Dijk's work emphasizes how discourse enacts and reproduces social power and inequality through text and talk, offering a basis for analyzing spoken academic discourse as socio-ideological practice. Fairclough's models similarly outline how discourse structures relate to societal power relations and normative practices in communication, which can be adapted to examine how students negotiate academic norms in speeches.

Despite the growing body of research on academic discourse, existing studies have predominantly focused on written academic texts, such as journal articles, theses, and research reports. Spoken academic discourse, particularly students' academic speeches, has received comparatively less attention within CDA research. Moreover, studies that do examine academic discourse often prioritize professional academics, overlooking students as active

social actors who must navigate complex power relations within academic institutions. As a result, there remains limited understanding of how students reproduce, negotiate, or potentially resist academic power relations through spoken discourse.

Addressing this gap, the present study aims to conduct a Critical Discourse Analysis of students' academic speeches to explore the discursive strategies they employ in academic contexts (Hyatt, 2013). Specifically, the study seeks to examine how power, ideology, and identity are manifested in students' academic speeches and how institutional academic norms shape students' language use. By focusing on spoken academic discourse produced by students, this research contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of academic communication beyond written texts.

The significance of this study lies in its theoretical, practical, and pedagogical contributions. Theoretically, it extends the application of CDA to spoken academic discourse in student contexts. Practically, the findings can enhance critical language awareness among students and educators by highlighting implicit power relations embedded in academic speaking practices. Pedagogically, the study offers insights for the development of academic speaking instruction that not only emphasizes linguistic accuracy but also fosters critical engagement with academic discourse conventions.

## **2. Method**

This study adopted a qualitative research design to investigate how language functions as a social practice in students' academic speeches (Talmy, 2010). A qualitative approach was considered appropriate because the research aims to interpret meanings, power relations, and ideological processes embedded in spoken academic discourse rather than to measure linguistic variables quantitatively. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was employed as the main analytical approach, as it allows for an in-depth examination of the relationship between discourse, institutional structures, and social power within academic contexts.

The data consisted of academic speeches produced by university students in formal educational settings (Biber et al., 2002). These speeches included seminar presentations and thesis proposal presentations delivered as part of course requirements. The participants were undergraduate students enrolled in a higher education institution, representing a specific academic discipline within the social sciences. A total of several academic speech events were selected as the primary data, as they provided rich examples of formal academic communication where students were required to demonstrate disciplinary knowledge and academic competence.

Data collection was carried out through audio and video recordings of the students' presentations to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the spoken data. The recordings were subsequently transcribed verbatim, capturing not only the spoken words but also relevant discourse features such as pauses, emphasis, and self-repair, which are essential in analyzing spoken discourse (Burton, 2021). Ethical considerations were carefully addressed throughout the research process. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection, and their identities were protected through the use of pseudonyms to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

The analytical framework for this study was based on Fairclough's three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis, which examines discourse at the levels of text, discursive practice, and social practice. At the textual level, the analysis focused on specific linguistic features, including lexical choice, modality, pronoun usage, hedging and stance expressions, passive constructions, and intertextual references (White, 2003). These features were examined to identify how students positioned themselves in relation to knowledge, authority, and academic norms. At the level of discursive practice, the analysis explored how the academic speeches were produced and interpreted within institutional contexts, considering

genre conventions and expectations of academic speaking. At the level of social practice, the analysis connected the identified discursive patterns to broader ideological structures and power relations operating within higher education.

The data analysis followed a systematic and iterative process. First, the transcripts were read repeatedly to gain an overall understanding of the data (Neale, 2016). Next, relevant linguistic features were coded and categorized in accordance with the CDA framework. The identified patterns were then interpreted in relation to the academic and institutional contexts in which the speeches were delivered. Finally, the findings were critically examined to reveal how students' academic speeches both reproduce and negotiate dominant academic discourses and power relations.

By employing this methodological approach, the study provides a comprehensive and transparent analysis of students' academic speeches, contributing to a deeper understanding of spoken academic discourse from a critical perspective.

### **3.1 Results**

#### **3.1 Results**

The analysis of students' academic speeches revealed several recurring discursive patterns that reflect how language is used to construct authority, negotiate identity, and reproduce institutional power relations within academic settings (Thornborrow, 2014). These patterns demonstrate that students' academic speeches are not merely presentations of knowledge but complex discursive practices shaped by academic norms and expectations.

One prominent pattern identified in the data is the strategic use of authoritative and tentative language. Students frequently employed tentative expressions, such as modal verbs, hedging devices, and epistemic markers, to signal caution and uncertainty when presenting claims. This tentative stance reflects students' awareness of their position as learners rather than established knowledge producers within the academic hierarchy. At the same time, instances of authoritative language were also observed, particularly when students referred to established theories, definitions, or widely accepted findings. In these cases, students adopted a more assertive tone, suggesting an attempt to align themselves with recognized academic authority and enhance the credibility of their arguments.

Another significant discursive pattern is the strong reliance on academic authority, which was manifested through frequent references to scholars, theories, and previous studies. Students often invoked citations explicitly in their speeches to legitimize their arguments and demonstrate adherence to academic conventions. Additionally, the use of passive constructions was common, particularly when presenting research findings or theoretical claims (Bada & Ulum, 2018). This linguistic choice serves to foreground information rather than the speaker, thereby reinforcing the impersonality and objectivity valued in academic discourse. Such reliance on external authority indicates that students position knowledge as something validated by institutions and experts rather than by personal experience.

The analysis also revealed how students constructed their academic identities through discourse. Many students positioned themselves as novice or compliant members of the academic community by adopting cautious language, deferring to authoritative sources, and avoiding strong personal claims. This identity construction reflects an internalization of institutional expectations regarding appropriate academic behavior (Matthews et al., 2014). However, in some instances, students displayed a more critical identity, particularly when questioning previous studies or highlighting research gaps. These moments suggest that while students largely conform to dominant academic norms, they also demonstrate emerging critical engagement with knowledge.

Furthermore, the discursive patterns observed in the speeches reflect underlying power relations between students and academic institutions. Students' language choices indicate an

awareness of evaluation and surveillance within academic contexts, such as assessment by lecturers or examiners. The preference for cautious language, passive voice, and reliance on established authorities can be interpreted as strategies to minimize risk and maintain legitimacy within institutional power structures. These patterns illustrate how academic discourse functions as a mechanism through which institutional power is reproduced, while simultaneously offering limited space for negotiation and resistance.

Overall, the results show that students' academic speeches are shaped by a complex interplay of language, power, and identity. Through their discursive choices, students navigate institutional expectations, construct their academic selves, and engage with dominant academic ideologies, highlighting the value of Critical Discourse Analysis in uncovering the social dimensions of academic speaking practices.

### **3.2 Reproduction of Dominant Academic Ideologies**

The analysis indicates that students' academic speeches largely reproduce dominant academic ideologies that privilege objectivity, hierarchy of knowledge, and institutional authority (Stich & Reeves, 2016). These ideologies are embedded in linguistic choices that reflect long-standing norms of academic discourse, particularly the prioritization of established knowledge over personal voice. Through their speech, students position academic knowledge as fixed, authoritative, and externally validated, rather than as a dynamic or contestable process.

One clear manifestation of this reproduction is the frequent reliance on authoritative sources and theoretical frameworks. Students consistently invoked well-known scholars and canonical theories to legitimize their arguments, often framing their claims as extensions or applications of existing research. This practice reinforces the ideology that knowledge gains legitimacy primarily through institutional recognition and scholarly endorsement, marginalizing alternative or experiential forms of knowledge. By foregrounding citations and theoretical references, students align themselves with dominant academic values that equate credibility with adherence to established disciplinary traditions.

The use of impersonal and cautious linguistic features further contributes to the reproduction of dominant academic ideologies. Passive constructions, nominalization, and hedging devices were commonly employed to minimize the presence of the speaker and emphasize objectivity. Such features reflect the ideology that academic discourse should be neutral, detached, and depersonalized (Brandl, n.d.). By suppressing personal stance and emotion, students conform to the expectation that academic authority derives from impersonality rather than individual voice, thereby reinforcing conventional academic norms.

Moreover, students' positioning of themselves as novice participants within the academic hierarchy reinforces the ideology of hierarchical knowledge production. Through tentative language and self-effacing expressions, students implicitly acknowledge the superior authority of lecturers, examiners, and established scholars. This discursive positioning reproduces power asymmetries within academic institutions, where students are constructed as knowledge consumers rather than producers. Even when students engage critically with existing literature, their critiques are often framed cautiously, indicating an awareness of institutional boundaries that limit overt challenges to dominant academic perspectives.

The findings demonstrate that students' academic speeches function as sites where dominant academic ideologies are continuously reproduced. Through conformity to institutional discourse conventions, students not only demonstrate academic competence but also participate in sustaining the ideological structures that govern knowledge production and authority in higher education (Collyer, 2015). This reproduction highlights the powerful role of academic discourse in shaping how students understand their place within the academic community and the limits of acceptable academic expression.

### **3.3 Negotiating Legitimacy and Credibility**

One key strategy used to negotiate legitimacy is the alignment with established academic authorities(Williams, 2018). Students frequently referenced well-known scholars, theoretical frameworks, and prior research to support their claims, thereby anchoring their arguments in institutionally recognized knowledge. By embedding their speech within existing academic discourse, students borrowed credibility from authoritative sources, which allowed them to present their arguments as academically valid despite their relatively limited institutional power. This reliance on external authority serves as a protective mechanism that reduces the risk of being perceived as unqualified or insufficiently rigorous.

At the same time, students employed hedging devices and modal expressions to manage the level of commitment to their claims(K. Y. Lee, 2013). Linguistic features such as “may,” “seems,” and “can be seen as” enabled students to present arguments cautiously, signaling openness to alternative interpretations. This tentative stance reflects an awareness of evaluative contexts in which academic speeches are delivered and demonstrates students' sensitivity to the expectations of lecturers and examiners. Through hedging, students negotiate credibility by appearing academically responsible rather than overly confident or confrontational.

Pronoun use also played a significant role in negotiating legitimacy. Students often shifted between first-person plural pronouns, such as “we,” and impersonal constructions to align themselves with the academic community and reduce individual accountability(Norris & Welch, 2020). This collective positioning suggests an attempt to share epistemic responsibility with the discipline or research tradition, reinforcing the legitimacy of their claims. In contrast, the limited use of first-person singular pronouns reflects caution in asserting personal authority within academic discourse.

Furthermore, the organization and rhetorical structure of the speeches contributed to the negotiation of credibility. Students adhered closely to conventional academic genres, including structured introductions, literature-based justifications, and formal conclusions(Afifi, 2020). Compliance with these genre conventions signals familiarity with academic norms and enhances the perceived credibility of the speaker. Through such discursive conformity, students demonstrate their membership in the academic community, even as they continue to operate within its hierarchical constraints.

The analysis shows that legitimacy and credibility in students' academic speeches are not inherent qualities but discursively constructed through language use. By strategically combining authoritative references, cautious stance-taking, and genre conformity, students navigate institutional expectations and position themselves as legitimate, credible participants in academic discourse.

### ***3.4 Positioning in Relation to Lecturers and Examiners***

The analysis demonstrates that students' academic speeches are shaped by an acute awareness of the presence and authority of lecturers and examiners as institutional gatekeepers(Oliver & Kettley, 2010). This awareness is reflected in how students discursively position themselves in relation to those who evaluate, legitimize, and sanction academic performance. Through language use, students construct asymmetrical relationships that acknowledge academic authority while seeking approval and validation.

One prominent strategy of positioning is the use of deferential and cautious language. Students frequently employed hedging devices, modal verbs, and indirect expressions when presenting claims, which signals respect for the superior epistemic status of lecturers and examiners. By avoiding absolute assertions, students present themselves as open to correction and guidance, reinforcing the hierarchical relationship in which lecturers and examiners are positioned as ultimate arbiters of knowledge. This discursive positioning reflects an internalization of academic power structures and the expectation that students should demonstrate humility and academic discipline.

Students also positioned themselves as compliant academic subjects through frequent references to course requirements, supervisors' guidance, or institutional expectations (A. Lee, 2019). Phrases indicating alignment with lecturers' instructions or assessment criteria suggest that students frame their work as fulfilling externally imposed standards rather than as independently driven inquiry. Such positioning serves to reduce potential evaluative risk and to present the speaker as cooperative and rule-abiding within the academic system.

At the same time, students strategically invoked academic authorities endorsed by lecturers and examiners, such as canonical theories or commonly cited scholars. By aligning their arguments with these recognized sources, students indirectly align themselves with the evaluators' epistemic frameworks. This alignment allows students to construct credibility and legitimacy while minimizing the possibility of ideological or methodological deviation from dominant academic perspectives.

In some instances, however, students adopted a more assertive stance when discussing methodological choices or research contributions, suggesting limited negotiation of authority. These moments indicate that while students largely accept hierarchical positioning, they also attempt to claim a degree of agency as emerging scholars. Nevertheless, such assertiveness is often carefully framed within respectful language, indicating that challenges to academic authority remain constrained by institutional norms.

The findings reveal that students' academic speeches function as sites where power relations between students and lecturers or examiners are discursively enacted. Through cautious language, compliance with academic norms, and alignment with authoritative knowledge, students position themselves as legitimate but subordinate participants in the academic community. This positioning highlights how academic discourse both reflects and reinforces institutional hierarchies in higher education.

### **3.5 Comparison with Previous CDA Studies**

The findings of this study are broadly consistent with previous Critical Discourse Analysis research that emphasizes the role of discourse in reproducing power relations and institutional ideologies. Similar to Fairclough's (1995) analysis of institutional discourse, the present study demonstrates that academic speech is shaped by normative expectations that regulate how knowledge may be presented and who is authorized to speak with legitimacy. The students' reliance on cautious language, impersonal constructions, and authoritative references reflects patterns identified in earlier CDA studies of professional academic and institutional discourse.

In line with van Dijk's (2008) work on discourse, power, and ideology, this study confirms that power relations in academic settings are enacted not through overt coercion but through subtle discursive mechanisms. Previous CDA studies have shown that speakers in less powerful positions tend to adopt mitigating strategies to align with dominant ideologies. Similarly, the students in this study employed hedging, modality, and deference to established scholars to negotiate their subordinate position within academic hierarchies. These findings reinforce van Dijk's argument that ideological control operates through shared knowledge and norms that are internalized by discourse participants.

Comparisons can also be drawn with CDA research focusing on written academic texts. Studies such as Hyland (2005) and Flowerdew (2013) have demonstrated that academic writing often constructs an impersonal authorial voice that prioritizes objectivity and disciplinary authority. While these studies concentrate on written genres, the present findings suggest that similar ideological patterns are reproduced in spoken academic discourse. Students' speeches mirrored the conventions of academic writing, indicating that dominant academic ideologies extend across modalities and influence both written and spoken forms of communication.

However, this study diverges from earlier CDA research by foregrounding students as primary discourse producers rather than professional academics or institutional elites. While many CDA studies analyze political speeches, media discourse, or expert academic texts, fewer focus on students' spoken academic performances. By examining students' academic speeches, this study reveals how individuals at the margins of academic authority actively participate in the reproduction and negotiation of dominant discourse practices. This focus contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how power and ideology operate at different levels of academic participation.

Furthermore, compared to classroom discourse studies that emphasize teacher student interaction, the present study highlights monologic academic speech as a critical site of ideological reproduction. Unlike dialogic classroom exchanges, academic speeches require students to perform institutionalized academic identities independently, under evaluative conditions. This distinction extends previous CDA findings by demonstrating how institutional power is embedded not only in interactional discourse but also in formal academic genres.

The comparison with previous CDA studies indicates both continuity and extension. While the findings confirm established CDA insights regarding discourse, power, and ideology, they also expand the scope of CDA by demonstrating how these dynamics operate in students' spoken academic discourse. This contributes to the growing body of CDA research that seeks to understand how institutional norms are internalized, reproduced, and occasionally negotiated by less powerful social actors within academic contexts.

### ***3.6 Pedagogical and Educational Implications***

The findings of this study have several important implications for academic speaking instruction in higher education. The analysis demonstrates that students' academic speeches are strongly shaped by institutional norms that prioritize caution, impersonality, and alignment with authoritative knowledge. While these conventions support academic credibility, they may also limit students' ability to express critical or original perspectives. Therefore, academic speaking instruction should move beyond a narrow focus on linguistic accuracy and presentation skills to explicitly address the discursive and ideological dimensions of academic speech. Instructional practices can incorporate critical reflection on how language choices such as hedging, modality, and passive constructions function to construct authority and manage risk in academic contexts. By making these conventions explicit, educators can better support students in developing both confidence and rhetorical flexibility in academic speaking.

The study also highlights the importance of fostering critical language awareness among students. Many students appear to internalize dominant academic ideologies without fully recognizing how language reproduces power relations and institutional hierarchies. Integrating critical discourse analysis principles into academic literacy courses can help students become more aware of how academic discourse positions them as novice participants and regulates acceptable forms of expression. Through guided analysis of academic speeches and texts, students can learn to identify implicit ideologies and question assumptions about objectivity, neutrality, and authority. This heightened awareness enables students to make more informed and strategic linguistic choices, empowering them to negotiate academic norms rather than simply conform to them.

In terms of broader university pedagogy, the findings suggest the need for pedagogical approaches that balance academic rigor with critical engagement. Universities often emphasize conformity to standardized academic genres as a measure of competence, which may inadvertently discourage intellectual risk-taking and critical voice. By recognizing academic speeches as sites of ideological negotiation, educators and curriculum designers can create learning environments that encourage reflective engagement with academic conventions. Assessment practices, for example, can be designed to value not only formal

correctness but also critical positioning and originality. Such pedagogical shifts can contribute to a more inclusive academic culture in which students are supported as emerging knowledge producers rather than merely evaluative subjects.

Overall, the implications of this study underscore the importance of integrating critical perspectives into academic speaking instruction and university pedagogy. By promoting critical language awareness and reflective engagement with academic discourse, higher education institutions can better equip students to participate meaningfully and confidently in academic communication.

#### 4 Conclusion

This study has examined students' academic speeches through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis to reveal how spoken academic discourse functions as a site of ideological reproduction and negotiation within higher education. The findings demonstrate that students' academic speeches are characterized by distinct discursive features, including the strategic use of authoritative and tentative language, reliance on established academic authorities, and adherence to institutional genre conventions. Through these linguistic choices, students construct academic identities that position them as legitimate yet subordinate participants in the academic community, reflecting broader power relations between students and academic institutions. The analysis further shows that power, ideology, and identity operate in subtle but systematic ways in students' academic speeches. Dominant academic ideologies such as objectivity, impersonality, and hierarchical knowledge production are reproduced through cautious stance-taking, passive constructions, and deference to authoritative sources. At the same time, students negotiate credibility and legitimacy by carefully balancing compliance with emerging critical engagement, indicating that academic speech is not merely reproductive but also a space of constrained agency. From a theoretical perspective, this study contributes to Critical Discourse Analysis by extending its application to spoken academic discourse produced by students, a domain that has received limited attention compared to written academic texts and elite discourse. By focusing on students as discourse producers, the study enriches CDA scholarship with insights into how institutional power operates at the level of everyday academic practices and how novice members of the academic community internalize and enact dominant discursive norms. Practically, the findings highlight the importance of incorporating critical academic speaking skills into higher education curricula. Academic speaking instruction should not only emphasize formal presentation techniques but also address the ideological and power-laden nature of academic discourse. Raising students' awareness of implicit power relations and evaluative expectations can empower them to make more strategic and reflective linguistic choices, fostering greater confidence and critical engagement in academic communication. Despite its contributions, this study has certain limitations. The analysis was based on a limited number of academic speeches within a specific institutional and disciplinary context, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings. Future research could expand this line of inquiry by conducting cross-disciplinary or cross-cultural studies to explore variations in academic speech practices. Longitudinal research following students' academic discourse development over time would also provide valuable insights into how academic identities and discursive strategies evolve throughout higher education.

#### 5 References

- Afi, N. (2020). Introducing genre-based pedagogy to the teaching of literature reviews in an Indonesian EFL context. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*. Macquarie University, Australia.
- Bada, E., & Ulum, Ö. G. (2018). Utilization of active and passive constructions in English academic writing. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 15(1), 413–421.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., Reppen, R., Byrd, P., & Helt, M. (2002). Speaking and writing in the university: A multidimensional comparison. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(1), 9–48.

- Brandl, S. (n.d.). *Personalization and depersonalization in academic discourse: a corpus-based comparison of Austrian undergraduate and graduate student texts with academic expert texts/vorgelegt von Sophie Brandl*.
- Burton, J. D. (2021). The face of communication breakdown: Multimodal repair in L2 oral proficiency interviews. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment, 10*(2), 30–61.
- Collyer, F. M. (2015). Practices of conformity and resistance in the marketisation of the academy: Bourdieu, professionalism and academic capitalism. *Critical Studies in Education, 56*(3), 315–331.
- Hyatt, D. (2013). The critical policy discourse analysis frame: helping doctoral students engage with the educational policy analysis. *Teaching in Higher Education, 18*(8), 833–845.
- Hyland, K. (2011). Academic discourse. *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Discourse Analysis, 125*.
- Lee, A. (2019). *Successful research supervision: Advising students doing research*. Routledge.
- Lee, K. Y. (2013). Hedging expressions used in academic written feedback: a study on the use of modal verbs. *Research in Corpus Linguistics, 33–45*.
- Lin, A. (2014). Critical discourse analysis in applied linguistics: A methodological review. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 34*, 213–232.
- Matthews, J. S., Banerjee, M., & Lauermann, F. (2014). Academic identity formation and motivation among ethnic minority adolescents: The role of the “self” between internal and external perceptions of identity. *Child Development, 85*(6), 2355–2373.
- Neale, J. (2016). Iterative categorization (IC): a systematic technique for analysing qualitative data. *Addiction, 111*(6), 1096–1106.
- Norris, M., & Welch, A. (2020). Gender pronoun use in the university classroom: A post-humanist perspective. *Transformation in Higher Education, 5*(1), 1–11.
- Oliver, C., & Kettleby, N. (2010). Gatekeepers or facilitators: The influence of teacher habitus on students' applications to elite universities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 31*(6), 737–753.
- Stich, A. E., & Reeves, T. D. (2016). Class, capital, and competing academic discourse: a critical analysis of the mission/s of American higher education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 37*(1), 116–132.
- Talmy, S. (2010). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 128–148.
- Thornborrow, J. (2014). *Power talk: Language and interaction in institutional discourse*. Routledge.
- White, P. R. R. (2003). Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text & Talk, 23*(2), 259–284.
- Williams, K. (2018). Three strategies for attaining legitimacy in policy knowledge: coherence in identity, process and outcome. *Public Administration, 96*(1), 53–69.