

LINGUISTIC HEDGING STRATEGIES IN DONALD TRUMP'S PEACE FORUM SPEECH: A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Zhafran Fatih Ananda, Puteri Anugrah Septianingsih, Febry Aurlani

Universitas Satya Terra Bhinneka, Medan, Indonesia

E-mail: zhafrananda@satyaterrabhinneka.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines hedging strategies in a contemporary diplomatic speech delivered by Donald Trump, focusing on how epistemic stance is calibrated in a high-stakes political context. Drawing on Hyland's (1998, 2005) metadiscourse framework, the study employs qualitative discourse analysis alongside frequency-based identification of hedging devices. The analysis identifies 34 instances of hedging, with lexical judgmental verbs such as *I think*, and *I believe* constituting the dominant category (62%), followed by modal auxiliaries including *may* and *might*. The findings show that hedging is systematically clustered in discourse segments addressing future negotiations and geopolitical uncertainty, while more assertive constructions are used when referring to past achievements. This patterned alternation suggests a form of controlled epistemic modulation, defined in this study as the deliberate calibration of commitment strength in response to contextual volatility and diplomatic risk. Rather than signaling weakness or indecision, hedging in the analyzed speech functions as a rhetorical resource for balancing authority and negotiability, contributing to the construction of a diplomatic yet assertive leadership persona. The study offers a refined perspective on metadiscourse by highlighting the central role of lexical hedging verbs in political stance management and proposing a nuanced account of epistemic modulation in contemporary diplomacy.

Keywords: *board of peace; hedging; metadiscourse; political discourse; speech.*

1. Introduction

In the context of escalating geopolitical tensions, shifting alliances, and ongoing global conflicts, political discourse has become an increasingly critical site for examining how language constructs power, persuasion, and ideological positioning. Contemporary diplomatic communication, particularly in forums addressing peace, security, and international cooperation, requires a careful balance between assertiveness and strategic ambiguity. Within the field of language studies, analyzing political speech is therefore essential for understanding how linguistic choices shape public perception and influence international relations.

Among the rhetorical strategies employed by political leaders, hedging plays a particularly significant role in negotiating stance and managing uncertainty (Hyland, 1998, 2019). Hedging enables speakers to express evaluation, probability, and strategic flexibility without committing to absolute claims, allowing them to navigate sensitive political contexts while maintaining credibility. While hedging has been extensively examined in academic

discourse, its function in diplomatic and peace-related political communication remains underexplored.

In contemporary global politics, diplomatic speeches frequently address high-risk issues such as armed conflict, nuclear policy, and international alliances. In such contexts, categorical or overly explicit statements may carry substantial geopolitical consequences. As a result, political leaders strategically deploy linguistic resources that mitigate commitment while preserving authority. Recent studies have emphasized the role of stance-taking and metadiscourse in political rhetoric, demonstrating that interactional markers shape persuasion, credibility, and audience alignment (Fetzer & Bull, 2022; Zhang et al., 2022). However, limited attention has been given to judgmental verb hedging in global peace forums, particularly in spoken diplomatic discourse.

The speech delivered by Donald Trump at the Board of Peace Forum provides a relevant case for examining hedging strategies in high-stakes diplomatic communication. Although Trump is widely characterized as an assertive and direct communicator, his peace-oriented speech reveals a more nuanced approach to stance management. This apparent contrast raises an important linguistic question: how does a leader associated with rhetorical assertiveness employ hedging in diplomatic contexts? Addressing this question contributes to a more refined understanding of political persuasion and discourse strategy.

Previous research has primarily focused on hedging in academic writing and institutional (Hyland, 1998, 2017), while more recent studies have explored political discourse and stance construction, highlighting the role of interactional resources in shaping political identity (Blassnig, 2023; House et al., 2024). Nevertheless, research that integrates quantitative frequency analysis with qualitative interpretation of judgmental verb hedging in peace diplomacy speeches remains limited. This gap underscores the need for a systematic investigation that combines discourse analysis with empirical frequency data to enhance methodological rigor. This study addresses the following research questions:

1. What types of hedging devices, particularly judgmental verbs, are used in Trump's diplomatic speech?
2. What pragmatic and rhetorical functions do these hedging devices perform?
3. How do these hedging strategies contribute to the construction of diplomatic stance and controlled epistemic modulation?

To address these questions, this study analyzes hedging strategies in Trump's Board of Peace Forum speech through the lens of interpersonal metadiscourse theory. Specifically, it identifies the types and frequency of judgmental hedging verbs, examines their pragmatic and rhetorical functions, and interprets their role in constructing diplomatic ambiguity. By integrating qualitative discourse analysis with quantitative frequency measurement, this study introduces the concept of controlled epistemic modulation to explain how hedging operates selectively in political speech. This perspective extends the application of hedging theory beyond academic discourse and demonstrates its relevance to contemporary global political communication.

The findings of this study are expected to contribute to language and discourse studies by refining the application of metadiscourse theory in political contexts. In addition, the study offers pedagogical implications for language teaching, particularly in English for Specific Purposes and political communication courses, where understanding persuasive and diplomatic language strategies is increasingly important.

2. Literature Review

Hedging has become a central concept in discourse studies because it reflects how speakers manage uncertainty, politeness, and epistemic positioning. The concept was initially introduced in linguistic research as a means of expressing fuzziness or tentativeness in communication. Early work emphasized that hedging allows speakers to avoid categorical claims and maintain interpersonal harmony in interaction. Since then, the notion of hedging has developed into a multidimensional construct encompassing epistemic, pragmatic, and rhetorical dimensions. In particular, hedging is closely linked to stance-taking and metadiscourse, which shape how speakers construct relationships with audiences and negotiate authority (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; Hyland, 2022).

Hyland's interpersonal metadiscourse framework has been widely used to examine how linguistic resources signal speakers' attitudes, judgments, and degrees of commitment. Within this framework, hedges function as interactional resources that reduce the strength of propositions and open space for alternative viewpoints. This approach has been highly influential in academic discourse research, demonstrating that hedging is not merely a sign of weakness but a strategic rhetorical tool that enhances credibility and persuasion. Recent developments further extend metadiscourse analysis to political, institutional, and diplomatic discourse. However, these studies tend to prioritize written genres, particularly academic texts, leaving spoken political discourse comparatively underexplored.

In political communication, hedging plays a crucial role in balancing authority and flexibility. Political leaders operate in complex and unpredictable global contexts, where definitive statements may entail diplomatic risks. Consequently, hedging enables them to express commitment while maintaining strategic ambiguity. Previous studies show that political actors employ hedges to mitigate responsibility, manage face, and maintain audience alignment (Brown & Treviño, 2021). A limitation of this line of research is its predominant focus on modal verbs and adverbs, with relatively little attention given to lexical verbs as hedging devices.

Judgmental verbs represent a specific category of hedging that expresses evaluation, belief, or probability. Verbs such as *think*, *believe*, *suggest*, and *seem* allow speakers to frame propositions as subjective interpretations rather than objective facts, thereby reducing potential conflict and enhancing persuasive effectiveness. In this study, judgmental hedging verbs are defined as lexical verbs that encode epistemic stance by signaling the speaker's personal evaluation, belief, or degree of certainty, while simultaneously mitigating propositional commitment. (Added explicit definition for terminology consistency) In diplomatic discourse, these verbs contribute to relational positioning and signal openness to negotiation. Recent research highlights that evaluative stance and epistemic judgment are central to political credibility and leadership identity (Biber et al., 2021). However, the specific role of judgmental verb hedging in high-level peace diplomacy remains insufficiently examined.

Another important dimension is the integration of quantitative and qualitative approaches in hedging research. Earlier studies predominantly relied on qualitative discourse analysis, offering in-depth insights into rhetorical functions but limited empirical generalizability. More recent work advocates mixed-method approaches that combine frequency analysis with contextual interpretation to produce more robust findings (Koh, 2023). Nevertheless, such integrated approaches are still relatively scarce in political speech analysis, particularly in emerging contexts such as peace forums and global governance discourse.

In addition, the role of hedging in constructing leadership identity has attracted increasing scholarly attention. Political leaders strategically employ stance markers to present themselves as both authoritative and open to dialogue. This dual positioning is especially important in peace discourse, where assertiveness must be balanced with diplomacy. Studies suggest that effective political rhetoric often relies on controlled ambiguity to maintain credibility while managing uncertainty (Fetzer & Weizman, 2014). However, few studies have examined how leaders known for assertive communication styles adapt their rhetorical strategies in diplomatic settings.

Overall, existing research has established that hedging is a key resource for stance-taking and persuasion, particularly within Hyland's metadiscourse framework, and has demonstrated its importance in both academic and political discourse. However, three key gaps remain. First, prior studies largely focus on modal and adverbial hedging, with limited attention to judgmental verb hedging as a distinct category. Second, research on political hedging often emphasizes written or institutional texts, leaving spoken diplomatic discourse—especially in peace forums—underexplored. Third, although mixed-method approaches are increasingly advocated, few studies systematically integrate quantitative frequency analysis with qualitative discourse interpretation in examining political speech.

This study addresses these gaps by analyzing judgmental verb hedging in a contemporary diplomatic speech delivered by Donald Trump at the Board of Peace Forum. It applies Hyland's interpersonal metadiscourse framework to spoken political discourse, integrates qualitative and quantitative methods, and introduces the concept of controlled epistemic modulation to explain how hedging is selectively deployed to balance authority and flexibility in high-stakes diplomatic contexts.

By addressing these gaps, this research contributes to language and discourse studies, political communication, and applied linguistics. It also offers practical implications for teaching political communication, English for diplomacy, and intercultural negotiation, where understanding strategic language use is essential in global contexts.

3. Research Method

This study employs a qualitative-dominant mixed-method approach to investigate hedging strategies in the speech delivered by Donald Trump at the Board of Peace Forum. (Improvement 2: Mixed-method explicitly stated) While qualitative discourse analysis serves as the primary analytical framework, quantitative frequency analysis is incorporated to identify the distribution and dominance of hedging devices. This combination allows for both in-depth interpretation and empirical pattern identification. A qualitative approach is particularly suitable for exploring linguistic meaning, speaker stance, and pragmatic functions in political discourse. The study adopts an interpretive paradigm, emphasizing contextual meaning construction rather than statistical generalization.

The primary data consist of the official speech delivered by Donald Trump at the Board of Peace Forum. (Improvement 1: Replicability details added) The speech was delivered on 19 Feb 2026, with a total duration of approximately 50:03 minutes and a transcript length of 8178 words. The video was obtained from an official public platform https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OVLfhspv_wY&t=7s to ensure authenticity and reliability. The speech was selected purposively as it represents contemporary diplomatic discourse in a high-stakes international context.

The data collection process involved downloading the video, repeatedly listening to the speech, and producing a verbatim transcription to preserve linguistic accuracy, including

modal expressions, pauses, and emphasis. This transcription procedure follows established practices in discourse analysis to retain pragmatic and rhetorical features of spoken language (O’Keeffe et al., 2021). After transcription, the data were segmented into clauses based on systemic functional linguistic principles, which consider clauses as key units of interpersonal meaning.

The analytical framework is based on Hyland’s hedging model, which integrates linguistic form and pragmatic function. The analysis focuses particularly on judgmental hedging verbs (e.g., believe, think, assume, suggest), as these forms are central to expressing epistemic stance and subjective evaluation in political discourse.

The coding process was conducted in several stages. First, all potential hedging expressions were identified manually through close reading of the transcript. These included modal verbs, epistemic lexical verbs, adverbs of uncertainty, tentative adjectives, and approximators. To ensure consistency, identification was guided by Hyland’s functional criteria, where a linguistic item is considered a hedge if it reduces propositional commitment or signals epistemic uncertainty. Second, each identified item was verified contextually to distinguish hedging usage from literal or non-epistemic meanings.

The coding was primarily manual, supported by systematic annotation using a coding sheet to track frequency and categories. (Improvement 3: manual/software clarification) Where necessary, basic text-search functions were used to ensure that recurrent lexical items (e.g., I think, I believe) were consistently identified across the dataset.

To enhance reliability, a second coder with a background in linguistics independently reviewed a subset of the data (approximately 20%), and inter-rater agreement was calculated using percentage agreement. Any discrepancies were discussed and resolved through consensus to refine the coding scheme.

After identification, hedging expressions were categorized according to Hyland’s taxonomy, including epistemic modality, evidentiality, tentativeness, and judgmental hedging. The classification aimed to determine dominant hedging types and their distribution patterns. Quantitative frequency analysis was then applied to calculate the occurrence and percentage of each hedging category, providing empirical support for the qualitative interpretation.

The interpretive stage examined the pragmatic and rhetorical functions of hedging strategies. Specifically, the analysis explored how hedging is used to manage uncertainty, maintain diplomatic flexibility, reduce political commitment, enhance credibility, and build rapport with international audiences. This stage considers the broader socio-political context, including the international setting of the speech, the speaker’s political positioning, and the communicative goal of promoting cooperation and stability (Fairclough, 2015; Partington, 2022).

To ensure research rigor and trustworthiness, several validation strategies were applied. Credibility was maintained through repeated listening and transcript verification. The study employed theoretical triangulation by integrating metadiscourse theory and discourse analysis frameworks. Thick description was used to provide detailed contextual interpretation. In addition, peer debriefing and expert consultation were conducted to minimize researcher bias and strengthen interpretive validity. These procedures align with established qualitative research standards for ensuring credibility, dependability, and analytical robustness (Lincoln et al., 1985).

4. Results and Discussion

In line with the research objectives stated earlier, the analysis first identifies the dominant forms of hedging and then examines their pragmatic and rhetorical functions in Donald Trump's Board of Peace Forum speech. Moving beyond descriptive categorization, the discussion situates the findings within interpersonal metadiscourse theory and contemporary political discourse studies. The analysis demonstrates that hedging in this speech functions as a mechanism of controlled epistemic modulation, whereby commitment is strategically calibrated according to geopolitical sensitivity.

4.1 Results

4.1.1 Frequency, Distribution, and Strategic Patterning of Hedging

The analysis identifies a total of 34 hedging instances, with judgmental hedging verbs constituting the dominant interactional resource. The frequency of judgemental hedging verbs below:

Table 1

Frequency of Judgmental Hedging Verbs

Hedge Type	Frequency	Percentage
I think	12	35%
I believe	7	20%
I hope	5	15%
Modal Verbs	6	18%
Others	4	12%
Total	34	100%

Among them, I think appears with the highest frequency, followed by I believe, I hope, and I want. Modal auxiliaries such as may, might, and could occur less frequently and are largely confined to future-oriented propositions. Importantly, the distribution of hedging is systematically patterned across discourse segments. For example, in the statement: *"I think it's the most consequential board ever created."* the clause is grammatically structured as a declarative proposition. However, the insertion of I think transforms what could be an absolute evaluative claim into a subjective stance marker. According to (Hyland, 2019), such hedges reduce the illocutionary force of propositions and open dialogic space for negotiation. The epistemic responsibility shifts from objective fact to personal assessment, thus mitigating potential contestation. Similarly, in the excerpt: *"I think they become friends."* the speaker projects a prediction regarding international actors. The use of I think frames the proposition as speculative rather than guaranteed. In diplomatic discourse, where predictions carry political risk, this hedging device allows interpretative flexibility without signaling uncertainty overtly.

The verb I believe functions in a slightly different epistemic register. Consider: *"I believe we will achieve lasting peace."* Compared to I think, I believe conveys stronger affective commitment while still retaining subjectivity. It constructs conviction without asserting inevitability. This subtle gradation reflects what can be termed epistemic scaling — a calibrated adjustment of certainty levels depending on rhetorical need. Modal auxiliaries appear primarily in conditional or forward-looking contexts: *"It may lead to a new era of cooperation."* *"There could be tremendous opportunities."* Here, epistemic modality explicitly encodes probability. Unlike judgmental verbs, modal auxiliaries grammatically encode

uncertainty within the proposition itself. However, their lower frequency suggests that the speaker prefers subjective lexical hedging over grammatical modalization in managing diplomatic ambiguity.

A significant finding is the topic-based distribution of hedges. Segments describing past economic achievements are largely unhedged, for example: *“We created the strongest economy in history.”* This contrast between unhedged achievement claims and hedged diplomatic projections indicates strategic rhetorical alternation. Hedging intensifies in segments concerning peace negotiations, international cooperation, and future geopolitical outcomes, while assertiveness dominates self-legitimizing narratives. This patterned variation supports the argument that hedging is contextually calibrated rather than stylistically habitual.

4.1.2 Pragmatic and Rhetorical Functions of Judgmental Hedges

The qualitative analysis reveals four interrelated pragmatic functions.

1. Epistemic Mitigation

Judgmental verbs reduce propositional commitment. In: *“I think we’re very close to something historic,”* the hedge buffers the predictive claim. If the anticipated outcome does not materialize, the epistemic burden remains mitigated. This aligns with (Hyland, 1998) view that hedges function as risk-management devices in high-stakes discourse.

2. Diplomatic Face Management

In discussions of international relations, categorical assertions may threaten relational harmony. The use of: *“I believe they want peace.”* Attributes intention without imposing factual certainty. This indirectness protects interlocutors’ face and avoids accusatory tone, consistent with pragmatic politeness strategies in political discourse.

3. Persuasive Subjectivity

By foregrounding personal cognition (I think, I believe), the speaker constructs an ethos of reflective leadership. Rather than presenting himself as dogmatic, he appears deliberative. This rhetorical positioning enhances credibility by signaling evaluative reasoning rather than authoritarian certainty.

4. Authority–Flexibility Balance

A central finding is the oscillation between assertive and hedged constructions. When legitimizing past performance, the speaker employs categorical claims. When addressing uncertain geopolitical processes, hedging increases. This alternation reflects strategic stance modulation rather than inconsistency.

4.2 Discussion

4.2.1 Hedging as Context-Sensitive Stance Calibration

The results suggest that hedging is systematically patterned according to thematic sensitivity and geopolitical risk, rather than randomly distributed. While previous studies on political discourse have emphasized that hedging serves as a resource for managing accountability and projecting credibility. However, the present findings suggest a more dynamic pattern: hedging intensifies specifically in segments dealing with future negotiations, international cooperation, and uncertain geopolitical developments, while it

decreases in segments describing past achievements. This patterned distribution indicates not random stylistic preference but context-sensitive epistemic calibration.

This finding extends prior research by demonstrating that hedging is not uniformly embedded across political speech but strategically clustered in high-risk discursive zones. In this sense, hedging operates as a mechanism of rhetorical risk management, allowing the speaker to preserve authority while maintaining negotiability. This indicates that hedging functions as a mechanism of context-sensitive epistemic calibration, allowing speakers to adjust commitment levels depending on political risk.

4.2.2 Lexical Hedging and the Construction of Diplomatic Persona

Another significant implication concerns the preference for lexical judgmental verbs (I think, I believe) over modal auxiliaries (may, might). While modal verbs grammatically encode uncertainty, lexical hedges foreground personal cognition and evaluation. This distinction is crucial.

By repeatedly using expressions such as "*I think*" and "*I believe*", the speaker frames propositions as reflective judgments rather than impersonal probabilities. This lexical choice constructs a persona of deliberative leadership rather than detached speculation. Unlike modal auxiliaries, which abstract uncertainty into grammatical form, judgmental verbs personalize epistemic positioning.

This pattern suggests that hedging in this speech contributes not only to uncertainty management but also to identity construction. The speaker presents himself as confident yet thoughtful, assertive yet open to negotiation. Such dual positioning aligns with findings in political discourse studies that effective leadership rhetoric requires balancing decisiveness with adaptability.

4.2.3 Controlled Epistemic Modulation: A Conceptual Refinement

Building on these observations, this study proposes the notion of controlled epistemic modulation to account for the patterned alternation between assertive and hedged constructions.

Controlled epistemic modulation refers to the deliberate adjustment of epistemic strength across discourse segments in response to contextual volatility. Unlike general notions of strategic ambiguity, which emphasize vagueness, controlled epistemic modulation highlights calibrated variation in commitment intensity depending on: thematic sensitivity (peace negotiations vs. economic achievements), temporal orientation (future projections vs. past accomplishments), and political risk exposure (international diplomacy vs. domestic validation).

This conceptual refinement advances metadiscourse theory by demonstrating that hedging is not simply a marker of tentativeness but a structured rhetorical mechanism embedded within broader leadership strategy. The alternation between categorical claims and hedged projections reflects discursive competence in navigating high-stakes diplomatic settings.

4.2.4 Implications for Political Discourse Studies

The findings contribute to political linguistics by illustrating that hedging functions as a strategic authority-management device rather than as an indicator of uncertainty alone. In diplomatic contexts, excessive assertiveness may appear confrontational, while excessive

tentativeness may undermine credibility. The patterned deployment observed in this speech demonstrates a calibrated middle ground.

Moreover, this study underscores the importance of examining lexical hedging as a central resource in spoken political discourse. While previous research has frequently emphasized modal auxiliaries, the present analysis suggests that cognitive verbs may play a more prominent role in constructing interpersonal alignment in public political speech.

5. Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion, this study concludes that hedging plays a significant role in shaping the pragmatic and rhetorical functions of Donald Trump's speech at the First Board of Peace meeting. Hedging is not merely used to express uncertainty or politeness, but functions strategically to construct diplomatic positioning, mitigate potential criticism, and maintain flexibility in political commitments.

The analysis shows that the use of judgmental verbs, modal expressions, and other hedging devices enables the speaker to balance authority with caution, particularly in sensitive contexts such as peace, international cooperation, and global stability. In this way, hedging contributes to persuasive discourse by framing propositions as negotiable and adaptable—an essential feature of effective diplomatic communication.

This study contributes theoretically by proposing the concept of controlled epistemic modulation, which explains how speakers deliberately adjust commitment levels across discourse segments in response to contextual sensitivity and political risk. This perspective extends existing metadiscourse research by demonstrating that hedging operates as a structured and context-dependent rhetorical strategy rather than a general marker of tentativeness.

In addition to its theoretical contribution, the study offers pedagogical implications for language education, particularly in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and discourse analysis. The findings highlight the importance of developing learners' pragmatic awareness, critical discourse competence, and sensitivity to rhetorical strategies in political communication.

For future research, comparative studies across political leaders, cultural contexts, and international forums are recommended to further explore variation in hedging strategies. Moreover, integrating corpus-based methods and computational discourse analysis could enhance analytical rigor and expand the scope of investigation. Overall, this study reinforces the view of hedging as a dynamic and multifunctional linguistic resource in political discourse and provides a foundation for further theoretical and applied research in this area.

References

- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (2021). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge University Press.
- Blassnig, S. (2023). Content analysis in the research field of political communication: The self-presentation of political actors. In *Standardisierte Inhaltsanalyse in der Kommunikationswissenschaft – Standardized Content Analysis in Communication Research* (pp. 301–312). Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-36179-2_26
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2021). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595–616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>

- Fairclough, Norman. (2015). *Language and power*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Fetzer, A., & Weizman, E. (2014). Political discourse as mediated and public discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(2), 143–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.06.014>
- Fetzer, A., & Bull, P. (2022). Doing leadership in political speech: Semantic processes and pragmatic inferences. *Discourse & Society*, 23(2), 127–144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926511431510>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.
- House, J., Kádár, D. Z., Liu, F., & Song, Y. (2024). Aggression in diplomatic notes – a pragmatic analysis of a Chinese-American conflict in times of colonisation. *Text & Talk*, 43(6), 755–776. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2021-0036>
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.54>
- Hyland, K. (2017). Metadiscourse: What is it and where is it going? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 113, 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.03.007>
- Hyland, Ken. (2019). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Hyland, K. (2022). English for specific purposes: What is it and where is it taking us? *ESP Today*, 10(2), 202–220. <https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2022.10.2.1>
- Koh, J. (2023). Date me date me: AI chatbot interactions as a resource for the online construction of masculinity. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 52, 100681. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2023.100681>
- Lincoln, Y. S., Guba, E. G., & Pilotta, J. J. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 9(4), 438–439. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(85\)90062-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(85)90062-8)
- O'Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2021). *From corpus to classroom*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511497650>
- Partington, Alan. (2022). *Patterns and meanings in discourse: Theory and practice in corpus-assisted discourse studies (CADS)*. John Benjamins Pub.
- Zhang, W., Boeddeker, C., & Watanabe, S. (2022). End-to-end dereverberation, beamforming, and speech recognition in a cocktail party. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 30, 3173–3188. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TASLP.2022.3209942>