

Appendix 3. Extract 2 from the ENEIDA Interview (Phase 2)

This appendix consists of the selected questions from the ENEIDA Interview (Phase 2) (see below) on which Moreno's (2022) study, financed by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation under Grant [Ref.: FFI2009-08336/FILO] and Universidad de León] under Grant [Code: 2021/00152/001] (PI, Ana I. Moreno), was based. The study focussed on the “local” rhetoric of *Limitations* in the Discussion (and/or other closing) (DC) sections of empirical research articles (RAs), due to Spanish scholars' perceived difficulty integrating *Limitations* in these sections (Moreno & Sachdev, 2019).

The quantitative phase of the study was based on two comparable samples of RAs in the social sciences (SSC) (see Appendix 1) drawn from the EXEMPRAES (Exemplary Empirical Research Articles in English and Spanish) Corpus (Moreno, 2013), compiled by the ENEIDA Team. The interview was held by email among a sample of the RA authors. The same interview was carried out in English or in Spanish depending on the language of publication of the article. The English version of the questions selected for the study are shown below.



ENEIDA Interview (Phase 2)

Writing empirical research article Discussion (and/or Conclusion) sections for publication in scientific journals

The present interview is a follow-up of two studies within Phase 2 of the ENEIDA project on “Rhetorical strategies to get published in English-medium journals from a Spanish-English intercultural perspective”, financed by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (Ref.: FFI2009-08336/FILO; PI: Ana I. Moreno). These studies are based on two comparable samples of empirical research articles (henceforth ERAs) drawn from the EXEMPRAES (Exemplary Empirical Research Articles in English and Spanish) Corpus, compiled by the ENEIDA Team. Since the Closing (i.e., Discussion and/or Conclusion and/or Suggestions) sections of ERAs have been identified as the most difficult to write for most scholars around the world (Moreno et al., 2012), the current interview focusses on such sections (henceforth DC sections). [...]

For further queries regarding the objectives of the project or possible requests for clarification on the interview questions, please contact:

Ana I. Moreno (Project Principal Investigator)
[...] ana.moreno@unileon.es [...]

PREFERENCES ABOUT MANAGING *LIMITATIONS* IN ERA DC SECTIONS

[...]

3. To what extent should the following issues be mentioned as a *Limitation* in an empirical research article in your field? Please use the following scale to rate each option:

1 = not at all; 2 = a little; 3 = rather; 4 = quite a lot; 5 = a lot

- A. The external validity of the study (i.e. the extent to which the results of a study can be generalised). _____ Why? _____
B. The internal validity of the study (i.e. the degree to which the results are attributable to the independent variable and not to some other rival explanation). _____ Why? _____

[...]

5. To what extent is it convenient to announce the *Limitations* of a study before actually stating them for the following reasons? _____ Please use the following scale:

1 = not at all; 2 = a little; 3 = rather; 4 = very; 5 = totally

- A. To make it easier for the reader to process a rather long stretch of upcoming text. _____
B. To make them clearly visible. _____
C. To make them less clearly visible. _____
D. Other (specify) _____

6. Before acknowledging one *Limitation* in a DC section, what is conventional to state in the preceding sentence? Please rate the options below using the following scale:

1 = not at all; 2 = a little; 3 = rather; 4 = very; 5 = totally

- A. Another limitation. _____
B. A positive feature or contribution of your study. _____
C. Other (specify) _____

Please focus on the most conventional option from Q6 and choose a reason for stating it from the list below: _____

- A. To minimise the negative impression possibly caused by the *Limitation*.
B. To display your expertise by showing your awareness of the shortcomings of your own study.
C. Other (specify) _____

7. After acknowledging one *Limitation* in a DC section, what is conventional to state in the following sentence? Please rate the options below using the following scale:

1 = not at all; 2 = a little; 3 = rather; 4 = very; 5 = totally

- A. A recommendation for future research or practice _____
B. Another limitation _____
C. A positive feature or contribution of your study _____
D. Other (specify) _____

Please, focus on the most conventional statement after a *Limitation* (Q7) and choose a reason why from the list below. _____

- A. To minimise the negative impression possibly caused by the *Limitation*.
- B. To display your expertise by showing your awareness of the shortcomings of your own study.
- C. To announce your own future research plans and implicitly mark the territory.
- D. To suggest how you plan to overcome the *Limitation* in your future research.
- E. To suggest to other researchers how they could overcome the *Limitation*.
- F. Other (specify) _____

[...]

11. Have your writing habits regarding *Limitations* changed since you wrote the article included in the EXEMPRAES Corpus until now? Yes / No _____ If so, in which way(s)? _____

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION

[...]

- 17. Sex: _____
- 18. Nationality: _____
- 19. Mother-tongue: _____

[...]

21. Language(s) in which you received most of your post-graduate training? _____

[...]

23. Disciplinary field: _____

[...]

EXPERIENCES WRITING AND LEARNING TO WRITE THE SELECTED RESEARCH ARTICLE

[...]

25. As far as you can remember, to what extent did you contribute to the actual writing and organisation of the ideas in the research article included in the EXEMPRAES Corpus? _____
Please use the following scale:

1 = up to 20%; 2 = 21%-40%; 3 = 41%-60%; 4 = 61%-80%; 5 = 81%-100%

26. As far as you can remember, indicate how much difficulty you experienced in writing the DC sections of the above-mentioned article. _____ Please use the following scale:

1= none; 2= a little; 3 = some; 4 = quite a lot; 5 = a lot

27. How many empirical research articles had you written in English-medium journals as the main author before you had written that article? _____ Please, use the following scale:

1= 0-9 articles; 2 = 10-22 articles; 3 = 23-36 articles; 4 = 37-53 articles; 5=54-200 articles

28. As far as you can remember, had you received any explicit training in writing for publication before you wrote the article in the sample? _____ If so, what kind of training and in what language? (e.g. attending a workshop in writing for publication in English). Please specify:

29. As far as you can remember, what other kinds of experiences most helped you directly or indirectly to write the research article in the EXEMPRAES Corpus? (E.g. following your PhD supervisor's advice, reading about similar studies in the same language and focussing on the structure/phrases used; getting feedback from your co-authors; searching for phrases in Google; asking some language mediator to revise your text, and so on). Please, specify: __

[...]

31. As far as you remember, did the scientific journal or other sources/people give you specific instructions/recommendations about the inclusion of *Limitations* and/or how to present them? Yes/No _____ If so, in which respects? _____

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Reconocimiento-NoComercial-CompartirIgual 4.0 Internacional License.

References

Moreno, A. I. (2011). Introduction to the Spanish team for intercultural studies of academic discourse (ENEIDA) project and research group. Retrieved June 28, 2020, from <http://hdl.handle.net/10612/1824>

Moreno, A. I., Rey-Rocha, J., Burgess, S., López-Navarro, I., & Sachdev, I. (2012). Spanish researchers' perceived difficulty writing research articles for English-medium journals: the impact of proficiency in English versus publication experience. *Ibérica*, 24, 157-184. [http://www.aelfe.org/documents/13_24_Moreno.pdf]

Moreno, A. I. (2013, June). Compiling comparable corpora of research articles for writing teaching purposes through interdisciplinary collaboration. Paper presentation at the 7th Conference of the European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing. Central European University, Budapest, Hungary.

Moreno, Ana I. (2022). An intercultural approach to “bad news” reporting as an embedded part-genre: the “local” rhetoric of *Limitations* in empirical research articles. *Ibérica*, 44, pp.

Moreno, Ana. I., & Sachdev, I. (2019). Course in writing empirical research articles for an international audience: How best to position yourself [Training course]. Escuela de Formación. León, Spain: Universidad de León. [<http://hdl.handle.net/10612/14680>]

Note: This interview should be cited as Appendix 3 of the following:

Moreno, Ana I. (2022). An intercultural approach to “bad news” reporting as an embedded part-genre: the “local” rhetoric of *Limitations* in empirical research articles. *Ibérica*, 44, pp.