Kimia Soltani*

Freelance Researcher, Ardabil, Iran
soltanikimia98@yahoo.com

Davud Kuhi

Islamic Azad University, Maragheh, Iran
davudkuhi@yahoo.com

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS TO MOVE RECYCLING IN RESEARCH ARTICLES: PERCEPTIONS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCHERS AND GENRE ANALYSTS

Abstract

The present study sought to collect and compare three groups of scholars' perceptions of move recycling (MR) in social science research articles (RAs). More specifically, in the first phase of the study, 14 non-Iranian and 12 Iranian experienced RA authors in English from six social science disciplines were interviewed about their perspectives on MR. In the second phase of the study, 11 reputable discourse analysts' rationales for MR were collected via email to triangulate the data and identify additional factors influencing MR. Based on the recurring themes that emerged from three layers of data analysis, seven interrelated factors affecting the use of MR were identified: (1) readers' guidance, (2) conformity to English academic writing conventions, (3) conformity to discipline-specific conventions, (4) the length of RAs, (5) editorial policy, (6) improving RA text coherence, and (7) research promotion. The results of this study may alert students and novice researchers that academic writing conventions are based on reasons and that they should think critically to fathom these reasons and consciously adhere to the conventions.

* Corresponding address: Kimia Soltani, Iranian Social Security Organization, Ardabil, Iran.

1. INTRODUCTION

According to Hyland (2000), successful academic writing requires adherence to certain textual practices and conventions. Some of these conventions have become mandatory in all academic disciplines in order to meet the communication needs of their members (Parodi, 2010). Since English research article (RA) is a highly specialized genre, the acceptance of novice members into their discourse community is contingent upon their acquaintance with and application of RA conventions.

One of the well-established conventions of English RA writing that deserves special attention is move recycling (MR). A move is "a section of a text that performs a specific communicative function" (Biber, Connor, & Upton, 2007: 23). Swales (1990) coined the term "move recycling" to refer to any distinct recurrence of a certain move. Indeed, MR provides multiple opportunities for readers to discern the writer's intentions, which are hidden in the recycled move. Swales (1990) argued that the length of social science RAs likely contributes to MR. In contrast, authors of hard science RAs assume their audiences to have a certain level of background knowledge, leading to a less frequent use of MR.

The example below demonstrates how Applied Linguistics researchers (Marsden & Kasprowicz, 2017) recycled the gap move (limitations of previous studies) in the Introduction section of RA.

Example of MR in the Introduction section of RA

1. *Very little quantitative data* exist about the extent and nature of teachers' and teacher educators' engagement with published research in the area of foreign language (FL) education in Anglophone contexts.

2. However, we have *very little concrete data* about the actual impact of this often-times noxious research versus teaching dichotomy. A crucial question, rarely empirically investigated yet.

3. We *do not have data* about (a) the extent to which FL teachers and teacher educators are exposed to material that directly reports or mentions research, (b) the nature of publications they read, or (c) what those publications, in turn, cite.

4. As a consequence, we have *a poor understanding about* the flow of internationally peer-reviewed research from journals that claim relevance to instruction, either in terms of FL educators' direct exposure (via reading such research) or their indirect exposure (via citation of research in publications that they read).

MR within a single RA section magnifies the significance of recycled moves, whereas MR across RA sections may demonstrate that these sections are not fragmented but rather collaborate to form a systematic and meaningful whole. The

161

following example demonstrates how Economics RA authors (Xu & Flapper, 2009) recycled the purpose of the study in the Methods and Results sections of the article.

Example of MR *across* RA sections

The first occurrence of the purpose of the study in the Introduction section
This paper aims to address the energy information and knowledge gap in the fluid-milk processing industries, through performing literature reviews, conducting data collection and analysis of energy in formation to characterize the production and energy usage associated with this industrial sector.

The recycling of the purpose of the study in the Methods section
This paper reviews and characterizes energy use in fluid-milk processing, and further discusses energy- savings opportunities and impact and implications of implementing energy programs on the fluid-milk processing industry in different countries.

The recycling of the purpose of the study in the Results section
This paper will focus on a more detailed analysis of fluid-milk processing sector and its energy use in the developed world, such as the USA and a few European countries...

A thorough review of the literature reveals that MR has been extensively reported within individual sections of RAs such as the *Introduction* (Kanoksilapatham, 2007; Lim, 2012), *Methods* (Arsyad, 2013; Li & Ge, 2009), *Results* (Kanoksilapatham, 2007; Yang & Allison, 2003), and *Discussion* (Basturkmen, 2012; Soltani, Kuhi, & Hadidi Tamjid, 2020). A recent study by Soltani, Kuhi, & Hadidi Tamjid (2021) examined MR in four traditional sections of RAs, namely the Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion (IMRD) sections in six social science disciplines (Psychology, Linguistics, Management, Applied Linguistics, Sociology, and Economics). The quantitative phase of the study revealed that MR was more frequent in Economics RAs than in other disciplines. In addition, it was most prevalent in the Discussion sections and least common in the Methods sections. The qualitative phase, which was based on an email survey, sought the reasons for these findings from the authors of the RAs themselves. Even though our previous study on this topic shed some light on the likely factors influencing MR, it lacked a meticulous and in-depth consideration of such factors because we interviewed RA writers regardless of their level of experience in research writing.
Nonetheless, according to Bhatia (2004), when discussing the common rhetorical structures of a particular genre from an ethnographic perspective, genre analysts should take into account specialist informants' beliefs and perceptions. Ethnography alludes to research methods that are based on naturally occurring data

collection (Hyland, 2009). Specifically, it includes research methods such as interviews, focus group discussions, surveys, biographical histories, and diaries, which provide a contextual understanding of texts (Dressen-Hammouda, 2013). According to Bhatia's (2004) ethnographic approach, discourse as a genre accounts not only for how text is constructed but also for how it is interpreted and utilized in specific professional contexts to accomplish specific disciplinary purposes. The ethnographic approach also helps researchers produce reliable and valid findings, and it has been extensively utilized in educational research due to its comprehensive and in-depth level of explanation (Hyland, 2009). This approach has its own advantages and drawbacks. According to positivist scholars, the lack of rigor in the ethnographic approach casts doubt on the generalizability of the results. In response to this criticism, Hammersley (2001) contends that all generalizations are relative and that even fuzzy generalizations obtained through ethnographic methods can provide significant information. Furthermore, researchers using such methods can provide nuanced interpretations and invaluable insights based on actual interaction with the contexts in which texts are produced (Connor & Rozycki, 2013). It is an alternative to the exclusive focus on text-based methodologies, according to Hyland (2013).

In recent years, as academics have become more cognizant of the social nature of discourse, ethnographic methods have evolved and risen in popularity. One of the newly developed methods for the ethnographic approach is genre mapping. According to Kruse and Chitez (2012), genre mapping implies the use of multiple steps for data analysis and simultaneous involvement of insider knowledge to gain a comprehensive understanding of how genres are structured. Using contrastive genre mapping, Kruse and Chitez (2012) compared writing cultures at three universities in distinct Swiss regions where different languages were used as the medium of instruction.

A close examination of the literature reveals that some of the most eminent genre analysts have used ethnographic methods, particularly interviews with specialist informants, to elicit their beliefs about the use of specific structures (e.g. Hyland, 2004; Joseph & Lim, 2018; Lim, 2014, 2018; Lim & Luo, 2020; Moreno, 2021; Mur-Dueñas, 2014). Ethnographic methods have also gained prominence in Iranian contexts (e.g. Afshar, Doosti, & Movassagh, 2018; Tajeddin & Pashmforoosh, 2020). For example, Soltani et al. (2021) used the email survey for the first time to seek clarification from the RA authors themselves. However, the studies were hampered by a lack of responses from experienced RA authors. As a result, there may be more plausible factors influencing MR that were overlooked in previous studies. Although RA writing guidebooks (e.g. Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002; Creswell, 2009; Feak & Swales, 2011) provide fairly in-depth explanations of the factors influencing writing conventions, particularly in EAP courses for non-native speakers, they are unfortunately not implemented adequately in Iranian universities. This may lead many students and inexperienced researchers in Iranian academic contexts (as well as in other non-English settings) down the wrong path, causing them to use MR

haphazardly or by mere imitation. To address the aforementioned problems, the present study sought to collect and compare the perspectives of three groups of specialist informants regarding MR: genre analysts, Iranian, and non-Iranian experienced RA authors. In particular, this investigation aimed to answer the following research question:

RQ: What are social science researchers' and genre analysts' perspectives on MR across RA sections?

2. METHOD

2.1. Design of the study

The data for this explanatory study was collected and interpreted qualitatively. In-person interviews were utilized to ascertain the perspectives of Iranian specialists on MR. Email surveys were used to collect the opinions of non-Iranian academics and genre analysts regarding MR. The responses of the three participant groups were analyzed to identify the recurring themes.

164

2.2. Participants

Three groups of RA authors were invited to participate in the study: (a) 12 Iranian specialist informants, two from each of the six disciplines under study, for face-to-face interviews; (b) 30 non-Iranian experienced English RA authors, with an equal number from each of the study disciplines, with 14 scholars responding; and (c) 25 reputable Applied Linguistics scholars from around the world with expertise in discourse analysis/ genre analysis, with 11 participating (see Table 1). It is worth noting that genre analysts were involved in the study because they possess the fullest insider knowledge. In total, 37 RA authors took part in the study, whose responses shed light on potential factors contributing to the use of MR.

Group 1 (face-to-face interview)	12 Iranian specialist informants, 2 from each of the six disciplines of social science
Group 2 (email interview)	14 out of 30 non-Iranian English RA authors
Group 3 (email interview)	11 out of 25 well-known genre analysts
TOTAL	37 participants

Table 1. Participants of the study

2.3. The corpus

Regarding RA selection, in our previous study (Soltani et al., 2021), we purposively selected RAs authored by three groups of scholars as the basis for the current study; therefore, the RAs were already available and had been analyzed – 67 empirical RAs with IMRD structures, published in high-index journals in six social science disciplines (Psychology, Linguistics, Management, Applied Linguistics, Sociology, and Economics) and written by three target groups were chosen for this study (see the Appendix for the list of journals). Simply put, for the first group, we selected 12 English RAs written by Iranian professors affiliated with two premier universities in Tabriz, Iran. Concerning the second group, we chose 30 English RAs written by experienced non-Iranian researchers, five from each of the six disciplines. Finally, for the third group, we emailed the authors of 25 RAs written by internationally renowned and established genre analysts (see Table 2).

These disciplines were preferred because (a) according to Swales (1990), MR is more prominent in social science RAs than other sciences; (b) according to Becher and Trowler (2001), the selected disciplines can be regarded as prototypes of social science RAs; and (c) the selected disciplines had RAs with IMRD structures, which was necessary for the study.

		Disciplines						Total
		Sociology	Linguistics	Psychology	Management	Economics	Applied Linguistics	
1	Iranian	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
2	Non-Iranian	5	5	5	5	5	5	30
3	Genre analysts	-	-	-	-	-	25	25

Table 2. The corpus

2.4. The procedure

In the first stage of the study, we conducted face-to-face interviews with 12 seasoned Iranian lecturers, to learn more about their motivations for using MR. Because MR is a technical term that was probably unfamiliar to these participants from various disciplines, they were not directly questioned about it. Instead, we highlighted MR in their printed papers and questioned them about its application. Their responses were recorded for transcription and content analysis during 10-minute interviews that were conducted separately and at different times. Then, we carefully read each author's responses in search of recurring themes, confirmation of previously identified causes of MR, or identification of new causes. When they cited multiple reasons for MR, we categorized and counted them separately (see sub-section 3.6).

In the second stage of data collection, the perspectives of 14 experienced non-Iranian authors on MR were gathered. Their proficiency in RA writing was assessed based on their ResearchGate or Google Scholar profiles. It is important to note that these groups were selected solely on the basis of their expertise in RA writing, regardless of their cultural backgrounds. Because we did not have physical access to this group, we sent them an email inviting them to participate in the study. We anticipated that not all of the invited researchers would respond; as such, we invited five specialists in each field of study. In total, 30 experienced academics were invited to participate in the study. With the previously analyzed RAs from these groups in hand, we emailed their authors with an open-ended question asking why they used the same moves repeatedly in different sections of their RAs. They were not directly challenged about their use of MR, as was the case with the first group. Instead, we organized their own sentences representing MR in the Microsoft Word document under the headings of each recycled move and emailed the document to them along with the PDF file of their papers. As expected, fewer than half (14 total) of these academic groups responded.

The follow-up phase of the study differed from earlier phases in that the target population consisted of eminent discourse/genre analysis scholars. This phase of the investigation aimed to confirm what had already been found and to find more possible causes of MR. We classified their use of MR once more in a Microsoft Word document and emailed it to them along with their original article. This time, they were explicitly asked in an open-ended question why they kept repeating certain moves in different RA sections, because, as seasoned discourse analysts, they were undoubtedly more familiar with MR and its rationale. Even though only 11 of the invited authors sent their perspectives on MR, their responses were insightful and shed additional light on the probable factors influencing MR. All three groups of scholars were assured that their responses would be used anonymously in the study.

2.5. Data analysis

After identifying the common justifications shared by the three author groups, we categorized and coded each justification based on the frequency with which it appeared in their responses. Thus, reason 1 was identified as the most frequently cited reason, whereas reason 7 was deemed the least frequently cited reason. If the same justification was repeated, it was only counted once. Even though "readers' guidance" and "conformity to English academic writing conventions" appear twice in the following example, they are only counted once because they pertain to the same theme:

Non-Iranian – Applied Linguistics

I think this is a <u>normal practice</u> (Reason2) *in research article writing. The repetition may* <u>remind the readers</u> (Reason 1) *of the content. Specifically, purpose statements may appear (1) briefly in the introduction section, (2) immediately after gap indication, (3) in the methods section as guidance for designing research, (4) in the discussion section for checking whether the purpose of the studies has been achieved through conducting the study. This has been **an accepted practice in the international academic community**. The repetition, it seems, provides **useful guideposts for readers**.*

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The main research question of the study concerned how three groups of academics treat MR in social science RAs. As mentioned, the answers of 37 scholars, including 12 Iranian scholars, 14 academics from other countries, and 11 genre analysts, were subjected to content analysis. According to participant responses, seven major factors may encourage RA authors to use MR. These are: (1) the need to guide the readers, (2) conformity to English academic writing conventions, (3) conformity to discipline-specific conventions, (4) the length of RAs, (5) journal editorial policy, (6) improving RA text coherence, and (7) research promotion. The frequency and percentage of RA authors' reasons to use MR are presented in Table 3.

167

REASONS	GENRE ANALYSTS	NON-IRANIAN	IRANIAN	TOTAL
Readers' guidance	11 (100%)	12 (85.7%)	8 (66.6%)	31
Conformity to English academic writing conventions	6 (54.5%)	11 (78.5%)	9 (75%)	26
Conformity to discipline-specific conventions	0	6 (42.8%)	6 (50%)	12
RA length	1 (9.09%)	4 (28.5%)	4 (33.3%)	9
Journal editorial policy	0	5 (35.7%)	4 (33.3%)	9
Improving RA text coherence	7 (63.6%)	0	0	7
Research promotion	6 (54.5%)	0	0	6

Table 3. Frequency and percentage of the three groups of scholars' reasons for MR

The following sections classify and highlight the seven most common reasons given by RA authors.

3.1. Reason 1: Readers' guidance

A large number of academics (31 of 37 total participants) postulated that they use MR to guide their readers through RA. Because the majority of scholars (8 out of 12 Iranian (66.6%) and 12 out of 14 non-Iranian (85.7%) cited this reason, it was determined to be the primary reason for MR. The examples provided below illustrate this justification. It should be noted that in each of the following examples, the authors' exact words were quoted, together with any language errors.

Excerpt 1 (Iranian – Management)

> *Good research articles typically use repetition of this content (through rephrasing/paraphrasing) at certain points in an article. Often, this repetition of the purpose can be found at the end of a literature review (leading into the introduction of the research questions), at the beginning of the results, and at the beginning of the discussion and/or conclusion. The purpose of this*
>
> *repetition is simply* **to aid to the reader** (Reason 1) *to understand the text.*

Excerpt 2 (Non-Iranian – Psychology)

> *I think it is because of the academic and rhetorical* **culture of Western** (Reason 2)
>
> *scholarship to remind* **the audience** (Reason 1) *throughout the paper what the focus of the research is and* **help** *them navigate the paper.*

It appears that RA authors utilize MR primarily to facilitate the reading process of their readers by eliminating the need to recheck the recycled move. In other words, MR could be used to meet the informational and interaction needs of authors and readers. This indicates that they care about their readers and also emphasizes that they try to make their texts easy to understand. This orientation to readers can be described by the fact that English academic texts follow a writer-responsible culture (Connor, 2005; Cushing Weigle, 2002; Kuhi, 2017; MacKenzie, 2015; Peterlin, 2013). That is, in English, the writer bears the responsibility to help the reader as much as possible to comprehend the text. Consequently, the writer should organize the content of the text as clearly and unambiguously as possible by providing them with various kinds of signals and comprehension cues, such as MR (Kuhi, 2017).

3.2. Reason 2: Conformity to English academic writing conventions

Another frequently observed recurring theme in scholars' responses was the enculturation to English academic writing conventions, which was mentioned by 24 out of 37 authors (9 out of 12 or 75% of Iranian scholars and 11 out of 14 or 78.5% of non-Iranian scholars). However, only about half of the genre analysts (6 out of 11, or 54.5%), mentioned this justification. The subsequent examples illustrate this theme in the two participants' responses.

Excerpt 3 (Genre Analyst)

These repetitions are common practices [Reason 2] *in post-introduction sections in many applied science and social science disciplines because it is important for writers to remind* the reader [Reason 1] *of the original main focus of the research being reported, and demonstrate clearly that their findings and discussion are* ***closely connected*** *with the main purposes(s) of their academic inquiry.*

Excerpt 4 (Non-Iranian – Applied Linguistics)

169

Repetition is conventional [Reason 2] *in RAs and thus* ***expected by*** the reader [Reason 1] *. If the repetition weren't* ***needed by readers****, it probably would have disappeared, that is been eliminated from genre expectations, long ago.*

It seems that MR is one of the unwritten but widespread conventions of social science RA writing that authors and researchers pursue worldwide. The strongest argument for the universality and standardization of rhetorical structures comes from Widdowson (1979: 61), who asserts that "scientific exposition is structured according to certain patterns of rhetorical organization which, with some tolerance for individual stylistic variation, imposes conformity on members of the scientific community no matter what language they happen to use." Several scholars who acknowledge Widdowson's (1979) claim also support this argument (e.g. Amnuai & Wannaruk, 2013; Bergmann & Luckmann, 1995; Hyland, 2009; Li & Flowerdew, 2020; Pérez-Llantada, 2013; Swales, 2004). This reasoning is also consistent with Yakhontova (2006), who points out that writing conventions within somewhat closed national academic communities have remained stable. Pennycook (2008) regards the internationalization of English academic discourse as a crucial element in the universal application of academic writing practices.

3.3. Reason 3: Conformity to discipline-specific conventions

According to experienced RA authors (12 out of 37), adopting discipline-specific conventions was another factor contributing to MR. Specifically, 6 of 12 Iranian researchers (50%) and 6 of 14 non-Iranian academics (42.8% of them) cited this reason. In our previous study (Soltani et al., 2021), we looked at the culture of the discipline and the rules of academic writing as a single unit that causes MR. However, in this study, we separated them because the two factors appeared so often in the academics' responses.

The following examples show how English academic conventions and disciplinary practices are associated.

Excerpt 5 (Iranian – Psychology)

"Some parts of repetitions in that paper were just due to following **the conventional way of academic writing** [Reason 2] *. In* **our field of study** [Reason 3] *, we should briefly present the main question, methodology, and the results in the introduction and then go through the details in the body of the paper."*

Excerpt 6 (Non-Iranian – Management)

Similar to other **scientific fields** [Reason 3] ***in Management***, *there are several* **established guidelines** [Reason 2] *for RA writing that should be followed. I tried to keep up with them. Also, it seems, the repetition, provides useful* **guideposts for readers** [Reason 1] *.*

It can be stated that what constitutes an appropriate and well-organized text is determined by the standards of academic writing as well as the specific demands of the authors' discourse community (Jiang & Hyland, 2020). Based on the aforementioned assumptions, one can argue that certain academic writing requirements in English are designed to meet the needs of various discourse communities. Another possible justification is that, because English has become the universal language for knowledge dissemination, researchers from all communities and disciplines should respect and adhere to its standards when writing RAs. Moreover, according to Hyland (2015), established conventions in each discipline provide a disciplinary scheme that allows writers to assume a certain level of background knowledge in their audiences and interact with them using unique codes. Likewise, Sharifian (2008) postulated that parts of researchers' schemes are

constructed based on their shared assumptions as members of a specific discourse community. Violations of such assumptions can lead to miscommunications among community members. These assumptions suggest that RA authors use MR to the extent that they adhere to specific requirements, norms, and conventions of their respective disciplines. Indeed, by employing MR in accordance with the norms of a particular discipline, authors demonstrate their membership in discourse communities and lend credibility to their work. In other words, as authors endeavor to satisfy their audiences, they need to present their messages in a manner that is more appealing to the relevant discourse community (Hyland, 2000). This may be the reason why Hyland (2015) stated that to work within a discipline and claim membership, one needs to engage in and be proximate to the community values and conventions it routinely employs.

3.4. Reason 4: The length of RA

Overall, 9 out of 37 academics (i.e. 4 out of 12 or 33.3% of Iranian RA authors and 4 out of 14 or 28.5% of non-Iranian RA authors) cited this reason for the use of MR. This reason was also found in one of the 11 responses from genre analysts (see sub-section 3.7). The following two excerpts from Iranian and non-Iranian email responses illustrate this factor.

Excerpt 7 (Iranian – Economics)

Reading <u>*long research articles*</u> (Reason 4) *such as* <u>*Economics*</u> (Reason 3) *might be boring for readers.* **By repeating these segments, writers try to** <u>*help readers'*</u> (Reason 1) *don't lose track of their reading and remind the main points.*

Excerpt 8 (Non-Iranian – Sociology)

The constant reference to the pre-established segments may keep <u>*readers'*</u> (Reason 1) *attention to the intended track so that they can keep a clear mind over my* <u>*lengthy research article*</u> (Reason 4) *which may cover quite a number of pages.*

It was noticed that this reason usually appeared along with the first theme (i.e. readers' guidance) and did not stand on its own. Thus, the two factors appear to be interdependent. It can be stated when writing lengthy RAs, authors utilize MR to help readers comprehend the recycled moves. One possible argument is that when

a substantial amount of new information is presented in RAs without reiterating what has already been presented, it becomes difficult to grasp the new information. As a result, straightforward and coherent reading is impeded. Therefore, a certain amount of MR is necessary to aid in reading comprehension, especially in lengthy RAs where the reader should keep track of what is being read. Based on the aforementioned premises and the claims of eminent scholars (Crookes, 1986; Swales, 1990, 2004), it is reasonable to assume that the longer the RA, the greater the likelihood of MR.

3.5. Reason 5: Journal editorial policy

The next reason provided by RA authors for MR was journal limitation or the need to satisfy journal editors and reviewers' requirements, which closely followed the justification discussed previously. This explanation was provided by 9 of the 37 RA authors, including 4 of the 12 Iranian RA authors (33.3%) and 5 of the 14 non-Iranian authors (35.7%). The following excerpts illustrate how Iranian and non-Iranian specialists incorporated this factor into their responses.

Excerpt 9 (Non-Iranian – Linguistics)

"Readers typically skim and read quickly to get the main points. So it is a favor to <u>the readers</u> [Reason 1] *to restate the most important parts of our writing to emphasize the unique contribution this article makes. That is also important for the article* <u>reviewers and editors of journals</u> [Reason 5] *".*

Excerpt 10 (Iranian – Management)

There are four main reasons:

1. *Summarization of the paper in these sections*
2. *Clarification*
3. *As a reminder for* <u>the readers</u> [Reason 1]
4. *Per article* <u>editors or reviewers' request</u> [Reason 5]

It can be argued that the possible sanctions for paper rejection strongly encourage authors to pursue journal frameworks because their editorial boards may only accept RAs that properly reflect the constraints of the journal. Although determining the extent to which a particular journal emphasizes MR is not simple, it is obvious

that each journal establishes its own norms and frameworks for researchers to follow. In other words, they should strive to write their RAs in accordance with editors' and reviewers' expectations; otherwise, their articles will be rejected. This is an instance of a situation in which the authors have no control over the rules of the publishing game, but because of "publish or perish" they should either follow these rules or receive a game-over card, to use Lee's (2012) metaphor. This reasoning has also been acknowledged by several researchers (Hanauer & Englander, 2013; Ozturk, 2007; Pérez-Llantada, Plo, & Ferguson, 2011).

3.6. Reason 6: Improving RA text coherence

Although this factor was identified in only 7 of the 37 RA author responses, its citation rate among the third group of participants was remarkable. That is, 7 out of 11 genre analysts (63.6%) mentioned this reason (see the following examples).

Excerpt 11 (Genre Analyst)

It is known as move recycling which is
a common feature of academic writing
Reason 2 *. It is used to establish and*

long
maintain the topic in a Reason 4 text **as part of achieving coherence**. *In fact,*
effective linkages
the repetition creates Reason 6 between and among sections of
readers
a RA resulting in a **cohesive text** *that Reason 1 can easily comprehend.*

Excerpt 12 (Genre Analyst)

In terms of textual construction, the feature is evidence of referential patterns
a fairly common *extended written text*
that are Reason 2 in Reason 4 **in English to help**
readers *coherent reading*
Reason 1 **,** *to achieve Reason 6*

This group of scholars suggested that MR is used to emphasize the interdependence of RA sections. This is in accordance with Yang and Allison's (2003) claim that MR connects RA sections. The uniformity across RA sections forewarned us that RA sections are not fragmented but rather closely related to form a coherent and meaningful text (Kanoksilapatham, 2015). Moreover, we can suggest that by predicting where their addressees will need additional assistance to comprehend a particular move, RA authors can establish cohesion by recycling the move

173

throughout their papers. All in all, RA authors may recycle the moves to facilitate reading without requiring the reader to return to previous sections. This, in turn, may hasten the reading process.

3.7. Reason 7: Research promotion

As evidenced by the following excerpts, authors' research promotion strategies may also account for MR. Even though this reason was mentioned by only 6 of the 37 respondents, more than half of the 11 prominent genre analysts (6 of 11, or 54.5%) cited it (see the following examples for this reason).

Excerpt 13 (Genre Analyst)

I see three reasons for move recycling:

1) Authors want their ideas/research activities to be quite clear for **the readers** Reason 1 *;*

2) Authors want to keep the attention of **the readers** Reason 1 *;*

3) Authors want to **promote** Reason 7 *their ideas.*

174

Excerpt 14 (Genre Analyst)

Usually, moves are repeated to remind **the reader** Reason 1 *of something important. More likely to ensure that the reader gets the message. I believe it improves the flow and the structure of an article and helps the writer to emphasize the argument or* **promote** Reason 7 *their idea. However, it should be used effectively and wisely. Otherwise, it will make the article longer and the ideas redundant without adding any value.*

The idea that English RAs are promotional in nature is not new; since the 1990s, it has been debated by a number of scholars (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Dahl, 2009; Fairclough, 1993; Flowerdew, 1999; Hyland, 2000; Lindeberg, 2004; Mur-Dueñas, 2010). Admittedly, current institutional trends are to sell scientific products and high-stakes genres such as RAs (Kuhi, 2014; Moreno, 2021, 2022; Yakhontova, 2002). Indeed, in this competitive and commercialized world of scientific products, RA authors are compelled to use various promotional elements to persuade their readers and attract the attention of editors and reviewers, or, in Flowerdew's (1999: 259) words, to make their study "sound, significant, and worthy of publication."

Many authors (Basturkmen, 2012; Dahl, 2009; Jiang & Hyland, 2017; Lim, 2018; Moreno, 2021, 2022; Sheldon, 2011) have also acknowledged the promotional aspect of rhetorical moves in RAs. According to Lim (2018), for instance, expert writers use rhetorical moves to justify and promote their research. In this light, MR can be regarded as one of the promotional techniques that authors use to intensify the significance and uniqueness of their work.

4. CONCLUSION

The current study strived to collect and compare three groups of scholars' perceptions regarding MR in the RA genre. All seven factors that contribute to MR appear to be interconnected: given the writers' responsibility in English academic texts, it is reasonable to speculate that MR is used to connect RA sections, create a cohesive text, and remind the reader of the recycled moves, especially in long RAs. It is also plausible to assume that MR has become a mandatory English academic writing convention, and authors should adhere to this convention either to provide readers with a consistent reading experience or to promote their research in a recent competitive and market-driven environment. This may pique the interest of their community members, particularly journal reviewers and editors. As one of the responses from non-Iranian RA writers states, *"If the repetition were not required by readers, it would have probably disappeared and been eliminated from genre expectations a long time ago."*

175

Five of the seven factors contributing to MR (i.e. readers' guidance, English academic writing conventions, discipline-specific conventions, RA length, and journal editorial policy) were distributed with similar frequencies across their responses, indicating that the two groups of academics (Iranians and their international counterparts) had similar perspectives regarding the rationales behind MR. Therefore, cultural differences appear to have no effect on Iranian and non-Iranian views on the discursive value of MR across RA sections.

Two more interesting themes emerged in the responses of well-known genre analysts: promoting their study and linking RA sections to improve the coherence and flow of the text. This demonstrates their extensive knowledge of the established conventions in English academic writing. Nonetheless, the aforementioned two reasons were missing in two groups of experienced academic (Iranian and non-Iranian) responses, implying that they are unfamiliar with all of the interplaying factors that underpin MR. This indicates that some experienced RA authors adhere to the norms and standards of English academic writing in order to obtain article acceptance permits, regardless of the underlying reasons for doing so. Nevertheless, as competent teachers and informational resources for their students, they need to develop their knowledge of academic writing conventions. Moreover, it is undeniable that if experienced scholars in a non-English academic setting are not aware of all the reasons behind MR, neither will their students or novice researchers

be. If this scenario holds true, it can be concluded that EAP and ESP writing courses in non-English academic settings, such as Iran, do not adequately equip researchers with justifications for established academic writing rules, such as MR. Therefore, EAP and ESP practitioners can encourage researchers to develop more analytical attitudes and question the logic underlying these standards and conventions rather than merely imitating and applying them.

In addition, in academic communities such as EAP writing classes, where the explicit teaching of conventions of English academic writing is encouraged, the findings of this study could be highlighted through consciousness-raising activities. There are sufficient examples of MR in various soft science disciplines that can be introduced to students and researchers. Practitioners of EAP writing might encourage students to compare and contrast MR in different disciplines and draw their attention to differences that might exist between them. The variety of lexico-grammatical resources for tracing recycled moves across RA sections can also be emphasized in EAP and ESP classes.

Given the writers' responsibility in English academic texts, EAP writing instructors may guide students to write their texts with a greater sense of responsibility, for example, by using MR intentionally in their RAs to meet the readers' need for such a unique comprehension facilitator. By taking this perspective, teachers' education and professional development programs could also acquaint prospective teachers with these social and interactive aspects of writing.

This study may pave the way for future investigations. More participants from each discipline are required to determine whether or not disciplinary differences influence the perceptions of experienced scholars regarding the use of MR. We acknowledge that other factors may also influence MR in social science RAs. Consequently, direct interviews with a large number of renowned scholars and genre analysts could shed light on several intriguing factors that contribute to MR. The triangulation innovation used in the current study – asking the authors of the RAs themselves about their use of MR – may strengthen the reliability of the results and can be adopted in future studies. Also, the inclusion of journal editors and reviewers in email dialogs would be of great value. Insights gained from these groups of scholars' responses could lead to a greater understanding of the degree to which MR is important to them.

176

[Paper submitted 12 Nov 2022]
[Revised version received 5 Jan 2023]
[Revised version accepted for publication 8 Jan 2023]

Acknowledgement

Wannaruk, Xianqing Luo and Fredricka L. Stoller for permitting us to use their names as sources of information and study participants.

References

Afshar, S. H., Doosti, M., & Movassagh, H. (2018). A genre analysis of the introduction section of applied linguistics and chemistry research articles. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *21*(1), 163-214. Retrieved from http://ijal.khu.ac.ir/article-1-2856-en.html

Amnuai, W., & Wannaruk, A. (2013). Investigating move structure of English applied linguistics research article discussions published in international and Thai journals. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(2), 1-13. http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n2p1

Arsyad, S. (2013). A genre-based analysis on discussion section of research articles in Indonesian written by Indonesian speakers. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *5*(4), 50-70. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i4.3773

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education* (6th ed.). Thomson Learning.

Basturkmen, H. (2012). A genre-based investigation of discussion sections of research articles in dentistry and disciplinary variation. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *11*(2), 134-144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.10.004

Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines*. Open University Press.

Bergmann, J. R., & Luckmann, T. (1995). Reconstructive genres of everyday ommunication. In U. M. Quasthoff (Ed.), *Aspects of oral communication* (pp. 289-304). Walter de Gruyter.

Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition/culture/power*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-based view*. Continuum.

Biber, D., Connor, U., & Upton, T. A. (2007). *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure.* John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.28

Connor, U. (2005). *Contrastive rhetoric.* Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Connor, U., & Rozycki, W. (2013). ESP and intercultural rhetoric. In B. Paltridge, & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The handbook of English for specific purposes* (pp. 427-443). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118339855.ch22

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Crookes, G. (1986). Towards a validated analysis of scientific text structure. *Applied Linguistics*, *7*(1), 57-70. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/7.1.57

Cushing Weigle, S. (2002). *Assessing writing.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511732997

Dahl, T. (2009). The linguistic representation of rhetorical function: A study of how economists present their knowledge claims. *Written Communication*, *26*(4), 370-391. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088309341241

Dressen-Hammouda, D. (2013). Ethnographic approaches to ESP research. In B. Paltridge, & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The handbook of English for specific purposes* (pp. 501-517). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118339855.ch26

177

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society*, *4*(2), 133-168. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002002

Feak, C. B., & Swales, J. M. (2011). *Creating contexts: Writing introductions across genres*. University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.3367288

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(2), 123-145*.* https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80125-8

Hammersley, M. (2001). Some questions about evidence-based practice in education. In P. Richard, & T. Gary (Eds.), *Evidence-based practice in education* (pp. 133-149). Open University Press.

Hanauer, D. I., & Englander, K. (2013). *Scientific writing in a second language*. Parlor Press.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Pearson.

Hyland, K. (2004). Graduates' gratitude: The generic structure of dissertation acknowledgments. *English for Specific Purposes*, *23*(3), 303-324. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(03)00051-6

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2013). ESP and writing. In B. Paltridge, & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The handbook of English for specific purposes* (pp. 95-113). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118339855.ch5

Hyland, K. (2015). Genre, discipline and identity. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *19*, 32-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.02.005

Jiang, F. K., & Hyland, K. (2017). Metadiscursive nouns: Interaction and cohesion in abstract moves. *English for Specific Purposes*, *46*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.11.001

Jiang, F. K., & Hyland, K. (2020). Prescription and reality in advanced academic writing. *Iberica*, *39*, 15-42. Retrieved from http://www.revistaiberica.org/index.php/iberica/article/view/74

Joseph, R., & Lim, J. M. H. (2018). Background information in the discussion sections of forestry journals: A case study. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *18*(1), 198-216. https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2018-1801-12

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2007). Rhetorical moves in biochemistry articles. In D. Biber, U. Connor, & T. A. Upton (Eds.), *Discourse on the move*: *Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure* (pp. 73-119). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.28.06kan

Kanoksilapatham, B. (2015). Distinguishing textual features characterizing structural variation in research articles across three engineering sub-discipline corpora. *English for Specific Purposes*, *37,* 74-86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.008

Kruse, O., & Chitez, M. (2012). Contrastive genre mapping in academic contexts: An intercultural approach. *Journal of Academic Writing*, *2*(1), 59-73. https://doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v2i1.79

Kuhi, D. (2014). Commodified discourses, commodifying discourses: In pursuit of a theoretical model on the constitutive functioning of academic discourse in marketization of higher education. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, *2*(1), 39-61. https://doi.org/10.22049/JALDA.2014.13517

178

Kuhi, D. (2017). Hybridity of scientific discourses: An intertextual perspective and implications for ESP pedagogy. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, *5*(2), 61-80. https://doi.org/10.22049/JALDA.2018.26150.1048

Lee, I. (2012). Publish or perish: The myth and reality of academic publishing. *Language Teaching*, *47*(2), 250-261. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000504

Li, Y., & Flowerdew, J. (2020). Teaching English for research publication purposes (ERPP): A review of language teachers' pedagogical initiatives. *English for Specific Purposes*, *59*(4), 29-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.03.002

Li, L-J., & Ge, G-C. (2009). Genre analysis: Structural and linguistic evolution of the English-medium medical research article (1985-2004). *English for Specific Purposes*, *28*(2), 93-104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2008.12.004

Lim, J. M-H. (2012). How do writers establish research niches? A genre-based investigation into management researchers' rhetorical steps and linguistic mechanisms. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *11*(3), 229-245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.05.002

Lim, J. M-H. (2014). Formulating research questions in experimental doctoral dissertations on applied linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes*, *35*, 66-88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.02.003

Lim, J. M-H. (2018). *Directional determinants in U.S. experimental doctoral dissertations: Writers' communicative resources in language education.* Partridge.

Lim, J. M-H., & Luo, X. (2020). Writing research questions and hypotheses: A genre-based investigation into writers' linguistic resources in social sciences. *ESP Today*, *8*(2), 206-226. https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2020.8.2.2

Lindeberg, A. (2004). *Promotion and politeness: Conflicting scholarly rhetoric in three disciplines.* Åbo Akademi University Press.

MacKenzie, I. (2015). Rethinking reader and writer responsibility in academic English. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *6*(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0001

Marsden, E., & Kasprowicz, R. (2017). Foreign language educators' exposure to research: Reported experiences, exposure via citations, and a proposal for action. *The Modern Language Journal*, *101*(4), 613-642. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12426

Moreno, A. I. (2021). Selling research in RA discussion sections through English and Spanish: An intercultural rhetoric approach. *English for Specific Purposes*, *63*(3), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.02.002

Moreno, A. I. (2022). To be, or not to be, self-critical? Writing discussion and/or closing sections in English and Spanish social science research articles. *ESP Today*, *10*(2), 221-244. https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2022.10.2.2

Mur-Dueñas, P. (2010). A contrastive analysis of research article introductions in English and Spanish. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, *61*, 119-133.

Mur-Dueñas, P. (2014). 'The main contribution of this study is' ...: An analysis of statements of contribution in English published research articles and L2 manuscripts. *Journal of Writing Research*, *5*(3), 271-283. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2014.05.03.2

Ozturk, I. (2007). The textual organization of research article introductions in applied linguistics: Variability within a single discipline. *English for Specific Purposes*, *26*(1), 25-38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.12.003

Parodi, G. (2010). The rhetorical organization of the textbook genre across disciplines: A 'colony-in-loops'? *Discourse Studies*, *12*(2), 195-222.

179

https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445609356500

Pennycook, A. (2008). English as language always in translation. *European Journal of English Studies*, *12*(1), 33-47. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825570801900521

Pérez-Llantada, C. (2013). The article of the future: Strategies for genre stability and change. *English for Specific Purposes*, *32*(4), 221-235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2013.06.004

Pérez-Llantada, C., Plo, R., & Ferguson, G. R. (2011). "You don't say what you know, only what you can": The perceptions and practices of senior Spanish academics regarding research dissemination in English. *English for Specific Purposes*, *30*(1), 18-30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2010.05.001

Peterlin, A. P. (2013). Translation as a paradigm shift: A corpus study of academic writing. *English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, *10*(1), 127-137. https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.10.1.127-137

Sharifian, F. (2008). Cultural schemas in L1 and L2 compliment responses: A study of Persian-speaking learners of English. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *4*(1), 55-80. https://doi.org/10.1515/PR.2008.003

Sheldon, E. (2011). Rhetorical differences in RA introductions written by English L1 and L2 and Castilian Spanish L1 writers. *English for Academic Purposes, 10*(4)*, 238-251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.08.004

Soltani, K., Kuhi, D., & Hadidi Tamjid, N. (2020). Intercultural study of move recycling in discussion sections of soft science research articles. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, *13*(27), 171-191. http://doi.org/10.30495/JAL.2021.681300

Soltani, K., Kuhi, D., & Hadidi Tamjid, N. (2021). Move recycling in soft science research articles: English native speakers vs. Iranian speakers. *Journal of Language Horizons*, *5*(2), 115-137. https://doi.org/10.22051/lghor.2021.33356.1376

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis*: *English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Exploration and applications*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524827

Tajeddin, Z., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2020). Persian-speaking teachers' perspectives on methods and materials for teaching English as an international language. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, *11*(1), 44-65. https://doi.org/10.22055/rals.2020.15416

Widdowson, H. G. (1979). *Explorations in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Xu, T., & Flapper, J. (2009). Energy use and implications for efficiency strategies in global fluid-milk processing industry. *Energy Policy*, *37*(12), 5334-5341. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.07.056

Yakhontova, T. (2002). Selling or telling? The issue of cultural variation in research genres. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp. 216-232). Longman.

Yakhontova, T. (2006). Cultural and disciplinary variation in academic discourse: The issue of influencing factors. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *5*(2), 153-167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2006.03.002

Yang, R., & Allison, D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes*, *22*(4), 365-385. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(02)00026-1

180

KIMIA SOLTANI, Ph.D. in TEFL. She has presented and published several papers in national and international conferences and journals. Her research interests are discourse analysis and genre analysis.

DAVUD KUHI is a full-time professor at Islamic Azad University, East Azerbaijan, Maragheh branch, Iran. He has been teaching ESP and Discourse Analysis for more than 20 years. A distinctive aspect of his work is that the analyses penetrate into deeper sociocultural processes behind the academic/scientific discourses. He has published a lot of papers in the field of discourse analysis in high-index national and international journals.

Appendix

DISCIPLINES	JOURNALS
Linguistics	*Journal of Linguistics, Australian Journal of Linguistics, Journal of English Linguistics, International Journal of Linguistics*
Management	*International Journal of Management Reviews, British Journal of Management, Journal of Management, Journal of International Management*
Sociology	*American Sociological Review, European Journal of Sociology, Sociological Review, International Journal of Sociology*
Psychology	*Psychology and Psychotherapy, Europe's Journal of Psychology, British Journal of Clinical Psychology, British Journal of Social Psychology*
Economics	*Energy Policy, Energy Economics, Cambridge Journal of Economics, Economic Modelling*
Applied Linguistics	*System, English for Specific Purposes, Modern Language Journal (MLJ), Language Teaching*

181