Jan Kochanowski University Press

This is a contribution from *Token*: *A Journal of English Linguistics*
Volume 16/2023.
Edited by John G. Newman, Marina Dossena.
© 2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press.

Academic writing conventions in Czech English-medium linguistics journals: Continuity and change over the last 30 years[1]

Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova
Masaryk University

ABSTRACT

This paper studies the development of academic writing conventions in English-medium research articles (RAs) by Czech linguists published in two national journals (*Brno Studies in English* and *Linguistica Pragensia*) over the last 30 years. Drawing on the genre analysis framework, the study investigates possible changes in the titles, rhetorical structure, statement of aims, research questions and hypotheses, and personal and locational metadiscourse markers for writer and reader reference in a small corpus of 20 RAs. The comparative diachronic analysis aims to identify continuity and change in the evolution of academic writing conventions and the factors influencing them. The findings indicate that Czech English-medium RAs have gradually adopted a more transparent rhetorical structure close to the IMRAD model, their titles have gained in informativeness, and researcher visibility has been enhanced due to an increase in locational and exclusive personal self-mention. These tendencies point to hybridity in the present-day English-medium discourse of Czech linguists which stems from the adaptation of diverging academic writing traditions to meet the publication needs of the authors.

Keywords: research article, rhetorical structure, diachronic analysis, reader reference, writer reference.

1 This work was supported by the Czech Science Foundation grant 21-12150S *Intercultural variation in writer-reader interaction in English-medium academic discourse by Czech and Anglophone novice writers.*

DOI:10.25951/11258

1. Introduction

Over the last 30 years, English has been firmly established as the language of international communication in the globalised academic world. The "academic lingua franca" status of English has facilitated rapid communication of new scientific knowledge while forcing non-Anglophone scholars to make their claims, report their results and interact with a large and varied international readership in an international language. Since writing in a language is typically associated with specific disciplinary, epistemological and cultural conventions, non-Anglophone writers may be seen as standing at a crossroads as they need to decide whether to accommodate the dominant Anglophone norms or continue to abide by the research writing conventions established in their original academic literacy. While English may be seen as a *Tyrannosaurus Rex* "gobbling up the other denizens of the academic linguistic grazing grounds" (Swales 1997: 347), the fate of the non-Anglophone academic literacies has gradually emerged as somewhat more complex (Tardy 2004).

Several studies have shown (e.g. Bondi 2009; Dontcheva-Navratilova 2014, 2021; Lafuente-Millán 2014; Lorés-Sanz 2011; Mur-Dueñas 2007; Šinkūnienė 2018; Shaw – Vassileva 2009) that the English-medium discourse of non-Anglophone scholars is somewhat similar to, but also different from, the writing of native Anglophone authors. This suggests that non-Anglophone scholars strive to resist stigmatization when aspiring to publish in international journals (cf. Flowerdew 2008) by preserving some of the discursive and rhetorical traditions of their original academic literacy, while at the same time adjusting to some extent to Anglophone academic discourse conventions. This simultaneous process of convergence with and divergence from Anglophone academic writing norms leads to hybridization (Peréz-Llantada 2013: 263) or 'glocalization' (Swales 2004:11; Sancho Guinda 2015: 29) of the discourse of non-Anglophone scholars. The diversity of culture-specific variants of academic English seems to be aptly grasped by the term 'alternative academic written English*es*' (Mauranen – Pérez-Llantada – Swales 2010: 647). Since the development of alternative academic English*es* has not yet attracted much scholarly attention from a diachronic perspective, the present study focuses on the development of one of these culture-specific variants of academic English (Czech) over the last 30 years.

The period 1990-2020 is characterised by major political and economic changes in Czech society which have impacted on the academic discourse community. The most significant change was the fall of the Iron Curtain (1989), which resulted in the opening of borders and led to more intensive

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

interaction with the global academic community, and gradually increased access to more recent publications. In this period, the local status of the Czech Anglicist community changed dramatically. Since before 1989 all relations with English-speaking countries were regarded as undesirable, and Russian was the second compulsory language taught in all schools, English studies at universities had a limited number of staff and students; consequently, the Czech Anglicist community was very small. However, in the 1990s Russian was replaced by English and German as the prevailing second languages taught at school, and by the end of the millennium English was clearly the preferred choice (*Framework Education Programme for Basic Education* 2007). In addition, as a result of the establishment of English as an international language in practically all domains, there was an urgent need for translators. In response to this demand for teachers and translators, English studies at universities raised the number of staff and students and included academic writing in English in their programmes to enhance the internationalisation of scientific research. At the beginning of the 21st century, the enlarged Czech Anglicist community is aspiring to be part of global academia and already feeling the impact of globalisation and commodification (Swales 2004; Sanchez Guinda 2015) marked by increased competitiveness and pressure to publish, especially in English. When looking for publication opportunities, Czech Anglicists typically submit their work to national English-medium journals and, only recently and less frequently, to international journals.

This paper studies the development of academic writing conventions in the emblematic academic genre of the research article (RA) with the aim of finding out how English-medium RAs by Czech linguists published in two national journals have evolved dynamically in response to disciplinary, sociocultural and broader socioeconomic changes in the local and global context over the period 1990-2020. The analysis focuses on the form and function of titles, rhetorical structure, the form and location of research aims, hypotheses and research questions, and the functions of metadiscourse markers for writer and reader reference. I begin by comparing the Czech and the Anglophone academic writing traditions and their development over the last three decades. Then I present my corpus and describe the analytical approach taken to the study of rhetorical features included in the bounds of this investigation. In the following sections, I present the findings of the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the selected rhetorical features and highlight the markers of continuity and change in the discourse of Czech linguists in relation to factors influencing the development of academic writing conventions as reflected by the two journals.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

2. The Czech and the Anglophone academic writing traditions

The Czech and the Anglophone academic writing traditions differ in many respects, the most prominent of which are primarily the way they approach discourse organization and writer-reader interaction (e.g. Čmejrková – Daneš 1997). The differences seem to stem primarily from divergences in their epistemologies, literacy traditions, the size and type of audience they address, and their contact with other academic writing norms.

The Anglophone academic tradition is associated with the Saxonic intellectual style, which is essentially empirically oriented and democratic. In contrast, the Czech academic tradition has been influenced by Teutonic epistemology, and, due to common Slavonic origins and historical circumstances, the Russian academic literacy (Čmejrková – Daneš 1997; Kozubiková-Šandová 2019), both of which tend towards theorizing, deductive reasoning, and elitism (Clyne 1987). According to previous research and style manuals, Anglophone academic texts are typically characterised by explicit discourse organisation indicated by section headings, a reader-friendly attitude and a high level of interactivity conveyed by metadiscourse markers, as it is the writer who takes responsibility for making the text understandable when striving to persuade the implied heterogeneous audience to accept the suggested views and claims (Bennett 2009; Hyland 2002; Thompson 2001). Czech academic discourse, in contrast, typically lacks explicit discourse structure, and when addressing the homogenous Czech disciplinary discourse community it shows a preference for a reader-oriented, depersonalized style associated with the use of impersonal constructions and the exclusive 'editorial we' (Čmejrková 1996; Čmejrková – Daneš 1997; Vassileva 1998; Yakhontova 2006).

However, the Czech and Anglophone academic traditions are undergoing various modifications. Recent research has shown that Anglophone academic writing conventions have evolved dynamically over the past 30 years. Several studies have evidenced changes in the generic structure of RAs (Bondi 2022), the form and function of titles (e.g. Busch-Lauer 2000; Li – Xu 2019; Xiang – Li 2020), the explicit formulation of research questions and hypotheses (Thewell – Bas-Bleda 2020), citation patterns (Hyland – Jiang 2017b), level of formality (Hyland – Jiang 2017a) and expression of stance (Hyland – Jiang 2016a), engagement (Hyland – Jiang 2016b) and metadiscourse in general (Hyland – Jiang 2018). These changes indicate that there is a tendency towards an increase of informative value and standardization of article components, a significant rise in the number

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

of citations, a slight decrease in formality, and, in the soft knowledge field, a less visible conveyance of stance and a decline in the extent to which authors engage with the reader. Apart from genre and disciplinary development incentives, these transformations may also suggest that Anglophone discourse is influenced by the growing number of second language writers who publish in international journals (Hyland – Jiang 2018).

Czech academic writing conventions have also evolved dynamically over the years. As Kozubíková Šandová's (2019) diachronic study of Czech RAs in linguistics indicates, several changes occurred in the 1990s concerning the form of titles and the overall organisation of the text, which gradually moved from a spiral with numerous digressions towards greater linearity and transparency, as indicated by the inclusion of section headings and/or numbering. The use of interactive metadiscourse increased after the beginning of the new millennium, thus facilitating text processing for the reader. Interactional metadiscourse, however, is marked by considerable idiosyncratic variation; it seems to show an increase in the use of self-mentions and a certain decrease in the use of hedges. Kozubiková Šandová (2019) attributes most of these changes to the impact of globalization and the influence of Anglophone academic literacy. Apart from this, the evolution of Czech academic discourse might be attributed to digitalisation, as computer-mediated text processing favours clearer text structure, and online access to numerous publications fosters the need to make texts easily surveyable to face the challenge of increased competition in academia.

It is obvious that differences between the Czech and the Anglophone academic traditions are considerable and their clash in the English-medium discourse of Czech linguists is likely to result in some degree of hybridization.

3. Data and method

3.1 Corpus

The study was carried out on a corpus of 20 single-authored linguistics RAs published in two Czech English-medium journals between 1990 and 2020. The choice of journals was limited to the only two peer-reviewed English-medium linguistics journals published in the Czech Republic (including the period before the split of Czechoslovakia in 1993) which have a sufficiently long history to provide data for this diachronic research and as such may be regarded as representative of the development of the Czech culture-specific variant of English. Both journals have now adopted an open-access policy.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

The first journal, *Linguistica Pragensia* (LP; published by Charles University, Prague), was founded in 1991 as a successor to the journal *Philologica Pragensia* (1958-1990). The second journal, *Brno Studies in English* (BSE; published by Masaryk University, Brno), was founded in 1959; it also includes a literature and cultural studies section, which is outside the scope of this investigation. For the purposes of the diachronic comparative analysis, the corpus was sub-divided into two sub-corpora, each comprising ten RAs (five from each journal), representing the periods 1990-1995 and 2015-2020 respectively.

Table 1 provides an overview of the size and composition of the corpus.

Table 1. Composition of the corpus

Period	Journal	No. of Articles	Wordcount
Period A – 1990-1995	*Linguistica Pragensia*	5	18,444
	Brno Studies in English	5	28,860
	Total	10	47,304
Period B – 2015-2020	*Linguistica Pragensia*	5	23,863
	Brno Studies in English	5	39,935
	Total	10	63,978
Total		20	111,282

The articles included in the corpus were selected to represent equally both journals in the two periods compared (1990-1995 and 2015-2020) and the spectrum of authors publishing in them. All articles are single-authored by different scholars, which reflects the dominant authorship pattern in the journals and minimises the impact of author idiosyncrasies. The selection of authors in each of the two periods includes highly experienced authors (with more than 25 years in academia) who have published extensively, authors who have substantial expertise (with more than 15 years in academia) but have begun to publish more recently, and authors who are at the beginning of their academic career. These three levels of expertise are represented relatively evenly across the two periods, although in the 1991-1995 period highly experienced authors represent the most numerous category (four) and the other two categories are each represented by three authors, while the 2015-2020 author sample comprises two highly experienced authors, four experienced and four early-career researchers. This difference reflects changes in the size and dynamics of the Czech Anglicist discourse community, which over the last 30 years has increased in membership and now comprises relatively experienced scholars and early-career researchers in considerable proportions.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

The corpus was compiled using the software tool *SketchEngine* (Kilgarriff et al. 2014), which was also used to search the corpus for personal expressions for writer and reader reference. In agreement with the common procedure in contrastive corpus-based research, the difference in word-count between the sub-corpora was neutralized by normalization to occurrences per 10,000 words.

3.2 Method

The diachronic comparative corpus-based analysis draws on the genre analysis framework (Swales 1990; Bhatia 1993) to investigate the rhetorical structure of RAs and realizations and functions of metadiscourse markers for writer and reader reference. The rhetorical structure of RAs is explored drawing on the IMRAD model (Swales 1990; Cotos et al. 2015; Gray et al. 2020; Schmied 2011, 2015), while taking into consideration the dynamic evolution of genres in response to sociocultural changes (Hyland 2000; Sancho Guinda 2015). As typical of social sciences, the rhetorical sections are coded as 'Introduction', 'Data and method', 'Results and discussion' and 'Conclusion'. The comparison between the articles published in Period A and Period B is carried out at the macrolevel of their overall organisation, while a more detailed moves analysis is applied to introduction, method and conclusion sections. Also investigated are specific rhetorical elements, namely the form and function of RA titles, the location and form of research aims, research questions, and hypotheses and functions of metadiscourse markers for writer and reader reference, so as to trace possible diachronic changes across the two periods.

The analysis of RA titles focuses on two formal features, i.e. length and syntactic structure, and two content-related features, i.e. information types and functions. Following Cheng et al. (2012) and Xiang and Li (2020), five types of syntactic structures are considered: nominal constructions, prepositional phrases, V-*ing* phrases, full sentences, and compound constructions (titles containing two parts separated by punctuation marks, such as a colon, dash or period). The taxonomy of information types included in titles used in this study draws on Sahragard and Mejhami (2016), Li and Xu (2019) and Xiang and Li (2020), and comprises five categories: topic only, method/design, dataset, result and conclusion. Finally, to identify the interactional potential of titles the analysis applies Busch-Lauer's (2000) three functions of titles: nominative, aiming at identifying a piece of work (which in this study is regarded as subsumed in the other two functions); designating, focusing on

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

indicating the content of the piece of work; and advertising, appealing to the reader.

The significance of statements of research aims, research questions and hypotheses in the rhetorical structure of RAs is considered with regard to frequency of occurrence, location and linguistic realisation (cf. Lim 2014; Jalilifar 2010).

Realizations and functions of expressions for writer and reader reference are explored within Hyland's (2005) interpersonal metadiscourse framework. The functional classification of personal expressions used in this study is informed by several taxonomies as suggested by previous research (e.g. Dontcheva-Navratilova 2013; Fløttum et al. 2006; Ivanič 1998; Harwood 2005; Hyland 2002; Sheldon 2009; Tang – John 1999). My classification takes into consideration the context and location of the personal structure within the genre of the RA and the semantic-pragmatic meaning of the verb with which the personal expressions occur (cf. Halliday 1994; Hyland 1999) as indicative of their role in writer-reader interaction.

The five roles of self-mention considered in this study are typically realised by the exclusive pronouns *I* and *we*; they include: (1) the discourse organiser role, which at the macro-level outlines the text structure, and at the micro-level indicates rhetorical moves, transition points and intra-textual connections, often expressed by the co-occurrence of *I/we* with discourse verbs (e.g. *discuss, present, summarise, focus on*); (2) the researcher role, which describes research and data collection processes and procedures, and tends to be signalled by the co-occurrence of *I/we* with research and cognition verbs (e.g. *analyse, find, use, understand*); (3) the arguer role, which is used to elaborate arguments, put forward claims and comment on findings, typically manifested by the co-occurrence of *I/we* with position verbs (e.g. *argue, claim, dispute, show*); (4) the evaluator role, which expresses agreement or disagreement with an issue, position or belief, and is commonly realised by the co-occurrence of *I/we* with evaluative and emotive verbs (e.g. *feel, be sceptical about, find something* + evaluative adjective), and (5) the reflexive-self role, conveying the situatedness of the researcher and casting his/her autobiographical self into the text by providing personal comments related to the design and realisation of the study or the teaching or research experience of the author (cf. Starfield – Ravelli 2006). Finally, personal expressions for writer reference are compared to 'locational self-mention' (Bondi 2014), i.e. the use of discourse (*paper*, *article*, *section*), research (*analysis*, *study*) and cognitive (*assumption*, *interpretation*) nouns to indirectly refer to the author, so as to explore the interplay of personality and impersonality across the two periods.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

While previous studies assign a single function to reader reference, this investigation considers two roles of reader reference, typically expressed by the inclusive pronoun *we*: (1) discourse community member, associated with reference to established practices and shared knowledge, and (2) the 'reader-in-the text' (Thompson – Thetela 1995), conveyed by direct address to the reader positioned as an interested colleague following the argument presented in the text.

4. Results and discussion

Before focusing on analysis of the rhetorical structure of the RAs representing the two periods, it is worth noting that there is considerable difference in the wordcount of the samples – 47,304 in Period A (average article length 4,730 words) and 63,978 in Period B (average article length 6,397 words). Moreover, one of the BSE articles in Period A is an outlier in many respects, including wordcount (10,916); the reason for its inclusion in the dataset is that it is authored by probably the most prominent Brno linguist of the period (Jan Firbas), whose influence on the Czech Anglicist community is considerable. Without this article, the average wordcount per text in Period A would be 4,043 words. This difference in article wordcount between the two periods already suggests a certain change in the way Czech authors conceive their texts and the level of informativeness the articles are intended to convey (a similar tendency is also found by Bondi (this issue) in her study of Italian research articles). Another factor leading to the increase in wordcount of articles concerns requirements imposed by journal editors; BSE, for instance, set 5,000 words as the minimum article length in 2008 (personal communication of the editor-in-chief J. Chovanec).

4.1 The rhetorical structure of RAs

The overall organisation of the RAs in the two periods is clearly different. As Example 1 shows, Period A RAs typically lack explicit indication of organisation in sections by headings and numbering; only three RAs use topic-based section headings (one of them only 'Conclusions'), while two use numbering of paragraphs (one with no section headings). Period B RAs, on the other hand, generally display the standard numbered section headings pertaining to the IMAD framework, although, as is typical of applied linguistics articles, there is some variation in section headings (Yang – Allison 2003). This

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

suggests that while in Period A Czech authors to a large extent abide by Czech academic writing conventions, in Period B they opt for a different article structure. The reason for this change seems to be twofold. Firstly, the way Czech linguists write their academic texts is clearly influenced by Anglophone academic conventions due to training in academic writing courses, access to international journals, and pressure to publish in English-medium local and international journals. The second reason stems from a certain change in article typology and methods used, as not all RAs included in the Period A sub-corpus are empirical. Drawing on Gray (2015), four of them may be categorised as hybrid, or mostly general theoretical, i.e. discussing a linguistic feature illustrated by examples taken from previous research or provided by the author without identification of a source. These hybrid articles are generally characterised by a fuzzy structure, which may have also affected the organisation of the Period A texts. The RAs in Period B, however, are empirical and use quantitative, qualitative or mixed methodology for data analysis; only one may be regarded as hybrid of the theoretical and empirical types.

(1) Period A (06_BSE_1991)

This paper is a sequel to the analysis of pronouns published in BSE 18 (Chamonikolasová, 1990). The previous paper dealt with the communicative dynamism (cf. Firbas 1990) and prosodic prominence (cf. Firbas 1990) of personal pronouns. The present analysis covers all pronominal categories and provides their comparison.

The formal classification of pronouns that has been applied in this paper is based on the conception of pronominal categories given in Quirk et al. 1985:

- central
  - personal (*I, you, he, . . ., me, you, him, . . .*)
  - reflexive (*myself, yourself, . . .*)
  - possessive (*my, your, . . ., mine, yours, . . .*)
- reciprocal (*each other, one another*)
- relative (the *who*-series, that)
- interrogative (the *who*-series)
- demonstrative (*this, these, that, those*)
- indefinite
  - positive
    - universal (*all, both, each, every*)
    - assertive (the *some* series, multal and paucal pron., *one, half, several, enough other, another*)
  - nonassertive (the *any* series, *either, few, little*)
  - negative the *no* series, *neither*)

Syntactically, the analysis is limited to pronouns implemented as simple noun phrases and functioning as independent sentence elements; it does not deal with pronouns inside a complex noun phrase (premodifiers or headwords), which are only part of a sentence element. The former and the latter show certain differences in functional sentence perspective and

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

Period B (12_LP_2016)

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper deals with the analysis of the representation of the different functions of the subject *it* in two text types: academic prose and fiction. It examines four basic functions of subject *it* — anaphoric *it*, empty *it*, and *it* as the component of extraposition (anticipatory *it*) and the cleft sentence (focusing *it*). Focusing not only on the distribution and frequency of the different functions but also on their correlations with other features of the two registers, it aims to discover in which respects and to what extent the two text types differ and whether such a basic, common word as *it* can play a role as a style marker.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The pronoun *it* has the same basic functions as the other third person pronouns, serving deictic and anaphoric uses. Aside from those, it can also have several "special uses" whose exact number varies in different interpretations. The *Longman Grammar* identifies the following three:

— Empty subject/object
— Anticipatory subject/object[1]
— Subject in cleft constructions (Biber et al., 1999: 332).

3. MATERIAL AND METHOD

The analysis presented in this article is based on 200 excerpts obtained from the British National Corpus (BNC), a corpus of 100 million words of British English from the latter part of the 20th century, accessed using the web-based interface *BNCweb* (CQP-Edition) available on-line from http://bncweb.lancs.ac.uk/. Two subcorpora of similar sizes were created from this corpus, one of academic prose and one of fiction.

The same search for *it* in the subject position was then carried out in both subcorpora, using the query "it (_{ADV})? _V*[D,Z]". The result of this query should be *it* followed by an optional adverb and any verb in either past tense form or third person singular present tense form.

The occurrence of the individual moves and steps in the Introduction, Method and Conclusion sections in the corpus is summarised in Table 2. (Only steps occurring in the corpus are listed; steps occurring only in Period B are highlighted in italics.) Comparison of the data for Period A and Period B shows a considerable change in terms of the quantity and range of moves and steps represented in the two sub-corpora. From a quantitative perspective, there is an increase in the occurrence of almost all moves and steps. Moreover, two moves, i.e. M3 'Establishing credibility' in the Method section and M3 'Reshaping the research territory' in the Conclusions, and several steps in other moves, i.e. 'Claiming centrality', 'Reviewing previous research' and 'Clarifying definition' in the Introduction, 'Introducing participants', 'Delineating study procedures' and 'Identifying variables' in the Method section, and 'Explicating results', appear only in Period B. It is significant that these newly adopted moves and steps contribute decisively to the replicability of the research and enhance its persuasive force.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

In the Introduction, the M1 'Establishing territory' move is typically realised by S1 'Providing general information', which occurs in most articles across the two periods. In Period A, this is sometimes combined with presentation of the study as a sequel to a previous study by the same author (Example 6, Period A text), while in Period B, this is usually done by indicating the topic of the study (Example 6, Period B text). The most significant change in Move 1 is the frequent occurrence of the S3 'Reviewing previous research' step, which not only allows writers to contextualise their research but also highlights its importance (Bhatia 1993; Samraj 2002). The absence of this step in Period A reflects an assumption on the part of the authors that their readership is acquainted with the main theoretical tenets and methodology to which they refer (cf. Dontcheva-Navratilova 2013), while its presence in Period B may be attributed to the influence of Anglophone rhetorical conventions and the efforts of Czech linguists to reach an international audience. The increased prominence of M2 'Identifying a niche' (from 9.52% to 23.07%) shows the greater argumentative effort invested by Czech linguists to point to the need for their research, while the more frequent use of the 'Outlining the structure of the paper' step in Move 3 indicates an attempt to help the reader with text processing.

Table 2. Rhetorical structure of the Introduction, Method and Conclusion sections

Rhetorical section	Moves/steps	Period A		Period B	
		N	%	N	%
Introduction	**M1 Establishing territory**	**9**	**42.86**	**10**	**38.46**
	S1 Providing general background	9		9	
	S2 *Claiming centrality*	0		2	
	S3 *Reviewing previous research*	0		8	
	M2 Identifying a niche	**2**	**9.52**	**6**	**23.08**
	Raising general questions	1		6	
	Highlighting a problem	1		1	
	Indicating a gap	0		3	
	M3 Addressing the niche	**10**	**47.62**	**10**	**38.46**
	S1 Introducing present research descriptively	8		2	
	S2 Announcing research aims/ purposes	5		10	
	S3 Presenting research questions	2		2	
	S4 Presenting research hypotheses	1		1	
	S5 *Clarifying definitions*	0		1	
	S5 Outlining the structure of the paper	1		3	
	Total moves	**21**	**100**	**26**	**100**

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

Method	**M1 Contextualizing methods**	**10**	**71.43**	**9**	**42.86**
	S1 Providing general background	9		5	
	S2 Identifying the methodological approach	7		7	
	S3 *Introducing participants*	0		1	
	M2 Describing the study	**4**	**28.57**	**9**	**42.86**
	S1 Describing data	4		8	
	S2 *Delineating study procedures*	0		7	
	S3 *Identifying variables*	0		2	
	M3 Establishing credibility	**0**	**0**	**3**	**14.28**
	S1 *Describing the data analysis*	0		3	
	Total moves	**14**	**100**	**21**	**100**
Conclusions	**M1 Re-establishing the territory**	**9**	**60.00**	**9**	**36.00**
	S1 Highlighting principal findings	9		9	
	M2 Framing new knowledge	**1**	**6.66**	**6**	**24.00**
	S1 *Explicating results*	0		6	
	S2 Addressing limitations	1		0	
	M3 Reshaping the territory	**0**	**0**	**2**	**8.00**
	S1 *Reshaping the field*	0		1	
	S2 *Supporting with evidence*	0		1	
	M4 Expanding the niche	**5**	**33.33**	**8**	**32.00**
	S1 Generalising results	4		6	
	S2 Proposing directions	2		2	
	S3 Claiming value	1		3	
	Total moves	**15**	**100**	**19**	**100**

(Steps occurring only in Period B are highlighted in italics; percentage shows the ratio for the specific rhetorical section, i.e. introduction, method and conclusions.)

Changes in the Method section concern primarily M2 'Describing the study' (marking a rise from 28.57% to 42.86%), which becomes a conventional move in Period B, i.e. it occurs in more than 60 per cent of texts (Kanoksilapatham 2015), and the appearance of M3 'Establishing credibility' via description of the data analysis (14.28%). These developments indicate that Czech linguists endeavour to enhance the replicability and reliability of their research, which may be due to the wider variety of topics under investigation, more frequent use of quantitative methods and an increased competitiveness when seeking to reach a wider readership.

The Conclusion section also appears to have gained in rhetorical complexity. The range of rhetorical moves is extended by the appearance of the new M3 'Reshaping the territory' (8%). While several of the Period A articles comprise very brief conclusions (Example 2) and only the most experienced authors point to limitations and implications of the study, in

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

Period B M2 'Framing new knowledge' (up from 6.66% to 24.00%) and M4 'Expanding the niche' (32.00%) may be regarded as conventional moves. For instance, in Example 3 the author emphasises the value of the approach used in the study in terms of contribution to knowledge and reliability, which can be interpreted as a 'promotional' feature; since promotional features are generally more frequent in Anglophone than in L2 discourse (Moreno 2021), their increased occurrence may be attributed to the influence of Anglophone rhetorical conventions.

(2) Summing up the answers to the three questions raised at the beginning of the present paper, the following statement can be made: the most frequent rheme in both English and Czech is an object in the final sentence position implemented by a modified noun. (09_BSE_1995)

(3) The analysis of corpus data, based on the activation of paradigmatic relation of alternation and the syntagmatic relation of co-occurrence of PHS with other constituents of the utterance, proved to be a reliable basis for context-sensitive interpretation of emergent communicative strategies and the dual, i.e. therapeutic and diplomatic usage of PHS in current communicative situations. (19_BSE_2019)

All in all, the evolution of the rhetorical structure of Czech English-medium RAs across the two periods clearly indicates a move towards the IMRAD framework associated with a prevalence of clearly empirical research and greater rhetorical complexity.

4.2 Titles of RAs

The results of the analysis of the form features of RA titles presented in Table 3 indicate obvious changes between the two periods.

Table 3. Formal features of RA titles

Titles	Title Length	Surface form				
		Nominal	Prep. phrase	V-*ing* phrase	Compound	Sentence
Period A	8.0	8	2	0	0	0
Period B	12.9	3	2	0	5	0

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

There is a substantial increase in title length between the two periods, from 8.0 to 12.9 words per title. This might be attributed to the influence of Anglophone academic discourse, since as Busch-Lauer (2000) suggests, L2 writers tend to use shorter titles than Anglophone linguists (8.5 vs 9.08 respectively in 2000), and to a general tendency over the last 30 years towards use of longer and thus more informative titles (Xiang – Li 2020). For instance, Li and Xu's (2019) diachronic research into titles of articles published in *Journal of Pragmatics* show an increase of title length from 8.02 in 1978 to 12.01 in 2018.

The syntactic structure of titles used by Czech linguists in both periods shows only three of the five structures available in the taxonomy of title structure, although the two non-represented types (sentence and V-*ing* phrase) account for only 10 per cent of all title structures in Anglophone texts (cf. Xiang – Li 2020). Period A displays only two structural title types: nominal (80%) and prepositional phrase (20%) (Examples 4 and 5). While there is no change in the occurrence of prepositional titles across the two periods, the nominal type has more restricted use in Period B (30%). The most striking diachronic change concerns the appearance of compound titles (Example 6), which do not occur at all in Period A, but represent 50 percent of all titles in Period B. This change may be associated with the influence of Anglophone conventions, since, as Busch-Lauer's (2000) findings indicate, the occurrence of compound titles is less frequent in RAs by L2 writers than in RAs by Anglophone writers (28% vs 64%) (see also Bondi in this issue). The compound structural title type has also been on the increase in international journals over the last 30 years, most likely in response to the need to provide the reader with more initial information amid the exponential surge in the number of RAs published. This is in line with previous diachronic research (Li – Xu 2019; Xiang – Li 2020) reporting that compound titles nearly doubled their rate in the period between 1988 and 2018.

(4) Some thoughts on contrastive grammar (03_LP_1994)

(5) On the discourse functions of the English language of conversation (07_BSE_1991)

(6) "Now is the time to root out evil": The role of natural world metaphors in the construction of the US and THEM dichotomy (18_BSE_2019)

The changes in title length and structure are also reflected in changes in content-related features. Table 4 summarizes the distribution of information types and functions of titles.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

Table 4. Content-related features of RA titles

Titles	Information type					Function	
	Topic	Topic + dataset	Topic + Method	Topic + Results	Topic + Conclusion	Designate	Advertise
Period A	8	2	0	0	0	10	0
Period B	1	3	2	3	1	7	3

In the first period, titles only have an informative function. They typically indicate the topic of the research. Only occasionally (20%) do they indicate the type of dataset the study is performed on (Example 7). In the second period, however, the titles are considerably richer in information content: the predominant types of titles indicate Topic and Dataset and Topic and Results (Example 8). Titles designating Topic and Method (Example 5) are less frequent, while those indicating the Title only or Title and Conclusion are rare. The increased occurrences of the Results, Dataset and Method components may be attributed to their higher degree of explicitness in comparison with Conclusion and Topic (Haggan 2004). My results differ to some extent from those reported by Xiang and Li (2020); while their results for linguistics RAs also indicate a decrease of Topic type titles (from 74% in 1988 to 53% in 2018), in their data, the Method information type is considerably more frequent than the Dataset type. This difference may stem from the small sample used in this study, as well as from the somewhat narrower range of methods used by the members of Czech Anglicist community.

(7) The vagaries of subject *it*: can it serve as a style marker? (12_LP_2016)

(8) Boring as hell: a corpus study of intensifying post-modification of predicative adjectives in the 'ADJ as NOUN' frame (15_LP_2020)

Another important evolution is visible in the function of titles, which in Period B are not confined to designating the content of the study, as 30 per cent of them have also an eye-catching or advertising function (Example 3). This seems to suggest an effort on the part of Czech linguists to become more competitive, as they seem to wish to make their titles more creative, stylistically rich and appealing by including quotes (Example 3) and expressive language (Example 5; cf. Busch-Lauer 2000: 90).

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

4.3 Aims of the research, research questions and hypothesis

Research aims, questions and hypotheses are part of the key move of the Introduction section M3 'Addressing the niche', which occurs in all RAs in the corpus. While in Period A, research presentation tends to be performed more frequently by S1 'Introducing present research descriptively', in Period B, this is realised primarily by S2 'Announcing research aims/purposes' (Table 4). In both periods, these steps may occur at the very beginning of the Introduction; in such cases, M1 'Establishing research territory' and M2 'Identifying a niche' may follow, or M3 'Addressing the niche' may constitute the only move in the Introduction (Example 6). When indicating the aims of their research, most Period A authors frame their study as an 'attempt', using set phrases such *in the present paper I will attempt to, this study attempts, the paper attempts*, which may be associated with the Czech convention of showing authorial modesty (Čmejrková – Daneš 1997). In Period B, all RAs include a clear indication of the specific aims of the study, typically using the set phrases *the aim of this paper is* and *this paper aims to* collocating with the verbs *examine, discover* and *show*, which have been categorised as lexical bundles typical of Anglophone academic discourse (Cortes 2013). This change seems to stem from the influence of Anglophone academic conventions as well as from the need to specify more clearly the aims of the study in a research territory packed with an ever higher number of publications.

Explicit research questions and hypotheses are not frequent in the corpus, which confirms the findings of previous research indicating that they are more common in RAs by Anglophone authors (Sheldon 2011). The frequency of occurrence of hypotheses and research questions does not differ across the two periods, as there is one RA including a hypothesis and two RAs comprising research questions in each period. Both hypotheses take the form of a statement, using the verb form *be* in Period A and *will* in Period B. Although the low number of research questions does not allow for generalisations, it might be relevant to note that they tend to be factual (Lim 2014) rather than polar, i.e. in the case of research questions (Example 9) they include a *wh*-pronoun and a present tense copular verb in an SVC structure. This kind of research question is typically associated with qualitative research (the prevailing kind of method used by Czech linguists) and seeks interpretation of situations, meanings and experiences (Lim 2014:84).

(9) What are the parts of speech that implement rheme most often? (09_BSE_1995)

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

It is somewhat surprising that the occurrence of hypotheses and research questions is restricted to only one of the journals (*BSE*), although the Instructions for authors in both journals do not mention any requirements concerning these steps. While it is difficult to find a satisfactory explanation for this situation, it might be associated with the topic and method applied, as both studies using research questions in Period A study Theme-Rheme articulation, and both studies in Period B combine discourse analysis and pragmatics.

4.4 Expressions for writer and reader reference

A quantitative analysis of self-mention and reader reference (Table 5a and Table 5b) shows a considerable decrease in the frequency of use of both features across the two periods: from 48.6 to 11.7 for self-mention and from 24.6 to 13.8 for reader reference. The relatively frequent use of self-mentions is typical of Czech-medium academic discourse (Dontcheva-Navratilova 2020: 132), yet the rate of author-reference may be seen as somewhat skewed by the outlier (10_BSE_1995) mentioned in Section 3, which comprises about 35 per cent of all uses of *I*, *me* and *my*. However, even without this article the occurrence of self-mentions in Period A is 28.8, which is more than two times higher than in Period B. There is also a change in the distribution of occurrences across the articles – in Period A all ten articles use self-mentions, while three articles comprise no reader reference expressions. In contrast, in Period B, all articles employ reader reference; however, two articles show no instances of self-mention. This may indicate that, while trying to avoid explicit indication of human agency, Czech linguists show a growing tendency to use reader-oriented features more typical of Anglophone academic discourse.

Table 5a. Self-mention across the two periods (per 10,000 words)

Periods	*I*	*me*	*my*	*we*	*us*	*our*	*the author*	Total
Period A	16.9	5.2	12.3	7.5	0	6.5	0	48.4
Period B	6.3	0.4	2.6	0.8	0	1.6	0	11.7

Table 5b. Reader reference across the two periods (per 10,000 words)

Periods	*we*	*us*	*our*	*you*	*one*	*the reader*	Total
Period A	5.7	5.7	3.7	0	8.0	1.5	24.6
Period B	8.9	1.4	1.2	0	1.3	1.0	13.8

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

The decreasing tendency in the incidence of expressions for writer and reader reference may be attributed to three factors. Firstly, it may reflect instructions provided by academic style manuals (Bennett 2009) and academic writing courses, which typically advise authors to maintain an impersonal tone. A second factor may be the impact of Anglophone writing conventions on applied linguistics and soft sciences in general, which, as Hyland and Jiang (2016a, 2016b) show, are characterised by a decline in self-mention and reader reference over the last 50 years. Finally, the change might reflect the expertise of authors represented in the corpus; Period A includes a higher proportion of highly experienced authors, who generally seem to be more prone to the use of writer and reader reference expressions (cf. Dontcheva-Navratilova 2014).

Realisations of self-mention and reader reference have changed to some extent. In Period A, both singular and plural first person pronouns are used to indicate self-mention (16.9 and 7.5 respectively); only two authors indicate self-mention exclusively by *I/me/my*, three use exclusively *we/our* and five use both singular and plural forms. This is most likely a transference from the Czech academic writing style where the use of self-mention *we/our* is standard practice intended to indicate author modesty. In addition, as Hyland and Jiang (2016a) note, over the same period *I* has replaced *we* as the preferred marker of stance in Anglophone applied linguistics discourse, which might also have impacted Czech linguists' writing habits. In Period B, the use of exclusive plural forms is rare (0.8) and always occurs in combination with singular forms, as in Example 10, where the author adopts the researcher role to highlight his/her agentive role in the research process (*my analysis*) but, when commenting on the results, opts for reducing personal attribution by using *we* in combination with several hedging devices (*should, tentative*).

(10) As follows from Table 2, the results of ***my analysis*** imply that the presentation scale is confined to the second passive only (…). Nevertheless, ***our results*** should be viewed as tentative; it would require analysis of more examples to verify whether the presentation scale may also be implemented in the first passive. (11_LP_2015)

Another significant change is the decrease in incidence of *one* and *the reader* (from 8.0 and 1.5 in Period A to 1.3 and 1.0 in Period B), which are less direct in their appeal to the reader. On the other hand, there is an increase in the use of *we* (from 5.7 in Period A to 8.9 in Period B), which is more explicitly dialogic and thus more likely to involve readers in the argument as colleagues and persuade them to accept the author's claims.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

Tendencies in the use of rhetorical functions of metadiscourse markers for writer and reader reference have also undergone some changes, which are summarised in Tables 6a and 6b.

Table 6a. Rhetorical functions of self-mention (%)

Self-mention	Period A	Period B
Discourse organiser	32.9	16.9
Researcher	39.6	64.4
Opinion-holder	9.8	3.4
Arguer	8.6	10.2
Reflexive self	9.1	5.1

Table 6b. Rhetorical functions of reader reference (%)

Reader reference	Period A	Period B
Disc. community member	16.9	20
'Reader-in-the-text'	83.1	80

In both periods, the most prominent role of self-mention is that of researcher, which appears in all RAs in the corpus. The researcher role is typically realised by the personal pronoun *I* in the agentive subject position collocating with research verbs, such as *find*, *analyse*, *examine*, and the possessive *my* collocating with research nouns such as analysis, *research*, *data*, *material*. The researcher role shows a striking increase in Period B (39.6% in Period A vs 64.4% in Period B), which may be associated with an attempt to increase the visibility of the researcher and to gain credit for decisions that scholars make while carrying out their study (Example 11), as well as with an effort to enhance research replicability and credibility.

(11) (…) after careful consideration ***I decided*** to winsorize the data, i.e. replace the outlier participants' means with the next highest value which is not an outlier (Field 2014), so as not to influence the control group's overall means. (20_BSE_2020)

The role of discourse organiser is the second most frequent in both periods; however, it indicates a decreasing tendency (32.9% in Period A vs 19.9% in Period B). Overall, self-mentions outlining the text structure are rather rare, since, as mentioned above, research aims are typically formulated in an impersonal way and the step 'Outlining the structure of the paper' in the

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

introduction is rather rare. Thus, most instances of the discourse organiser role operate at the micro-level to indicate transition points and intra-textual connections. In Period A, this role is most visible in the outlier article (10_BSE_1995), which comprises all 13 uses of *let me* (26% of all occurrences of the discourse organiser role), indicating transition points in discourse (Example 12), which may account to a large extent for the less frequent occurrence of this role in Period B.

(12) ***Let me*** now turn to the analysis of the other text. (10_BSE_1995)

The more authoritative roles of opinion-holder, arguer and reflexive self are considerably less frequent. Only the arguer role shows an increase in use (from 8.6% in Period A to 10.2% in Period B); this seems to indicate a transition from a descriptive presentation of results (typical of the Czech academic literacy) towards a more argumentative reasoning aimed at persuading the reader to accept the writer's claims. It is interesting to note that while in Period A the arguer role is realised primarily by *I* and *we* in the agentive subject position collocating with position verbs, such as *argue, propose, show* (Example 13), in Period B, it is also conveyed by the possessive *my* collocating with nouns, such as *proposal*, *understanding* and *hypothesis*.

(13) ***I will argue*** now that it is one of the substantial tasks of CGR to find out which of these differences can be ascribed to the translator's imagination and creativity only, and which; on the contrary, must be regarded as differences in the language structure. (03_LP_1995)

The opinion-holder and reflexive-self roles show a decreasing tendency, perhaps because most of the instances occur in the outlier 10_BSE_1995. In Period A, the opinion holder role is typically expressed by the collocations *I believe* and *I trust*, which might be interpreted as boosters. The considerably lower frequency of this role (9.8% in Period A vs 3.4% in Period B) may stem from a tendency to reduce authorial intrusion in the text. The self-reflexive role in Period A is associated with personal comments concerning the realisation of the study and the teaching or research experience of the author (Example 14), while in Period B it refers primarily to personal communications of colleagues that the author has used in the study.

(14) With one exception, the analyses were carried out ***under my direction*** by students who attended ***my seminars*** on FSP. (10_BSE_1995)

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

Reader reference conveys predominantly the 'reader-in-the text' role (83.1% in Period A and 80% in Period B), which shows a slight decrease in Period B, complemented by an increase in instances representing the reader and the writer as in-group members of the same community (e.g. *our country*, *our talking habits*). The 'reader-in-the text' role typically endeavours to position the reader as a co-researcher who follows the writer's chain of arguments and thus may be induced to accept the writer's views and claims (Example 15).

(15) ***If we extracted*** this purported modificant from the verb's meaning, ***we would be left*** with a core describable as the very general 'move'. (17_BSE_2016)

A comparison of personal self-mention (Table 5a) and locational self-mention (Table 7) shows that while self-mention expressed by personal pronouns has considerably decreased (from 48.4 in Period A to 11.7 in Period B), locational self-mention has strikingly increased over the two periods (from 31.3 in Period A to 64.2 in Period B), as also found in Bondi's (this issue) case study. This indicates that Czech scholars tend to adopt a more impersonal style of writing which may be associated with the scientific paradigm dominant at the end of the 20th century in Anglophone academic writing related to "clarity, economy, rational argument supported by evidence, caution and restraint" (Bennett 2009: 52).

Table 7. Locational self-mention (per 10,000 words)

Periods	Discourse nouns	Research nouns	Cognitive nouns	Total
Period A	9.5	19.4	2.5	31.3
Period B	22.5	38.7	3.2	64.2

The most frequent forms of locational self-mention across both periods are research nouns (e.g. *analysis*, *study, sample, material, results*: Example 16), followed by discourse nouns (e.g. *paper, article, section, table*: Example 17) and cognitive nouns (e.g. *conclusion, interpretation*), which are considerably less frequent. The increase in research nouns may be associated with the tendency towards explicit statement of research aims, description of data and orientation towards empirical research in Period B. The raise in frequency of discourse nouns may be attributed to an awareness of the importance of structuring the text more transparently to help readers with text processing.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

(16) ***The present study*** is to be regarded as a specific inquiry into the relationship between the immediately relevant context and the retrievability span. (10_BSE_1995)

(17) Following the analysis, ***the paper*** works with two basic topic management evasion techniques: raising a new safe topic and perspective reprojection. (13_LP_2017)

Overall, the use of writer and reader reference expressions is marked by considerable variation across the two periods and across individual texts. The changes observed seem to indicate that the influence of Czech academic conventions in English-medium texts has diminished, while the influence of Anglophone conventions has increased.

5. Conclusion

The diachronic comparative analysis in this study has explored the evolution of Czech linguists' writing practices in the genre of Czech English-medium RAs in response to the emergence of new sociocultural and publication situations over the last 30 years. Since the fall of the Iron Curtain, Czech Anglicists have established active interaction with the international linguistics community and aspire to make their work available to an international readership in response to the pressure to publish in order to advance in their academic career. My analysis has shown that the English-medium discourse of Czech linguists has undergone several changes indicating a transition from writing conventions strongly influenced by the Czech academic literacy to hybrid-in-nature writing practices accommodating the Czech culture-specific tradition and Anglophone academic discourse conventions dominant in international academic publications, thus enhancing Czech linguists' chances of having their work published in an international context.

The hybridity of the present-day English-medium discourse of Czech linguists is manifested by the persistence of several features typical of Czech academic writing conventions. These show considerable variation in section labelling, infrequent occurrence of certain rhetorical moves and steps, such as *Indicating a gap*, *Proposing directions for further research* and *Reshaping the field*, and rare but still present self-mention by means of *we* and *our*. The process of merging Anglophone and local rhetorical norms is also indicated by the presence of considerable variation across individual texts. However, despite these signs of continuity, it can be argued that all rhetorical features

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

of English-medium RAs by Czech linguists have been affected by change. Over the 30-year period, Czech linguistics English-medium RAs have become more empirically oriented, their length has increased, their organisation has become more explicit, and they have adopted mostly the IMRAD rhetorical structure, thus enhancing the informativeness and surveyability of the text. A similar tendency is noticeable in the development of titles, which, apart from becoming longer and more informative, may display an eye-catching function indicating an increase in competitiveness on the part of Czech linguists. The rhetorical structure of RAs has also gained in complexity by comprising more moves and steps which make the discourse more argumentative, clearly state the research aims, help the reader with text processing, contribute to the replicability of the research and enhance its persuasive force. The frequency of use and functions of personal expressions for writer and reader reference have also changed: the exclusive *we* has been gradually replaced by the use of *I* and impersonal forms, while the researcher role of self-mentions has shown a striking increase aimed at enhancing the visibility and credibility of the researcher. These changes appear to reflect the influence of the Anglophone academic literacy on the English-medium discourse of Czech linguists; however, they could also have been impacted by changes taking place in Anglophone academic writing conventions, which are characterised by increased informativeness and decreased conveyance of stance and reader engagement (cf. Hyland – Jiang 2016a, 2016b, 2018).

The findings of this study may raise our awareness of the ways in which culture-specific variants of English adapt diverging academic writing traditions in order to enhance L2 academic writers' chances of publishing in a national and international context. Obviously, the results of this study cannot be overgeneralized, as they are limited by the small size of the corpus and the limited number of features included in the research. Nevertheless, I believe that this study has shown the potential of diachronic comparative analysis for exploration of the evolution of English-medium academic discourse in different linguacultural settings and for helping us understand the reasons for the changes that we observe.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

Brno Studies in English (BSE)
https://journals.phil.muni.cz/bse/about, accessed November 2023.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

Linguistica Pragensia
https://linguisticapragensia.ff.cuni.cz/en/about-journal/, accessed November 2023.

Secondary sources

Bennett, K.
2009 "English academic style manuals: A survey", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes 8*, 43-54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.12.003.

Bhatia, V.
1993 *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. Longman. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315844992.

Bondi, M.
2009 "Polyphony in academic discourse: A cross-cultural perspective?" In: E. Suomela-Salmi – F. Dervin (eds.) *Cross-Cultural and Cross-Linguistic Perspectives on Academic Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 83-108. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.193.06bon.
2014 "Changing voices: Authorial voice in abstracts". In: M. Bondi – R. Lorés-Sanz (eds.) *Abstracts in Academic Discourse: Variation and Change*. Bern: Peter Lang, 243-270. https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-0351-0701-2.
2022 "The scientific article: Variation and change in knowledge communication practices". In: C. Hanganu-Bresch et al. (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Scientific Communication*. London: Routledge, 159-169. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003043782.

Busch-Lauer, I.
2000 "Titles in English and German research papers in medicine and linguistics". In: A. Trosborg (ed.) *Analysing Professional Genres*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 77-97. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.74.08bus.

Cheng, S. W. – C. W. Kuo – C. H. Kuo
2012 "Research article titles in applied linguistics". *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 6 (1), A1–A14.

Clyne, M.
1987 "Cultural differences in the organisation of academic texts: English and German", *Journal of Pragmatics 11* (2), 211-247. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(87)90196-2.

Čmejrková, S.
1996 "Academic writing in Czech and in English". In: E. Ventola – A. Mauranen (eds.) *Academic Writing.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 137-152. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.41.11cme.

Čmejrková, S. – F. Daneš
1997 "Academic writing and cultural identity: The case of Czech academic writing". In: A. Duzsak (ed.) *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 40-62. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110821048.41.

Cortes, V.
2013 "The purpose of this study is to: Connecting lexical bundles and moves in research article introductions", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes 12*, 33-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.002.

Cotos, E. – S. Huffman – S. Link
2015 "Furthering and applying move/step constructs: Technology-driven marshalling of Swalesian genre theory for EAP pedagogy", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes 19*, 52-72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.05.004.

Dontcheva-Navratilova, O.
2014 "The changing face of Czech academic discourse". In: K. Bennett (ed.) *The Semiperiphery of Academic Writing*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 39-61. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137351197_3.
2020 "Persuasion in academic discourse: Metadiscourse as a means of persuasion in Anglophone and Czech linguistics and economics research articles". In: O. Dontcheva-Navratilova et al. *Persuasion in Specialised Discourses.* Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 121-158. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-58163-3.
2021 "Engaging with the reader in research articles in English: Variation across disciplines and linguacultural backgrounds", *English for Specific Purposes* 63, 18-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.02.003.

Fløttum, K. –T. Dahl – T. Kinn
2006 *Academic Voices: Across Languages and Disciplines*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Flowerdew, J.
2008 "Scholarly writers who use English as an Additional Language: What can Goffman's '*Stigma*' tell us?", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 7 (2), 77-86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.03.002.

Framework Education Programme for Basic Education
2007 Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic, https://www.msmt.cz/vzdelavani/zakladni-vzdelavani/framework-education-programme-for-basic-education, accessed November 2023.

Gray, B.
2015 *Linguistic Variation in Research Articles*. *When Discipline Tells only Part of the Story.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.71.

Gray, B. – E. Cotos – J. Smith
2020 "Combining rhetorical moves analysis with multi-dimensional analysis: Research writing across discipline". In: U. Römer – V. Cortes – E. Friginal (eds.) *Advanced Corpus-based Research on Academic Writing*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins., 137-168. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.95.06gra.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

Haggan, M.
2004 "Research paper titles in literature, linguistics and science: Dimensions of attractions", *Journal of Pragmatics* 36 (2), 293-317. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(03)00090-0.
Halliday, M. A. K.
1994 *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd edn.). London: Edward Arnold.
Harwood, N.
2005 "'We do not seem to have a theory… The theory I present here attempts to fill this gap': Inclusive and exclusive pronouns in academic writing", *Applied Linguistics 26*, 343-375. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami012.
Hyland, K.
1999 "Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge", *Applied Linguistics* 20 (3), 341-367. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.3.341.
2000 *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
2002 "Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing", *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (8), 1091-1112. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00035-8.
Hyland, K. – F. (K.) Jiang
2016a "Change of attitude? A diachronic study of stance", *Written Communication* 33, 251-274. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088316650399.
2016b "'We must conclude that…': A diachronic study of academic engagement', *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 24, 29-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.09.003.
2017a "Is academic writing becoming more informal?", *English for Specific Purposes* 45, 40-51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.09.001.
2017b "Points of reference: Changing patterns of academic citation", *Applied Linguistics* 40 (1), 64-85. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx012.
2018 "'In this paper we suggest': Changing patterns of disciplinary metadiscourse", *English for Specific Purposes* 51, 18-30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2018.02.001.
Ivanič, R.
1998 *Writing and Identity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Jalilifar, A. R.
2010 "Research article introductions: Sub-disciplinary variation in applied linguistics", *Journal of Teaching Language Skills* 2 (2), 29-55.
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.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

Kilgarriff, A. et al.
2014 "The Sketch Engine: Ten years on", *Lexicography* 1, 7-36.
Kozubíková-Šandová, J.
2019 "Proměny českého akademického diskurzu během posledních padesáti let" [Changing Czech academic discourse in the past 50 years], *ČMF 101,* 54-71. https://doi.org/10.14712/23366591.2019.1.4.
Lafuente-Millán, E.
2014 "Reader engagement across cultures, languages and contexts of publication in business research articles", *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 24 (2), 201-223. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12019.
Li, Z. – J. Xu
2019 "The evolution of research article titles: The case of *Journal of Pragmatics,* 1978-2018", *Scientometrics* 121, 1619-1634. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03244-3.
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.
Lorés-Sanz, R.
2011 "The construction of the author's voice in academic writing: The interplay of cultural and disciplinary factors", *Text & Talk* 31 (2), 173-193. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2011.008.
Mauranen, A. – C. Pérez-Llantada – J. M. Swales
2010 "Academic Englishes: A standardised knowledge?" In: A. Kirkpatrick (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. London/New York: Routledge, 659-676.
Moreno, A. I.
2021 "Selling research in RA discussion sections through English and Spanish: An intercultural rhetoric approach", *English for Specific Purposes* 63, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.02.002.
Mur-Dueñas, P.
2007 "'I/we focus on…': A cross-cultural analysis of self-mentions in business management research articles", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 6, 143-162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2007.05.002.
Pérez-Llantada, C.
2013 "'Glocal' rhetorical practices in academic writing", *European Journal of English Studies* 17 (3), 251-268. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825577.2013.867180.
Sahragard, R. – H. Meihami
2016 "A diachronic study on the information provided by the research titles of applied linguistics journals", *Scientometrics* 108, 1315-1331 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2049-4.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

Samraj, B.
2002 "Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines", *English for specific purposes* 21 (1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00023-5.

Sancho Guinda, C.
2015 "Genres on the move: Currency and erosion of the genre moves construct", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 19, 73-87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.07.001.

Schmied, J.
2011 "Academic writing in Europe: A survey of approaches and problems". In: J. Schmied (ed.) *Academic Writing in Europe: Empirical Perspectives*. Göttingen: Cuvillier Verlag, 1-22.
2015 "Graduate writing in Europe in comparison: A research-based approach to metalanguage and genre". In: J. Schmied (ed.) *Academic Writing for South Eastern Europe: Practical and Theoretical Perspectives*. Göttingen: Cuvillier Verlag. 1-24.

Shaw, P. – I. Vassileva
2009 "Co-evolving academic rhetoric across culture; Britain, Bulgaria, Denmark, Germany in the 20th century", *Journal of Pragmatics* 41 (2), 290-305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.07.009.

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

Šinkūnienė, J.
2018 "The power of English: I and we in Lithuanian, Lithuanian English and British English research writing". In: P. Mur-Dueñas – J. Šinkūnienė (eds.) *Intercultural Perspectives on Research Writing.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 15-37. https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.18.03sin.

Starfield, S. – J. Ravelli
2009 "'The writing of this thesis was a process that I could not explore with the positivistic detachment of the classical sociologist': Self and structure in New Humanities research theses", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 5, 222-243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2006.07.004.

Swales, J. M.
1990 *Genre analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1997 "English as *Tyrannosaurus rex*", *World Englishes* 16 (3), 373-382. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00071.
2004 *Research Genres. Explorations and Applications.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524827.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.

Swales, J. – C. B. Feak
1994 *Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.2173936.
Tang, R. – S. John
1999 "The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun", *English for Specific Purposes* 18, 23-39. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00009-5.
Tardy, C.
2004 "The role of English in scientific communication: *Lingua franca* or *Tyrannosaurus rex*?", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 3, 247-269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2003.10.001.
Thewell, M. – A. Bas-Bleda
2020 "How common are explicit research questions in journal articles?", *Quantitative Science Studies* 1 (2), 730-748.
Thompson, G.
2001 "Interaction in academic writing: Learning to argue with the reader", *Applied Linguistics* 22 (1), 58-78. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.1.58.
Thompson, G. – P. Thetela
1995 "The sound of one hand clapping: The management of interaction in written discourse", *Text & Talk* 15, 103-127.
Vassileva, I.
1998 "Who am I/who are we in academic writing?" *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 8 (2), 163-192. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.1998.tb00128.x.
Xiang, X. – J. Li
2020 "A diachronic comparative study of research article titles in linguistics and literature journals", *Scientometrics* 122, 847-866. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03329-z.
Yang, R. – D. Allison
2004 "Research articles in applied linguistics: Structures from a functional perspective", *English for Specific Purposes* 23, 264-279. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(03)00005-X.
Yakhontova, T.
2006 "Cultural and disciplinary variation in academic discourse: The issue of influencing factors", *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 5, 153-167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2006.03.002.

Address: OLGA DONTCHEVA-NAVRATILOVA, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Education, Masaryk University, Poříčí 9, Brno 602 00, Czech Republic. navratilova@ped.muni.cz.
ORCID code: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0378-7975.

2023 Jan Kochanowski University Press. All rights reserved.