

Text Recycling: Views of North American Journal Editors from an Interview-Based Study

Michael Pemberton
Georgia Southern University
ORCID ID 0000-0002-8860-273X
Susanne Hall
California Institute of Technology
ORCID ID 0000-0003-3066-1937
Cary Moskovitz
Duke University
ORCID ID 0000-0001-5324-2407
Chris M. Anson
North Carolina State University
ORCID ID 0000-0002-9799-3111

Supplementary Materials

Appendix 1

Phase 1, Part 2 Interview protocol

Sample:

Targeting 24 participants from across humanities, social sciences, and STEM who took our original survey

Research questions:

- What attitudes, values, and beliefs influence decisions about whether and under what conditions text recycling is considered to be acceptable or unacceptable?
- How strongly held are these beliefs?

Interview protocol

Introduction to interview:

- Use audio and video for introductions
- Greet interviewee, thank them for participating
- Confirm interviewee is a current editor or associate editor of a journal
- REMIND: de-identified; not chosen for participation because of past practices
- If subject indicates a willingness to consent, begin recording
- Terminate video and begin audio-only recording, and let subject know we are recording
- Make sure interviewee is identified here and going forward using number assigned in 'Journal editor interviewees_master spreadsheet'
- Get subject to confirm consent on recording
- Provide an overview of the summary's 5 parts:
 - Part 1: Personal experiences with text recycling
 - Part 2: Editorial experiences with text recycling
 - Part 3: Exploring text recycling variables in the context of journal editing/reviewing
 - Part 4: Final questions about beliefs about text recycling
 - Part 5: Collect demographic information

Part 0: Definition of text recycling

- Read aloud **HANDOUT 1: Definition** [separate doc]
- Ask if the subject feels they understand the concept well enough to answer some questions about it. [Answer questions about definition but avoid starting active discussion of acceptability of TR at this phase.]

Part 1: Personal experiences with text recycling

Later in this conversation, we'll talk with you about how you think of text recycling in your work as a journal editor or editorial board member. But to start, we want to know about your own experiences with text recycling as a writer.

1. Are there any situations you can think of when you have recycled writing from one of your previously written documents into a new one? This might include, for example, recycling material [refer to **HANDOUT 2: Examples of situations...**]
 - a. IF NEEDED: What motivated you to recycle in each situation?
 - b. Were your motivations for recycling the same across these contexts—or different for some?
2. Have there been times when you considered recycling text but decided not to do so—either because you felt it might be inappropriate, or because it might be perceived by others as inappropriate or otherwise problematic? If so, can you describe one such situation and your reasoning or concerns?
3. Now that you've thought a bit about your own experience with text recycling, can you articulate the principles that govern when you would or wouldn't recycle text as an author?

Note to interviewers: If/when the subject raises the idea of **rewording or rewriting text rather than recycling it**, follow up on that idea with the following questions. (This may occur during any of the parts of the interview.)

You say that in situation X authors should rewrite prose in different words rather than recycle.

- What would you say is the goal of rewriting prose? How might you explain this to someone new to your field?
- What kind of rewriting would you want? Could you describe how an author should go about such rewriting? For example, authors could 'rewrite' their prose by rearranging sentences or clauses, by replacing words with synonyms, or by trying to generate new, similar sentences without direct reference to the existing sentences.
- What's 'enough' change—and why?

Part 2: Editorial experiences with text recycling

We've been discussing your experience with text recycling as an author. Now, we want to ask you about whether you have actual experiences at your current journal related to text recycling.

- For how many journals have you served as editor, whether associate editor, editor, or editor-in-chief, during your career?
- Approximately how many total years have you served as editor (inclusive of associate editor, editor, editor-in-chief)?
- How many journals do you currently edit, and what is your role within the editorial structure of each? (If needed: Do you have final decision-making power or not?)
- Have you served on editorial boards for journals where you were not also an editor or associate editor? If so, how many?

1. First, tell us about your own experiences dealing with recycling in submitted manuscripts to this journal:
 - a. Have you ever dealt with text recycling in your role with this journal? If so, can you recall any especially challenging or surprising situations?
 - b. If you have dealt with text recycling on multiple occasions, what is the most common situation—and how do you deal with it?
 - c. Is there a particular experience that shaped your beliefs or practices?
2. We want to understand how your journal handles text recycling as a matter of policy.
 - a. Has your editorial board discussed journal policy regarding text recycling? Does the journal have a written policy about text recycling? If so, can you describe it?
 - b. Does this journal use Ithenticate, Cross-Check, or other plagiarism detection software? If so, has this affected how your journal handles text recycling?

Part 3: Journal context, exploring TR variables

We have been talking about your past experiences with text recycling as an author and editor/reviewer. Now, we wish to get your thoughts on specific factors that may affect one's sense of whether text recycling is appropriate in different situations.

As a context for this next set of questions, imagine that your journal has received an article submission that you are to review. The article makes what you think is an original and valuable contribution to the field. However, you discover it contains some recycled text. You have to make a decision about whether to respond about that recycling—and if so, how.

1. **First, let's talk about the amount of recycled material.** Text recycling can be as little as a clause, as long as a paragraph, or more. **[refer to HANDOUT 3: AMOUNT]**
How might the **amount** of recycled text affect whether and how you would respond to this submission? (Remember that you believe that the article is worthy of publication based on its original content.)
2. Recycled material might appear in different **locations** or sections of a paper. Recycled material can also have different **rhetorical purposes**. **[refer to HANDOUT 4: PURPOSES]**
How might the **location or rhetorical purpose of the recycling** affect whether and how you would respond to this submission??
3. Academic writers compose many kinds of texts that can be the **source** of subsequent recycling. For example, an author might recycle material from sources such as ... **[refer to HANDOUT 5: SOURCES]**
How might the **source** of recycled text affect whether and how you would respond to this submission?
4. **Authorship** can also affect opinions about whether text recycling is appropriate when the source or new texts are not simply single-authored texts by the same author. Remember that text recycling refers to reusing 'one's own' work—but what counts as 'one's own' is less straightforward for multiple-authored work. How might the **authorship** affect whether and how you would respond to this submission? **[refer to HANDOUT 6: AUTHORSHIP]:**
Does it matter if the documents come out of the same research group, as opposed to being the result of an ad hoc collaboration of individual scholars?
5. **Let's talk about citation:** How might the **citation** of recycled text affect whether and how you would respond to this submission?
 - a. *If yes:* Does this depend on the amount of recycled material, or on the type of source?

- b. *If yes*: Does it matter where and how the source work is cited? For example, say that the source is cited in the Introduction as part of the review of prior work—but that a paragraph of recycled material from the source appears much later in the paper without additional citation?
6. **Now let's talk for a moment about issues of copyright.** How might the **issue of copyright** affect whether and how you would respond to this submission?
[Follow-up if needed: For example, recycled text may be taken from a published source that is under copyright. How would that affect your reaction to the recycling of text?]
7. We have just discussed a number of variables that might affect your response to text recycling in an article submitted to this journal? **How do you think your stated opinions about text recycling compare** to others working for this journal, or to those working for other journals in your field?

Part 4: Final questions on beliefs about TR

1. We've talked in details about a number of variables that may affect your responses to text recycling as an editor or editorial board member. We have some final questions that will ask you to summarize your thoughts about text recycling.
 - a. As a gatekeeper in the field, how would you explain the ethics and appropriate practices of TR in your field to new scholars entering the field?
 - b. Are there current attitudes, policies, and practices regarding TR in your field that think ought to be changed or handled differently than they are? Why?
2. Have your views on text recycling changed as a result of doing this interview? If so, how?

Part 5: Collect demographic data

Go through final demographic questions. [refer to **HANDOUT 7: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA**]

Interview is complete. Thank subject for participating.

Fill in demographic and other details in 'Journal editor interviewees_master spreadsheet' and put audio file in 'Interview Recordings' folder in Box

Statement of Informed Consent

Participants who opted to take part in the survey were asked to provide their names and contact details for follow-up questions, but access to all personal data was restricted to the investigating team and was removed before analysis of the results.