Appendix 2. Extract 1 from the ENEIDA Interview (Phase 2)

This appendix consists of the selected questions from the ENEIDA Interview (Phase 2) on which Moreno's (2022) study was based. The interview was held by email among a sample of the authors of the Social Science (SSC) component of research articles in the EXEMPRAES Corpus, whose Discussion and/or Closing sections the author analysed. The same interview was carried out in English or in Spanish depending on the language of publication of the article. The selected questions (in English) were the following:

ENEIDA Interview (Phase 2)

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

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

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

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

PREFERENCES ABOUT MANAGING *LIMITATIONS* IN ERA DC SECTIONS

1. Please rate the following reasons for stating *Limitations* in a DC section according to the following scale:

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

    A. To prevent readers from over-generalizing your findings. _____
    B. To warn the readers about what cannot be concluded from your findings. _____
    C. To create a niche for suggestions of future research. _____
    D. To display your expertise by showing your awareness of the shortcomings of your own study. _____
    E. To promote your work indirectly by enhancing the credibility of your own contribution. _____
    F. To anticipate potential criticism and ward off criticism. _____
    G. Other (specify) _____

2. Please rate the following reasons for *not* stating or *not* stating *more Limitations* than you would have liked in a DC section, using the following scale:

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

   A. Because you have already mentioned them in another section of the article. _____
   B. Because the anticipated reader would be more interested in the application of your results at this stage. _____
   C. Because you believe your study is excellent. _____
   D. Due to space limitations. _____
   E. Because the anticipated reader would not understand the intricacies of your study. _____
   F. In order not to detract more from the value or contribution of your study. _____
   G. Other (specify) _____

[...]

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION

[...]

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

[...]

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

[...]

23. Disciplinary field: _____

[...]

EXPERIENCES WRITING AND LEARNING TO WRITE THE SELECTED RESEARCH ARTICLE

[...]

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

Note: This interview should be cited as follows:

Moreno, Ana 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*. Volume 10 (2), Appendix 2.