Index Terms: Manifestations of Key-Word Terms in ELT Research Publications: Are We Not Tuned to Genuine, Art-based Qualitative Lines of Inquiry Yet?*

Marjan Vosoughi (corresponding author) ***
Assistant Professor, English Dept., Sabzevar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sabzevar, Iran.

Zohreh Nafissi**
Associate Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Literature, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran.

Abstract

Stated key words after the abstract section in research articles are among those lines of inquiry which have received less attention in Applied Linguists (AL) studies. In this paper, the researcher explored the distribution of stated key terms and expressions as used by 73 researchers in AL domains in both local (NOORMAGZ) and global database publishers (SAGE, ELSEVIRE, SCIENCE DIRECT) Those Scimago journal lists, which were abstracted in Thomson Reuters Web of Science [WoS] journals were precisely screened in terms of their compatibility with title vs. topic match index as well as their position in the research articles throughout the whole sampled research papers including Introduction, Review of Literature, Method, Results & Discussion (IRMRD) to explore authors' tendencies towards art-based utilization of key word selection/assignment for research writing aims. The results over title-topic match indicated that at least one or two stated key words significantly appeared in the title of research paper within both local and global databases with the higher preference for keyword-title match among Iranian researchers. Regarding the most probable positions in the sampled research articles, gained data in this research could not significantly show any differences between local and global researchers. Possible implications were discussed in the light of critical, art-based approaches for key word elaboration/explanation in English Language Teaching (ELT) and AL research.

Introduction

In writing an academic paper, distinct stated key words as lexical units (Bigi & Morasso, 2012) after the abstract section have received less attention in research studies pertained to Applied Linguistics (AL) and English Language Teaching (ELT) via discourse analytic lenses (Babaii & Taase, 2013).

Writers use keywords/index terms mostly to introduce the nucleus of their study, which usually stand out as instantiations for well-known working models in a specific field of study on the one hand and the essence/core of their research on the other. In academic contexts, such terms and expressions, otherwise known as 'keywords' are defined as descriptors that 'capture the essence of the topic of the document' (Howcroft, 2007, p.75). In many cases, researchers include these terms as related topics, which act as an upshot showing the fundamental messages of their research in each case.

By differentiating academic vs. general search, reliance on stated key words confirm the essential processes that researchers have to go through to find apt data and evidence in different academic disciplines (Raamkumar, Foo & Pang, 2017). In effect, other researchers who mainly base their search for finding relevant information to their studies on such stated keywords can easily find their intended sources (Bartoli, 2018). This mostly used strategy otherwise termed as 'teleporting' by Teevan, Alvarado, Ackerman and Karger (2004; as cited in Babaii, & Taase, 2013) also does good for the researchers whose studies are found based on key word search strategy by others since their citation might in effect improve.

In ELT and Testing domains, varied terms within a long time span have appeared and then disappeared or replaced with newer terminologies such as "Language Skills" (Reading, writing, Speaking, Listening) vs. "Subskills" denoting the so-called Vocabulary, Grammar, Pronunciation (Chastain, 1971), Approach, Method and Technique" (Richards & Rodgers. 1991), "Task vs. Activity" (Prabhu, 1987), "Language Functions vs. Language Goals" Halliday (1975), "Acquisition, vs. Learning" (Ellis, 1990, 2001; Krashen, 1986),

"Competence vs. Performance" (Chomsky, 1975), and some newer varieties such as "FonF vs. Fonfs" denoting Focus on Form vs. Focus on forms (Ellis, 2001), Narrative Testing (Cain, 2003), Teacher Agency (Biesta, Priestley & Robinson, 2015), Intercultural Competence (Byram, Nichols & Stevens, 2001) etc. which also abound in the ELT literature and are used interchangeably by various authors/writers (Tomlinson & Quinton, 2019). In addition, for the latter case, also within testing domains, as another subdivision of expertise in ELT, recent terminologies such as "Assessment" and "Portfolio Assessment" are suggested to be replaced with other older terms such as "Testing" and "Points/Scores" respectively (Fulcher & Davidson, 2007).

The argument here is that in line with Socio-Cultural trends in language teaching and research (Vygotsky, 1987), the processes of meaning making through key word selection by both authors and readers if conceivably be resided in the existing theories by referring to some well-known key terms only, the outcome might not be agreeable by the recent experts in art-based, qualitative lines of inquiry in Language Education arenas (Barone & Eisner, 2011; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 2007; Leavy, 2015; Whissell, 2012, etc.).

Here, the researcher explored the distribution and manifestations of stated key terms and expressions within some sampled research articles in AL, which local and global writers/researchers used. The aim was to reveal AL researchers' tendencies towards art-based utilization as to key word selection/assignment for research articles.

Then, this research was projected to screen the lexical development practices that occur through selecting key terms by authors within academic research articles in ELT and AL domains. Explicitly, in this paper, the present author then decided to take notice of key word assignment by the Iranian and international scholars in AL and ELT domains and critically designate by way of recent critical/reflective approaches (Canagarajah, 1999; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 2007) to push relevant arguments and case events against unification of keywords in AL sub/disciplines. Before joining the measures taken in this respect, a brief review of the related literature is provided.

Background of the Study

With respect to reputable uses of keywords by researchers, proponents of positivistic views (Hinkel, 1999) seem to focus on how using well-known keywords might typically allow their readers to judge whether or not a certain article covers materials, which are relevant to their interests and confidently provide readers with appropriate terms/words to search in the web or help indexers/editors classify together related materials through those specific cloud formation of key word tags in different disciplines (Figure 1).

Figure 1

An Image of Keywords Cloud Representation within Local Journal

Such measures denote and support the efforts by some genre scholars like Swales (2004, 2005), Paltridge and Starfield (2013) etc. to construct a framework for research articles (RAs), and it is termed as' Create-a-Research-Space (CARS) models within academic writing approaches. In recent times, people's understanding over diverse phenomena within Arts and Humanities have been focused upon by miscellaneous researchers to reexamine their new approaches in writing and publication (Engels, Ossenblok, & Spruyt, 2012), check their impact on research world press (Levitt, Celia, Diepeveen, Chonaill, Rabinovich & Tiessen, 2010) and see how they can break through new changes in expressing their stance in academic settings (Williams, Stevenson, Nicholas, Watkinson, & Rowlands, 2009).

In line with recent art-based approaches, then there have appeared some brand new accounts within qualitative research inquiries (Barone

& Eisner, 2011; Leavy, 2015) to join expressive dialogues between art, aesthetics and language related matters. Ryan (2014) is a case in point. Through linking art with literacy, Ryan asserted that:

…The arts are powerful spaces to interrogate how our own personal understandings are mediated by contexts of schooling, curriculum and sometimes by hegemonic views of the world – important considerations in becoming literate in a rapidly changing, globalized world. (p.5)

Here, as discursively stated by the author, the role of language to express thinking lines by any one writer gets penitent since it is initially originated from previous hegemonies in the current and contemporary contexts for each writer/author/researcher and reworded for the aims of literacy attainment. However, as she continued, in the process of becoming literate, writers' verification of issues- text rituals, dynamics and structures- is quite personal and they cannot separate their own feelings, opinions and cultural values in any piece of writing they produce.

Consistent with such art-based, qualitative research inquiries, one important axiom is to eradicate ambiguities in expressing terms and ideas. A large number of other existing studies in the broader literature have lately examined this issue on Aesthetics and how this might influence human's thought-making processes. Thorgersen (2014), focusing on outcome-based curriculum and learning, asserted that "*Educational science has not considered knowledge to comprise a set of objects for a very long time*" (p. 19). Instead, setting fixed objects and tools for studying complex relations within human beings could be explored through a constantly updated system of education that let students prepare for the society via any media and or multimodality discourses (Tomlinson, & Quinton, 2019).

In Craig's and Porter's study (2014), it became evident that by bringing arts-based approach to multimodal and multilingual literacies, authors concluded that their South Korean English learners had found a new window to practice critical thinking via transgressive expression

(Duncum, 2009) and counter-literacies (Pennycook, 2010). In their innovative programs for writing courses, students were not required to cling to set phrases but as Swann and Maybin (2007) had already offered, creativity and language were merged to require students to produce novel phrases for describing cases and events in their surrounding world. Such newly produced terms/expressions were then recurrently re/contextualised and re-formed by the local students in particular situations creatively. By this, they had presented some stress-free pathways towards some languaging events that had prolonged other possible ways for them to engage with texts rather than be mere critical/reflective critiques.

Schemit (2005) provoked a sense of writer's novel uses of metaphor within qualitative research, to designate and represent the interaction between the researcher's ability to appreciate the sense of things in his/her professional world and the rules of the methodology as it is normally acknowledged to be the norms. In academic settings and still influenced by positivistic views over the actual and authentic practices, it seems that such practices might be frown upon by proponents of academic writing approaches even in qualitative strands. It seems that research methodologies, which focus on systematic genre analysis (Bruce, 2008; Hartley, 2008), academic prose (Coxhead & Byrd, 2007), genre-based teaching (Cheng, 2006; Lee, 2012) be also some efforts in this line.

Regarding key word selection/assignment, a quick sift into the related literature showed that in many cases, researchers made an attempt to explore this topic based on visibility on the net instead of finding out the appropriacy in line with socio-historical origin tends for keyword selection/assignment on behalf of research aims. In natural sciences, specificity as a criteria to act within academic, professional discourses via using pre-fabricated terms is a norm however Hartley and Kostoff (2003) listed how even within Humanities, this trend also occurs, though Cleveland & Cleveland (2013) demonstrated that within Humanities as compared with Social Sciences and Engineering, scholars tended to use fewer key words in their online search queries

and asked informants-among their colleagues- for the relevant index terms. They recounted how in psychology journals, for example, authors were suggested to enumerate their key words from a set of APA (American Psychological Association) 5000 terms that appear in the renowned Index Terms. In a recent study by Sajed, Nourmohammadi and Asadi (2016) within Iranian databases, key word density of websites for universities in the Iranian Ministry of Science, Research and Technology (MSRT) was measured along Iranian academic libraries. More dense key words boosted the chances of information retrieval and thus led to more visibility and higher ranks for universities. Fifteen websites were explored and it became clear that except Tehran University which ranked the highest in google searches among Iranian scholars, almost none of the libraries had used appropriate keywords in their websites. Similar results had been found by Mardani and Danesh (2013) within medical library databases.

Within ELT domains, in the few studies that were found within local databases, three criteria were deliberated by Babaiee and Taase (2013) including domain, degree of specificity, and relation to the titles. Their results according to the authors attested to the fact that the substantial rate of title-keywords matching among Iranian scholars with ELT major, especially with respect to field-specific keywords, pointed to the prominence of users' field-specific information and knowledge for locating relevant facts on the web. Equally, Farjami (2013) found a similar result during a corpus-based study within Iranian databases that probed word frequencies for more frequent content words, and abbreviations in the abstract section of journal articles within ELT against the general and academic word lists. The author finally reported that identified words were context-sensitive and pertained to the specialized terminologies within AL (Applied Linguistics) rather than more general written texts.

Some scholars believed that key word selection could be major-specific in which case, in some university disciplines, the focus is on the method rather than topic/title relevance. As an instance, Hughes (2005) reported how authors/researchers in his research brought

keywords in their studies in accordance with different disciplines such as Economics, Management, Psychology, and Education to stipulate their utilized method in the keywords for example experiment, case study, questionnaire, grounded theory, or they might make use of data sources such as primary, secondary, tertiary students, senior citizens, or even locations e.g. country, town, institution etc.

In a recent study by Raghunath (2013), it was explicated how implementing machine-based translation through using set phrases by all researchers could be useful and user-friendly in giving weight to the commonly used phrases, words, codes etc. by the researchers for the scholars in Information Literacy Sciences. Proper translations from source to target languages were to be considered as practical measures to explore frequencies of occurrence for diverse keywords in dissimilar languages, graphical regions, word clusters among other benefits using computer corpora programs.

The study by Bogoslovskaya, Novikova, and Itcenko (2015) could have been of help for the scholars in educational sciences to recognize how even a common word such as "student" mean differently in diverse contexts. In their study, they denoted the possible meanings for the word "STUDENT" in English and Russian and showed though it had appeared in English language much earlier in the 15th century, the semantic description of the word had remained comparatively steady over time between the two contexts. By the same token, Sene-Mongaba's attempt (2015) in building a corpora (Lingua) for linguistic/academic terms in French was another effort in standardization of keywords for a certain discourse. In line with such accounts, other scholars had also proposed newer models in exchange for keyword search strategy, which lacked precision for large databases. Lopez-Veyna, Sosa-Sosa, & Lopez-Arevalo (2014) projected a plan for semantic extraction from some structured and semi-structured data sources which compensated the inadequacies of prior methods for searching in large databases. But it could be said that again such measures were in one way or another in line with reliance on mere word coverage.

Still, there was a large number of scholars, who were in favor of fixed key word searching and index terms for finding relevant data. Boscolo, Bertrando, Fiocco, Palvarini, and Pereira (1995) cited Aristotle and verified how he had introduced "appropriacy" of speeches, to illustrate the changes that a speaker or theorizer in a certain domain of knowledge can have in mind and describe it to the public by using fabricated terms adapting to definite circumstances and certain audiences. This assertion by Aristotle could have encouraged those who were involved in dialogical contexts to consider set rules in their arguments but by the word 'appropriacy', one can also infer that to tailor certain contexts, people might invent brand new declarations that need new terms to be confirmed by the audiences at hand. Some other scholars in favor of such accounts had extensively considered 'keyword utilization' as a strategy for mind organization and concept mapping of the ideas in specific fields (Kane & Trochim, 2007; Hager, Scheiber, & Corbin, 1997) or to improve their analytical skills for finding the relationships between and among related concepts in educational fields of study (Davies, 2011).

Esfandiari (2019) employed an empirical genre-based approach over the introduction chapter of Iranian PhD theses within AL realms to examine how they defined key concepts and approached definitional keywords. He reported a case for non-alphabetic arrangement of the terms in this genre, existence of key terms in the research questions than the title and recurrent uses of indirect quotations by PhD candidates. Having contrasted 'key words' (upright for finding and searching aims) with 'key terms' (suitable for introducing research variables and topic), the author finally interpreted the academic audience to predetermine an obligatory condition for universities to stipulate some fixed rules for PhD students to regularly follow them in their thesis writing.

Keywords, also known as the focal words by Bigi and Morasso (2012), could still play other roles such as carriers of cognitive, implicit premises in argumentative texts. Such an outlook upon the applicability of key words in the minds of communicators of knowledge was similar to the purposes of the present research. After listing some crucial

features of keywords such as acting as tools for knowing the perception of participants in an interaction through verbal interface, showing some clues on the certain context, shared values in that society, embodied with emotive content, group identities, socio-historical periods, etc, the authors revealed that any word can activate just certain goals, which were both text and context-specific.

Ideas on key word selection in research paper were contradictory in the literature, however, in many cases, as records in above-cited this section revealed, the authors' tendency was towards using fixed index terms/key words. In the existing literature, within common local databases focusing on language arenas, the present author could not locate other researches on the topic under questions in this study with an ELT cling to it. Having had this gap in mind, the present author thought this research could prove a suitable ground to initiate talk on this issue and push relevant arguments in this regard.

In line with the purposes of this study, the following questions were consequently suggested:

1) Were sated key words after abstracts compatible with title or general topic of the sampled research articles in ELT domains in the last five years?

2) Was sated key word selection/assignment based on topic/title compatibility significantly different among Iranian vs. International researchers in ELT domains?

3) Were keywords significantly disparate in the body of the published research papers in ELT domains?

4) Were keywords significantly disparate in the body of the ELT published research papers among Iranian vs. International researchers?

Method
Documentation
In line with the aims of this study to partially reveal the realities of key word assignment by AL scholars/researchers in writing their research

articles in English, the author initially made recourse to both local and global research databases.

Within local research websites, the author picked out Noormagz as an eminent and largest database for articles that included and integrated Islamic sciences and Humanities within which articles related to AL studies could easily be found under the theme lists termed as Literature and Languages. This website categorizes published research articles on diverse disciplines in Humanities including Jurisprudence, Psychology, Law, History, Geography, Education, etc. In Noormagz website, within research journals related to Literature and Languages category, there existed 216 categorized lists covering journals, which included different language departments such as Persian, French, English, German, and Arabic and their entries could be retried through five strategies (by title, category, author, scientific rank and publisher). Initially, peer-reviewed research articles were retrieved by *scientific rank* strategy, which gave rise to 736 and 101 titles within Science-Research and Scientific-Prograrive ranks respectively. Then, within Science-Research- journals, those which were published in English language were spotted which included 29 titles, within which the journals on AL and ELT issues (No=9) were spotted. The listed journals, which were finally sampled have alphabetically been displayed in table 1 below.

Table 1
Sampled Journals on ELT and Applied Linguistics within Local Databases

No.	Journal Title	Publication frequency	Publisher	Journal Web Address	Latest Released Issue
1	Applied Language Studies	Quarterly	Sistan and Baluchestan University	http://ijals.usb.ac.ir	2019

2	Applied Linguistics[1]	Biannual	Azad Tabriz University	http://jal.iaut.ac.ir	2018
3	Applied Linguistics	Biannual	Kharazmi University	https://ijal.khu.ac.ir	2018
4	Applied Research on English	Biannual	Isfahan university	http://are.ui.ac.ir	2020
5	Issues in Language Teaching	Biannual	Allameh Tabatabaie University	http://ilt.atu.ac.ir/	2018
6	Journal of Language and Translation	Quarterly	Islamic Azad university, Tehran-South branch	http://ttlt.azad.ac.ir	2019
7	Research in Applied Linguistics	Biannually	Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz	http://rals.scu.ac.ir	2019
8	Teaching English Language	Biannual	the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology, TELLSI (i.e., Teaching	http://www.teljournal.org	2020

			English Language and Literature Society of Iran)		
9	Teaching Language Skills	Quarterly	Shiraz university	http://jtls.shirazu.ac.ir	2020

For the journal articles within global research databases, titles indexed in ISI (International Scientific Indexing), from peered reviewed databases were chosen alphabetically from Scimago journal list abstracted in Thomson Reuters Web of Science (WoS) journals. Within Scimag website[2], categories could be retrieved by *subject*, *region*, *type* and *year*. There, provided lists of periodicals in the Arts and Humanities Citation Index within Language and Linguistics subject were chosen in *All regions* and Journals within *by type* drop list, which denoted other categories such as book series, conference proceedings and trade journals were excluded. The initial search by above-cited criteria gave rise to a total number of 452 entries in 2018, from which the first 9 titles were chosen to match the alphabetical list in the local databases. Table 2 demonstrates the selected journal lists in the second group. Alphabetical listing was used in this study to ensure complete impartiality of the author/researcher with regard to journal titles.

Table 2

Sampled Journals on ELT and Applied Linguistics within Global Databases

No.	Journal Title	Publisher	Coverage	Journal Website Address	Latest Issue
1	Annual Review of Applied Linguistics	Cambridge University Press	2005 ongoing	www.cambridge.org/core/journals/annual-review-of-	March, 2019

				applied-linguistics	
2	Journal of Memory and Language	Elsevier Inc.	1985-ongoing	https://ees.elsevier.com/jml/	June, 2020
3	Communication theory	Wiley-Blackwell	1991-ongoing	https://academic.oup.com/ct	February, 2020
4	Modern Language Journal	Wiley-Blackwell	1916-1996, 1998-2001, 2005-ongoing	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/15404781	February, 2019
5	Cognition	Elsevier BV	1972-1974, 1976-ongoing	https://www.journals.elsevier.com/cognition/	June, 2020
6	Journal of Communication	Wiley-Blackwell	1951-ongoing	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/14602466	Dec, 2017
7	Journal of second Language writing	Elsevier Ltd.	992-ongoing	https://www.journals.elsevier.com/journal-of-second-language-writing	March, 2020
8	Language Teaching Research	Sage	1997-ongoing	https://journals.sagepub.com/home/ltr	January, 2020
9	TESOL Quarterly	Wiley-Blackwell	1981-ongoing	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/loi/15457249	February, 2020

It needs to be mentioned that for more convenience, in the international sets, through open access refinement keys on their website pages, only open access articles that could be downloaded without charge were considered from the sampled journals that welcomed and supported open access policy. Therefore, the author had to go further back in the previous issues to complete pooling free of charge articles. For those journals in which, the author had to go back far beyond defined range of 2015 to 2020, the number of articles was reduced to less than six paper. Furthermore, in the pooled journals, there existed some which had not required authors to provide key terms in their article i.e., Applied Linguists from Oxford University Press and TESOL Quarterly from Wiley-Blackwell. These journals were either omitted or replaced with other journals down further in the retrieved list.

Also, for controlling the effect of norms applied by journal editors in both local and global contexts, selection from diverse international and in-house university and publishers was ensured to eradicate policy impacts. Finally, seventy three full-length research articles from the local (no= 36) and global (no=37) research articles that met the determined criteria for this research were chosen and itemized for final appraisals through content analysis procedures via MAXQDA, version 12 pro.

Procedures

For the aims of this research, the two last issues of each journal in both local and global sets were chosen as the final datasets and their published research articles went under thorough content analysis. Initially, for practicality reasons, from each sampled issue, six articles were randomly chosen from the first, middle and last pages of the sampled issues as the ultimate datasets, which finally totaled 108 research paper in all.

Within international/global sets of articles, selection first had to be made based on the type of published paper since diversities for article type were more than local databases. For instance, empirical, review articles, annotated bibliographies, letter to the editor, commentaries, short report and position paper were excluded and the focus was put

over full research papers only. Within global databases, there were also some articles termed as "Erratum" or "Corrigendum", in which corrections by the authors whose previous publications had problems were observed in the list. Such articles were not also considered since they were nor original and did not provide key terms. According to the aims of the present study on analyzing the keywords, only original, full-length empirical articles, which incorporated key terms after their abstract and itemized the four sections of their research as (Introduction, Literature Review, Method, Results, & Discussion) (IRMRD) were then considered final sampling. Conclusion segment was measured within discussion sections. Due to some indistinct boundaries in some research articles between the introduction and review of literature esp. among global scholars as well as results and discussion parts, the counts/hits for Introduction and Review were merged in the table. Also, the Method, Results, Discussion and Conclusion sections were considered as a unified element in calculations. The occurrence of key terms in Tables and Figures as well as appendices were disregarded due to repeated verbatim that was habitually followed for some key terms that were among the least frequent words in the body of the text but stated only within e.g. abstracts or references. Admittedly, then article sections were divided into two major parts namely "Introduction & Literature Review" and "Results & Discussion". In the analyzed research articles, marking and counting the hits were initially conducted in Maxqda Ver. 12.3 and the related inferential tests were conducted through SPSS tables. Figure 2 shows one sample image of the retrieved hits in Maxqda.

Table 1

Sample experimental stimuli for Experiment 1. For this set of items, the two response options were the singular and plural forms of the verb *ignore* (i.e., arhamarh-ec' 'ignore-AOR.3.SG' and arhamarh-ec'-in 'ignore-AOR.3-PL', respectively). SG = singular, PL = plural, NOM = nominative, ACC = accusative, DEF = definite, AOR = aorist.

case match, singular attractor	Nkarič-∅-ë, Painter-SG.NOM-DEF	or-i-n that-SG.ACC-DEF	k'andakagorç-∅-ë sculptor-SG.NOM-DEF
case match, plural attractor	Nkarič-**ner**-ë, Painter-PL.NOM-DEF	or-onc' that-PL.ACC	k'andakagorç-∅-ë sculptor-SG.NOM-DEF
case mismatch, singular attractor	Nkarč-i-n, Painter-SG.ACC-def	or-i-n that-SG.ACC-DEF	k'andakagorç-∅-ë sculptor-SG.NOM-DEF
case mismatch, plural attractor	Nkarič-**ner**-i-n, Painter-PL.ACC-DEF	or-onc' that-PL.ACC	k'andakagorç-∅-ë sculptor-SG.NOM-DEF

'The painter(s) that the sculptor…'

5

Figure 2

A Scanned Image of A Table Having A Verbatim For A Stated Key Term in Paper No.5 (International Set)

This criteria was considered to ensure valid and balanced measurement for the datasets all the same. The other reason was that in some research articles, the number of figures and tables were imbalanced or the same key terms on a certain page were explicated in the footnotes section and this might skew the results for some of the most frequent key terms in a research article for no good reason. Also, in the listed key terms, there were occasionally some cognates such as "numerical cognition" (paper no.4, in the international set) or "Bayesian data analysis" (paper no. 2, in the international set), which had no frequency of occurrence as a complete cognate (whole words) but their first part of the word had a high frequency of occurrence. These words were also omitted from the final analysis and only stated key terms having at least 1 frequency of occurrence in the specified sections above were considered in the final analysis. Also, there were some of the least frequently stated key terms that only occurred in the excluded sections in this study such as the reference section; for example, the word ' prosody' (paper no.1, in the international set). In such cases, the other least frequently stated key word with a higher frequency items in the upper lists were replaced.

Search engine in Maxqda lexical search was also not sensitive to the capital or small letter of the intended words, so a simple search of the words gave rise to correct calculation in the data analysis stages. Moreover, if any sought key word was found in the author's affiliation lines, like for example the time a key word such as 'fear' had been cited as '*Section on Neurobiology of Fear and Anxiety*' (paper no.9 in the international set), this was noted and excluded from final analysis. This was also done concerning final notes, appendices and acknowledgements. Conversely, there were overlaps for some the most frequently stated key terms, in which parts of the cognates was within other key words. For example in paper no. 26 within international set, there was a key word titled "digital multimodal composing", from which the words "multimodal" and "composing" were also repeated in another key word as "multimodal composing" without the word "digital". In such cases, these were counted as one hit only.

Through 'extended lexical search' tab capability within Maxdqa, fitting retrieved keywords were first listed alphabetically and the least and most frequently stated key terms were counted and controlled with above-cited criteria for each article as seen in one analyzed sample below (Figure 3). In this way, the most and the least frequent words were automatically listed in the first rows and the last rows. This ensured a correct and efficient retrieval in the datasets.

ANY: Numerical cognition
Modified numerals

250 hits in 1 documents and 1 document group

Document	Search string	Begin	Preview	End
global\14. scalar bounds	Approximate	1: 408	Rounding APPROXIMATE number system ABSTRACT Speakers routinely	1: 418
global\14. scalar bounds	cognition	1: 348	Numerical COGNITION Modified numerals Mental number line Rounding	1: 356
global\14. scalar bounds	cognition	13: 4719	system underlying number COGNITION involving uncertainty about exact	13: 4727
global\14. scalar bounds	cognition	14: 5535	and pragmatics language, COGNITION, and mind (pp. 25–42). Cham:	14: 5543
global\14. scalar bounds	cognition	14: 7176	foundations of higher COGNITION: Attention and perfor- mance (pp.	14: 7184
global\14. scalar bounds	cognition	14: 8295	Bayesian models of COGNITION. In R. Sun (Ed.). Cambridge handbook of	14: 8303
global\14. scalar bounds	cognition	15: 37	COGNITION.2007.06.004. Jansen, C. J. M., & Pollmann, M. M. W. (2001)	15: 45
global\14. scalar bounds	line	1: 392	Mental number LINE Rounding Approximate number system ABSTRACT	1: 395
global\14. scalar bounds	line	2: 1690	sequence of dividing the number LINE into equisized sections (e.g.,	2: 1693
global\14. scalar bounds	line	3: 4715	Dashed LINE (left) shows objective prior for movie runtimes based on	3: 4718
global\14. scalar bounds	line	7: 828	are located on the number LINE (x-axis) and how frequent particular p	7: 831
global\14. scalar bounds	line	7: 950	4, c is marked by a gray LINE along the number line on the x-axis; p	7: 953
global\14. scalar bounds	line	7: 973	a gray line along the number LINE on the x-axis; p estimates for when	7: 976
global\14. scalar bounds	line	7: 1083	plotted to the left of the gray LINE, p estimates for when they saw	7: 1086
global\14. scalar bounds	line	7: 3350	are located along the number LINE (x-axis) and how frequent they are	7: 3353
global\14. scalar bounds	line	8: 3253	steps along the number LINE. Table 5 shows that as we go through	8: 3256
global\14. scalar bounds	line	9: 191	points on the mental number LINE (e.g., 50, 100, 150, 175, 200, 225,	9: 194
global\14. scalar bounds	line	11: 3351	reference points on the number LINE. As the absolute magnitude of a	11: 3354
global\14. scalar bounds	line	13: 5143	indicated by a red horizontal LINE. Table 10 Shifts in boundary	13: 5146
global\14. scalar bounds	line	14: 9116	Calibrating the mental number LINE. Cognition, 106, C. Hesse and A.	14: 9119
global\14. scalar bounds	Mental	1: 378	MENTAL number line Rounding Approximate number system ABSTRACT	1: 383

Figure 3

A Scanned Image of the Retrieved Page for Paper no. 14. in the International Set

Results

After going through arrangement and classification of the listed research articles within local and global databases, descriptive reports and inferential statistics were initially prepared after content analysis for tallying the spotted keywords throughout the whole paper and data were prepared to find partial responses to the research questions under study.

Response to Research Question no. 1: Were Sated Key Words after Abstracts Compatible with Title or General Topic of the Sampled Research Articles in ELT Domains?

In response to this first question, the main intention was to clarify to what extent, the key words that were explicitly brought by the authors/researchers after the abstract were also explicitly mentioned in the title of their work. This was carried out through not tallying the number of stated key word spots/hits in keyword section and title only. Titles were explored in verbatim in the first stage and if one single key word was also overtly cited- mostly having the same form- in the title,

this was noted and documented as positive-yes record for title match. On the other hand, if this was not the case, it was recognized as negative -no record- and keyword match with topic was instead registered during data analysis procedures. Table 3 has summarized descriptive statistics for the data at this stage.

Table 3

Title/Topic Match Compatibility Records for the Sampled Research Articles in both Local and Global Databases

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	55	75.3	75.3	75.3
	No	18	24.7	24.7	100.0
	Total	73	100.0	100.0	

As seen in table 3, of the 73 sampled research articles, the majority of authors (55, 75.3%) had used at least one of their stated key words in the title. On the other hand, with regard to topic similarity, the no records were tallied and the results showed that only 24.7% among hits belonged to research articles in which the topic deliberation was on subject matching only. In the second stage, another attempt was made to identify any differences between and among local and global databases.

Response to Research Question no. 2: Was sated key word selection/assignment based on topic/title compatibility significantly different among Iranian vs. International researchers in ELT domains?

In the second step and in line with the second research question, an attempt was made to differentiate local with international (global) research paper in ELT and AP sub/disciplines. Table 4 below initially recaps the data, this time for a cross/tabulation of local vs. global research articles.

Table 4

A Cross Tabulation over Venue Type Versus Title Compatibility

Venue Type/ Title Compatibility	Positive Records	Negative Records	Total
Global	24 (64.9%)	13 (35.1%)	37
Local	31(86.1%)	5(13.9%)	36
Total	55 (75.3%)	18 (24.7%)	73

The findings on descriptive statistics, as shown in table 4, detailed that in all, within both local (86.1%) and global (64.9%) databases, the extent of title match for yes records was more than negative hits. However, among local authors, such a difference was sharply more conspicuous. In order to see if the observed differences in all four cells was significant or not, a Chi-square test in SPSS was run (Table 5).

Table 5

Chi-Square Tests for Title Compatibility as to Venue Type (local vs. Global)

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	Point Probability
Pearson Chi-Square	4.434[a]	1	.035	.056	.032	
Continuity Correction[b]	3.364	1	.067			
Likelihood Ratio	4.563	1	.033	.056	.032	
Fisher's Exact Test				.056	.032	
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.373[c]	1	.037	.056	.032	.024
N of Valid Cases	73					

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.88.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table
c. The standardized statistic is -2.091.

The chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relation between venue type and title vs. topic match compatibility. The relation between these variables was significant, X2 (1, N = 73) = 4.43, p = .03. Therefore, it could be claimed that local authors were more likely than global authors to use title-match strategy in their attempts to manage their keywords at hand. Additionally, table 6 below shows the subsequent directional test for examining the power of the observed significant tests between venue type and the title-match hits.

Table 6
Directional Measures for Association after Chi-Square *Tests for Keyword Compatibility with Title vs. Topic*

			Value	Asymptotic Standardized Error[a]	Approximate T[b]	Approximate Significance	Exact Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Lambda	Symmetric	.130	.128	.950	.342	
		venue type Dependent	.194	.185	.950	.342	
		title compatibility Dependent	.000	.000	.[c]	.[c]	
	Goodman and	venue type Dependent	.061	.053		.037[d]	.056

Kruskal tau	title compatibility Dependent	.061	.054		.037[d]	.056
Uncertainty Coefficient	Symmetric	.050	.045	1.100	.033[e]	.056
	venue type Dependent	.045	.041	1.100	.033[e]	.056
	title compatibility Dependent	.056	.050	1.100	.033[e]	.056

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Cannot be computed because the asymptotic standard error equals zero.

d. Based on chi-square approximation

e. Likelihood ratio chi-square probability.

As seen in table 6, the data displayed acceptable power based on Exact Fishers Test for small data (p= .05).

Response to the Third and Fourth Research Questions:

Were keywords significantly disparate in the body of the published research papers in ELT domains?

Were keywords significantly disparate in the body of the ELT published research papers among Iranian vs. International researchers?

In line with appraising the nature of stated as opposed to implied keyword management in the present research among ELT and AL scholars, the questions at this point were concerned with where sampled scholars possibly directed their readers/audience to notice the keywords in their research articles.

Table 7 displays descriptive statistics regarding the most and the least frequently used sections for keyword inclusion within sampled research articles.

Table 7

Article Section Spot for Stated Keywords in the Sampled Datasets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I and LR	32	43.8	43.8	43.8
	R and D	41	56.2	56.2	100.0
	Total	73	100.0	100.0	

As it is clearly observed, within both local and global databases, the extent to which stated keywords occurred was more or less the same for the primary and secondary sections in the sampled research articles with the secondary sections receiving higher probability (56.2%). This indicated ELT scholars' overall inclination to include their highly important words in the latter parts of the research paper.

In the next phase, the present researcher again undertook a comparison between local and global ELT authors. Table 8 and 9 display descriptive and inferential statistics in this regard.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for the Article Section and Key Word Hits in the Local vs. Global Sets

Venue Type/ Article Section	I & R	R & D	Total
Global	14 (37.8%)	23 (62.2%)	37
Local	18(50.0%)	18(50.0%)	36
Total	32 (43.8%)	41 (56.2%)	73

Interestingly, the point hits for sections of the paper within local sets were exactly the same while this was not the case with international sets with the latter parts of the paper receiving more attention (62.2%) in this regard. In order to see whether the observed differences in the cells were significant or not, another chi-square test was run (Table 9).

Table 9

Chi-Square Tests for Spotted Parts in the Paper against Venue Type (local vs. Global)

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	Point Proba bility
Pearson Chi-Square	1.096[a]	1	.295	.350	.209	
Continuity Correction[b]	.658	1	.417			
Likelihood Ratio	1.099	1	.295	.350	.209	
Fisher's Exact Test				.350	.209	
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.081[c]	1	.298	.350	.209	.109
N of Valid Cases	73					

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.78.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. The standardized statistic is -1.040.

Based on the data from table 9, it could be said that the proportion of keyword detections in the first and second half of the sampled research paper did not differ by venue type in the local and global sets, X2 (1, N = 73) = 0.29, p > .05.

Discussion

The main goal line in this paper was to raise scholars' awareness over what we are doing with the language at our hand when we are being involved in semantic meaning making process in modern eras with multifaceted issues such as language learning/teaching (Manning &

Kunkel, 2014; Krauss, 2005; Meyer, Coyle, Halbach, Schuck, & Ting, 2015; Scarino, 2014). Initially, some facts and evidences were collected and analyzed based on some concerns, which could designate how differently scholars in ELT sub-disciplines within both local and global domains had made use of language pieces as lexical units to be connected with each other through language used in research writing genre (Hyland, 2008; Johansson, 2009).

Summary of the Results

The first preliminary results over title-topic match in this research showed that, overall, the most important key words also appeared in the title of research paper. In effect, this confirmed the sampled ELT authors' interest in choosing focused, specific, retrievable and concise names as titles for their research. This was in line with other results in that from 1980s onward, the tendencies of authors have been claimed to have changed over using more definitive titles that are far from abstract, art-based realizations as noted in the past (Whissell, 2012). Nevertheless, this was more consistently followed with Iranian scholars as compared with international authors as the datasets verified. In fact, this could show among other things a rather unique performance on the part of Iranian scholars to be linked to the habit of finding matches and similarities in their talk all around the topics and subjects they were initiating. In some specific cases, esp. authors in the global sets used key words within the title related to the method they had used in their study such as "Narrative inquiry", or "Constant Comparative Analysis", etc.

In the second phase, other evidences were collected regarding the position where ELT scholars tended to invest on their key words, which gained data could not significantly show the differences between our scholars and international researchers. This measure was taken to see to what extent ELT scholars probably tended to invest on the major key words in their study by giving full descriptions in the introduction and literature review sections.

The findings in this stage could designate authors' tendency to care for the most important words/index terms as an issue, which does/does

not need much elaboration and description in terms of rich explanations for meaning making processes, which is not in line with the major messages in this research. Only the major key words that are repeated in the title are given due attention by the authors. In some cases, the present author found out that some of the key words did not even occur once in the whole paper. Seemingly, they just acted as fillers. Within existing literature (American Psychological Association, 2020; Capone, 2019; Petric, 2012), three general customs for key word definition in general essay writing were found including direct definitions, indirect descriptions and block quotations. These key word definition strategies had been instigated from genre analysis models of academic research articles (Petrić, 2012). Direct quotations denoted verbatim or exact repetition of a textual fact, given as evidence from a source. Indirect quotations, on the contrary, signified modifications that writers brought to their text but indirectly echoed someone else's voice (Capone, 2019).

To the best knowledge of the present researcher, the stated key words should all be defined in one way or another in the body of the research paper. There shouldn't be any exceptions in terms of the major vs. minor index terms. In fact, in many research papers, usually the major keywords are defined in one of the three above-cited ways and other stated key terms are left over to themselves and included only as related subjects to the main topic of the research. Such mannerism might mislead other researchers in finding the exact themes they are finding. On the other hand, when some authors opt for including index terms that might increase their rate of citation only can find less opportunities to do so, if the aim is mere upsurge in quantitative citation. Nevertheless, since searching is one of the crucial steps of writing a research paper, other projecting tools should also be deliberated such as using diverse motor search engines such as Google Scholar [http://scholar.google.com/],Microsoft Academic Research [http://academic.research.microsoft.com/], Science Direct [http://www.sciencedirect.com/] among others.

Implications of the Study

Based on Socio-Cultural trends in recent era, words are defined within the context in which they are used. A critical point that comes to mind at this point is how knowledge is made through research writing accomplishments-discursively or non-discursively (Foucault, 1972). Here, this is not to reiterate the effect that such awareness might have over the practices we are indulged in within our research professional life, but to open a line of discussions over how we are damaging our professional world by just using common and current index terms that are haphazardly pointing us to diverse ways, if we cling to them just because they are nominated and are norm candidates for some meanings that are shared in our discipline.

Art-based research trends put emphasis on the fact that people can activate their faculties to transform situations into what they can express through literary equivalents (Barone & Eisner, 2011). As they declared, in this sense, "language is likely to be non-discursive rather than discursive" (p. 10), which means that since human beings experience linguistic phenomena in diverse conditions, such conditions should lead to different expressive terms. However, it seems that by inclusion of some index terms, we are again making our attempts to unify our measures in doing research.

Here, a possible, related hazard in clinging to existing key terms only might be gradual divergence from the origin of such terms from other disciplines. The point is that we, as researchers, sometimes seem not to be fully wary of some probable socio-political uses of the commonly used terms and expressions or the educational meaning overlaps of the utilized terms but we just use them since they are common and current and highly-referred to by other researchers/experts in the field (Cleveland & Cleveland, 2013). Another possible danger is that when we, as information seekers, are to extract and retrieve related sources for our study, we might be facing with difficulty to assort linked sources that might be quite fit for our aims. As also mentioned by Gee (1996, 2003), discourses refer to more than how individuals participate in language practices but also include their embodied ways of

performance in diverse conditions/contexts. This should be closely born in mind for research aims related to key word selection by authors since every word we use to communicate a message from our research has still other meanings associated with it, which might divert others' mind to still other different domains.

An example might clarify this issue in that the majority of the terms and expressions in ELT areas are originated from Psychology and Sociology realms as such. As an example, one current term such as "Community of Practice" (CoP), as brought by Wenger (1998) to our field from Sociology which is also repeatedly discussed and reconsidered either by the pioneer(s) of the terms in question or revolutionized by other more eminent scholars within ELT realms (Hoadley, 2012), is now becoming more sensible to ELT issues. A debatable issue here is that the foundations of these terms might not have been fully brought into ELT lines and this might either prefabricate readers and writers to stick to some wrong arguments or push them to raise faulty issues in their goal pursuits for language education.

Quite recently, journal editorials are even urging their perspective authors to take note of some keywords as the directive lines for "Aims and Scopes" of their journals or they include some of these keywords within "keyword clouds", "browse by subject", "subject lines" or "codes and category lists" to let their readers find proper resources or initiate their talk by submission within those defined terms/ words. This measure is in action because key words as differentiated from buzzwords are considered rather fixed semantic units, which are more or less stable (Castree, 2013), wide-ranging, and entailing great social forces. Admittedly, some scholars use highly referred key words for their research to gain more publishing records and discernibility in recent digital eras (ACME Editorial Collective, 2007). This is also turning the processes of meaning making towards inferior quality for the aforementioned reasons in this study.

Certainly, after embarking on any research, and study programs, if authors do not focus on the main issue or problem through selecting

partially relevant key words, they, in effect, will merely mislead other researchers. However, the main argument here is that research at a university should be the result of an insight shaped via academic studies. Such insights if not based on rethinking the foundations of the sciences and knowledge, the outcome cannot be far reaching. Hereby, words can actually be deconstructed, or reconstructed after exiting paradigm shifts are used to advance new paradigms (Miri, 2020). The impact by positivistic views, which had followers mostly in Natural Sciences such as Medical, Biological and Engineering Sciences viewed arts as entailed with emotive forces only rather than being informative (Knowles & Cole, 2008). Relativity was considered a norm with Arts and Humanities. This in itself could substantiate how the efforts in these domains can be differential and filled with ambiguities. Even in some Natural Sciences including Medicine, Heath (2001) reminded this fact as the hesitations/uncertainties that scientists have in using some words which there exist in such domains to an excess. Such remarks were designated as 'uncertain clarity'. Some examples were brought in his manuscript as the author referred to the patient-doctor interaction in which by using a word by the patient about how s/he felt in a painful situation, it seemed that they –medical practitioners- knew what pain was like without asking any further questions, and around eighteen seconds or less, they accredit the painful situation as something that is surely known to them both-patient and doctor.

Such views as finding molds to incorporate issues and concepts within sculpturing structure is limitative of the mind and can be misleading, as the author declared, "Too often the patient's story is distorted and coerced to fit the patterns of science. The common illness symptoms including headache, tiredness, abdominal pain and many others, can all be caused as much by stress and unhappiness, as by more or less serious disease. Scientific medicine offers much benefit but also carries great dangers, as the frightening prevalence of iatrogenic disease testifies", (p.65). Here, the cause and outcome of the pain became hitherto blurred since full description and elaboration had not been taken for granted by the doctors in the preliminary screening stages.

Then, this problem is also extended to the society at large as the author claimed:, "But these are rigorously censored stories, surrounded by what Gadamer [1996] has described as "the infinity of the unsaid", which is also represented by the millions of stars left out in the naming of the constellations". (ibid). In educational errands where we are doing our professions, on a daily basis, we are concerned with different situations of success and failure. The terms 'success' and 'failure' are again tentative expressions, which need elaboration but we use them all in the same manner and with the same wordings. Similar terms are abound in our research terminology such as 'proficiency', 'intelligence', 'competence', etc.

"As each one of us appropriates words for our own purposes, we add our own particular shade of meaning, producing a centrifugal force which continually develops and fragments language; yet at the same time, all language is social and built on the attempt to achieve shared and centripetal understanding… All language reflects what we have understood in the past and dictates how we will understand the future." (p. 66).

Conclusion
Taken together, we should try our best as researchers to prevent our readers becoming trapped within the words/terms and the language that we use to communicate different complex ideas. As Anderson and Goolishian (1988) stated, "we find that labelling is always a dangerous process ... because it connotes problems as fixed or invariant".

In this study, as gained datasets associated with keyword assignment among AL scholars confirmed, we are still far from being competent in art-based qualitative lines of injury in which words are considered in their original and genuine spirits and backgrounds. Naturally, this may have been exacerbated by the research policy makers from higher research sectors in the country. For instance, regarding the criteria for keyword selection and assignment, in the majority of guidelines and templates found for paper templates in the "for authors" files in the first page of submissions, we see only formatting norms are usually mentioned such as the fonts, margins and the required punctuations.

Scarcely do journal editors require authors/researchers to include other criteria or benchmarks such as strict semantic relevance, method applicability, title matching, abstract inclusion etc. (Müller, Kenny & Sternberg, 2004). In some research venues in the international level, we have also experienced this case that we are exposed to a list of key terms by journal editorial teams to be selected by us. Admittedly, this is also against the norms cited in art-based, qualitative research on this issue, since this mannerism might act as a restrictive factor against the mind and targeting researchers who have other cultural voices at their disposal (Berry, 2010). Here, this means that within publication fields of inquiry in academic settings, a typical writer in some cases might hitherto not be able to reveal his/her positive/negative or neutral attitudes towards those existing terminologies and terms and in effect s/he might cling to the existing wordings by others to show only the authenticity of his/her work to be considered in that field as relevant as well as to the higher socio-cultural approaches s/he is in. The point is that, some of the proposed key terms within newer approaches of socio-cultural errands might have either lost their vigor because they probably denote perished and corroded senses of the past, or they only show in what domains, the main paper is to be found only.

To sum up, Gavelek and Bresnahan (2014) mentioned a quote from Einstein as "It is the theory that decides what we can observe" but then they disguised the fact that theories mostly 'serve as lenses drawing our attention of what to see' (p.140). But, they contended that although the words we use to describe a theory can guide us to what is important, they can also serve as a set of blinders to us, which might lead us to ignore what would otherwise be important' (p. 140). In other words, as the second main theme in socio-cultural theory by Vygostsky signified, the mediation of the mind is mainly carried out by the tools and signs human beings use. He believed that signs, as he called "psychological tools," could play a determinative role in controlling our behavior by having an inward orientation by what one can see in his/her surroundings. This connoted the contested, situational nature of the literacy practices we are indulged in (Gee, 2001).

In this research, the author tried to designate how sense making as a crucial and pertinent process in research writing arenas can be still more complex by utilizing the most precise terms and key words that recapitulate the nucleus of a research article. So, due researchers in AL fields must somehow change their strategies in using index terms in their studies by giving full explanations and reports over their origin and depict some possible, prospective destinations that lighten future readers' minds. In this research, the focus was on key word use by AL researchers. Further research can be conducted over preparing comparative designs to dis/liken the mannerism of AL and ELT researchers/scholars with other disciplines related to Arts and Humanities. Still, other comparisons can be made over other aspects of meaning making in research arenas such as title selection strategies by authors, the proportion of highly loaded terms as titles such as emotive language, distancing language etc. in research articles within ELT sub/disciplines. This practice can also be followed in other research genre such as book reports, academic MA and PhD proposals, thesis and dissertations, review articles in which case meaning making practices subjectively occurs through semantic units such as key terms by individual researchers.

References

ACME Editorial Collective. (2007). The politics of indexing and ranking academic journals. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, *6*(2), 131-34.

American Psychological Association. (2020). *APA style guide to electronic references*. American Psychological Association, Washington DC.

Anderson, H., Goolishian, HA. (1988). Human system as linguistic systems: preliminary and evolving ideas about the implications for clinical theory. *Family Process*, 27, 371-93.

Babaii, E., & Taase, Y. (2013). Author-assigned keywords in research articles: Where do they come from. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *16*(2), 1-19.

Barone, T., & Eisner, E. W. (2011). *Arts based research*. Sage.

Bartoli, E. (2018). Are there ways to improve the citations of a scientific paper?. *European journal of internal medicine*, *50*, 3-5.

Berry, R. (2010). *Terminology in English language teaching: Nature and use* (Vol. 93). Peter Lang.

Biesta, G., Priestley, M., & Robinson, S. (2015). The role of beliefs in teacher agency. *Teachers and teaching*, *21*(6), 624-640.

Bigi, S., & Morasso, S. G. (2012). Keywords, frames and the reconstruction of material starting points in argumentation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44*(10), 1135-1149.

Bogoslovskaya, Z. M., Novikova, V. S., & Itcenko, A. V. (2015). The name of the concept STUDENT in Russian and English languages: on lexicographical material. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *215*, 301-305.

Boscolo, L., Bertrando, P., Fiocco, P. M., Palvarini, R. M., & Pereira, J. (1995). Language and Change The Use of Keywords in Therapy. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, *16*(2), 57-63.

Bruce, I. (2008). *Academic writing and genre: A systematic analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Byram, M., Nichols, A., & Stevens, D. (Eds.). (2001). *Developing intercultural competence in practice* (Vol. 1). Multilingual Matters.

Cain, K. (2003). Text comprehension and its relation to coherence and cohesion in children's fictional narratives. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 21, 335–351.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. *Non-native educators in English language teaching*, *7792*.

Capone, A. (2019). *Indirect reports and pragmatics in the world languages*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Castree, N. (2013). *Making sense of nature*. Routledge.

Chastain, K. (1971). *The development of modern-language skills: theory to practice* (Vol. 14). Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.

Cheng, A. (2006). Understanding learners and learning in ESP genre-based writing instruction. *English for Specific Purposes*, *25*(1), 76-89.

Chomsky, N. (1975). *Reflections on Language*. London: Temple Smith.

Cleveland, A. D., & Cleveland, D. B. (2013). *Introduction to indexing and abstracting*. ABC-CLIO.

Coxhead, A., & Byrd, P. (2007). Preparing writing teachers to teach the vocabulary and grammar of academic prose. *Journal of second language writing*, *16*(3), 129-147.

Craig, M., & Porter, C. (2014). " Speaking Back" from the English Periphery: Art-Work in a South Korean High School English Classroom. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *13*(2), 35-54.

Davies, M. (2011). Concept mapping, mind mapping and argument mapping: what are the differences and do they matter? *Higher education*, *62*(3), 279-301.

Duncum, P. (2009). Toward a playful pedagogy: Popular culture and the pleasures of transgression. Studies in Art Education, 50(3), 232-244.

Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition: Learning in the classroom*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, 51, 1– 46. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.2001.tb00013.x.

Engels, T. C., Ossenblok, T. L., & Spruyt, E. H. (2012). Changing publication patterns in the social sciences and humanities, 2000– 2009. *Scientometrics*, *93*(2), 373-390.

Esfandiari, R. (2019). Definitional Clarifications in the Introductions of PhD theses: A Genre-Based Analysis, *Journal of English language Teaching and Learning,* 11 (23).

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon.

Fulcher, G., & Davidson, F. (2007). *Language testing and assessment*. New York: Routledge.

Gadamer, H-G. (1996). *The enigma of health: the art of healing in a scientific age.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gavelek, J., & Bresnahan, P. (2014). Ways of meaning making: Sociocultural perspectives on reading comprehension. In *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 164-200). Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge Falmer.

Gee, J. P. (2001). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy 44*(8), 714–725.

Gee, J. P. (2003). Opportunity to learn: A language-based perspective on assessment. *Assessment in Education, 10*, 27–46.

Gumperz, J., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (2007). Discourse, cultural diversity and communication: A linguistic anthropological perspective. *Handbook of intercultural communication*, *7*, 13-29.

Hager, P. J., Scheiber, H. J., & Corbin, N. C. (1997). *Designing & delivering: Scientific, technical, and managerial presentations*. John Wiley & Sons.

Hartley, J. (2008). *Academic writing and publishing: A practical handbook*. Routledge.

Hartley, J., & Kostoff, R. N. (2003). How useful are key words' in scientific journals?. *Journal of Information Science*, *29*(5), 433-438.

Heath, I. (2001). 'A fragment of the explanation': the use and abuse of words. *Medical humanities*, *27*(2), 64-69.

Heath, S. B., & Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hinkel, E. (1999). Objectivity and credibility in L1 and L2 academic writing. *Culture in second language teaching and learning*, *90108*.

Hoadley, C. (2012). 12 What is a Community of Practice and How Can We Support It?. *Theoretical foundations of learning environments*, 286.

Howcroft, G. (2007). A Beginner's Guide to Metadata and Keywords. Editors' Bulletin, 3 (3), 75-77.

Hughes, W. P. (2005). Keywords: Their choice and their importance. Association of Researchers in Construction Management (ARCOM) Newsletter, 20(1), 2–3 and 21(1), 4–5.

Hyland, K. (2008). Genre and academic writing in the disciplines. *Language Teaching*, *41*(4), 543-562.

Johansson, V. (2009). *Developmental aspects of text production in writing and speech* (Vol. 48). Department of Linguistics and Phonetics, Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University.

Kane, M., & Trochim, W. M. (2007). *Concept mapping for planning and evaluation* (Vol. 50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Karpicke, J. D., & Blunt, J. R. (2011). Retrieval practice produces more learning than elaborative studying with concept mapping. *Science*, *331*(6018), 772-775.

Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. L. (2008). *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples, and issues*. Sage.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Krauss, S. E. (2005). Research paradigms and meaning making: A primer. *The qualitative report*, *10*(4), 758-770.

Leavy, P. (2015). *Method meets art: Arts-based research practice*. Guilford Publications.

Lee, I. (2012). Genre-Based Teaching and Assessment in Secondary English Classrooms. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *11*(4), 120-136.

Levitt, R., Celia, C., Diepeveen, S., Chonaill, S. N., Rabinovich, L., & Tiessen, J. (2010). Assessing the Impact of Arts and Humanities Research at the University of Cambridge. Technical Report. *RAND Corporation*.

Lopez-Veyna, J. I., Sosa-Sosa, V. J., & Lopez-Arevalo, I. (2014). A low redundancy strategy for keyword search in structured and semi-structured data. *Information Sciences*, *288*, 135-152.

Manning, J., & Kunkel, A. (2014). Making meaning of meaning-making research: Using qualitative research for studies of social and personal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *31*(4), 433-441.

Martinez, D. (2019). Sample APA Research Paper. Purdue University: Academic Success Center.

Meyer, O., Coyle, D., Halbach, A., Schuck, K., & Ting, T. (2015). A pluriliteracies approach to content and language integrated learning–mapping learner progressions in knowledge construction and meaning-making. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *28*(1), 41-57.

Miri, J. (2020). Scholarly Insight into Academic Studies at the University [PDF]. Retrieved from Telegram channel of Iranian structures-@Iranianstructures.

Müller, H. M., Kenny, E. E., & Sternberg, P. W. (2004). Textpresso: an ontology-based information retrieval and extraction system for biological literature. *PLoS biology*, *2*(11).

Paltridge, B., & Starfield, S. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of English for specific purposes* (Vol. 592). West-Sussex: Wiley-blackwell.

Pennycook, A. (2010). Language as a local practice. New York, NY: Routledge.

Petrić, B. (2012). Legitimate textual borrowing: Direct quotation in L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(2), 102-117.

Prubhu, N. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Raamkumar, A. S., Foo, S., & Pang, N. (2017). Using author-specified keywords in building an initial reading list of research papers in scientific paper retrieval and recommender systems. *Information Processing & Management*, *53*(3), 577-594.

Raghunath, M. T. (2013). *U.S. Patent No. 8,484,218*. Washington, DC: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Richards, J. C. & Theodore, S. (1991). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University. Press.

Ryan, M. (2014). Reflexivity and aesthetic inquiry: Building dialogues between the arts and literacy. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *13*(2), 5-18.

Sajed, T., Nourmohammadi, H. A., & Asadi, S. (2016). Measuring keyword density of websites of MSRT universities' Libraries. *Journal of Scientometrics, 2,* 1(3), 1-26.

Scarino, A. (2014). Learning as reciprocal, interpretive meaning-making: A view from collaborative research into the professional learning of teachers of languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*(1), 386-401.

Schmitt, R. (2005). Systematic metaphor analysis as a method of qualitative research. *The qualitative report*, *10*(2), 358-394.

Sene-Mongaba, B. (2015). The Making of Lingala Corpus: An Under-resourced Language and the Internet. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *198*, 442-450.

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

Swales, J. M. (2004). Research genres: Explorations and applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. (2005). Attended and unattended "this" in academic writing: A long and unfinished story. *ESP Malaysia*, *11*(1), 1-15.

Swales, J. M. (2005). Attended and unattended "this" in academic writing: A long and unfinished story. *ESP Malaysia*, *11*(1), 1-15.

Swann, J., & Maybin, J. (2007). Language creativity in everyday contexts. Applied Linguistics, 28(4), 491-496.

Thorgersen, K. (2014). Outcomes-Based Aesthetics? Reflections over Aesthetic Communication and Outcomes-Based Learning Based on a Study of Six Syllabi. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *13*(2), 19-34.

Tomlinson, P., & Quinton, M. (Eds.). (2019). *Values across the curriculum*. Routledge.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Whissell, C. (2012). The trend towards more attractive and informative titles. *Psychological Reports*, 110, 427–44.

Williams, P., Stevenson, I., Nicholas, D., Watkinson, A., & Rowlands, I. (2009). The role and future of the monograph in arts and humanities research. In *Aslib Proceedings*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

مردانی نژاد, ع. و دانش، ف. (۲۰۱۳). ارزیابی تراکم کلمات کلیدی در وب سایت های برتر کتابخانه مرکزی دانشگاه های علوم پزشکی ایران. *کتابداری و اطلاع رسانی, ۱۵* , ۲٦۳-۲۸٤.