

RHETORICAL STRUCTURE OF SERBIAN AND ENGLISH CALLS FOR PAPERS: THE CASE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

UDC 81'42:06.053.2

811.163.41'42:811.111'42

Aleksandar N. Pejčić

University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, English Department

Abstract. *Along with international research in the diverse field of genre analysis of academic discourse, there has been a steady increase in the number of studies of Serbian academic texts and comparative studies between Serbian and other languages. However, in the variety of researched academic genres, calls for papers (CFPs) have received comparatively little attention. In this study, the author compares the schematic structure of a sample of 16 Serbian and 16 English calls for papers of international conferences in humanities and social sciences in order to analyze differences in the production of rhetorical moves according to Swales' (1990) CARS model and Yang's (2013; 2015) models of rhetorical moves in CFPs. The results of qualitative and quantitative analyses show that Serbian CFPs in humanities and social sciences do contain a set of rhetorical moves which differs from the English calls in the ordering of the opening steps, the contents of the info-promotional Move 3 and the concluding moves, as English calls offered more follow-up websites and Serbian authors opted for a cordial greeting. The author concludes that the results reveal different practices in the two languages that may be culturally determined.*

Key words: *call for papers, rhetorical moves, Serbian, academic discourse, humanities, social sciences*

1. INTRODUCTION

As the academic need for different rhetorical functions develops along with the technology that enables it and transforms it, the variety of academic genres needed for successful professional communication has been growing as well, and with it the interest in the principles that govern the production of texts which, as the discourse community

Submitted March 29, 2022; Accepted August 21, 2022

Corresponding author: Aleksandar Pejčić

University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy

E-mail: alexpejic@gmail.com

(Swales 1990) becomes more internationalized, reach a more varied audience and may encounter cultural differences. Over the past few decades, the body of research in academic discourse has steadily increased, with studies dealing with different stages of academic production. Research has extensively covered oral production such as conference presentations, classroom presentations, and discussions, but the macro-organization of written texts including titles (Haggan 2004), abstracts (Lores 2004; Samraj 2005), different sections of academic papers, such as introductions (Samraj 2002), discussions (Holmes 1997) or conclusions (Yang & Allison 2003) have also gathered much attention. Because of the differences in the logic of writing and different rhetorical patterns that different cultures employ in their academic texts (Kaplan 1966), contrastive and comparative approaches have focused on various aspects of academic writing that exemplify differences in culture-specific patterns and discourse expectations (Blagojević 2012a) of international authors.

Among topics such as politeness strategies, persuasiveness, author's self-identification and gender-sensitive writing, summarized in Blagojević (2012b) as some of the leading issues in cross-linguistic studies of academic writing, the issue of ordering and structuring academic texts of different genres has also drawn plenty of attention. This has been especially true since John Swales (1990; 2004) analyzed the structure of academic papers with the genre-based approach and proposed models of different academic genres, but most notably the introductions to research articles, including specific rhetorical moves and steps that writers of academic texts in English typically adhere to. However, while subsequent studies (Duszak 1994) have used Swales' model to compare research articles from different cultures, the genre which is said to be initial in the genre chain of academic production (Swales 2004; Yang 2013; 2015), the Call for Papers, has not yet received much attention.

Among many studies of Serbian academic discourse in the past which have analysed different aspects of cultural differences between Serbian and English academic writers, such as the methods of achieving persuasiveness (Blagojević 2010), metadiscourse (Blagojević 2004), or author's self-identification via first person pronouns (Tošović 2002; Novaković & Sudimac 2017), the corpora of those studies have mostly been based on the academic research article as the carrier of said units of comparison.

Curiously, the CFP, to date, has not received this kind of interest, despite its role as the initiator of academic production prior to, during or following academic conferences, major national or international events that produce oral and written discourse via abstracts, conference presentations, various conference announcements and, lastly, published research articles or reviews. As the few previous studies by Yang (2013; 2015) and Mohammadi et al. (2013) have shown, a review of CFP's rhetorical structure from a macroscopic perspective (Purves 1988) can be successfully accomplished, and its dual function of informing and promoting gives additional topics for consideration (Yang 2015).

Therefore, it is the purpose of this paper to initiate the investigation of this academic genre in Serbian academic community and compare it to its English counterpart by examining the rhetorical structure and its component rhetorical moves and steps. More specifically, the study will try to answer two research questions:

1. What are the rhetorical schematic structures of Serbian and English calls for papers in the selected sample?
2. Are there any differences between Serbian and English schematic structures of this academic genre in the selected sample?

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Even though the theoretical framework related to the research of CFPs as an academic genre is quite recent and not many studies exist in this area, the interest in the rhetorical structure of academic texts has been present in the past three decades. As we have shown with the studies noted in the previous section, different sections of academic papers have been analyzed, mostly influenced by John Swales' (1981; 1990; 2004) CARS (Create A Research Space) model of introductions. It is the model which he used to perform an analysis of research articles as a genre and define the *moves* and *steps* not only in the research article as a whole but in its component sections and even other academic genres. However, as Swales' own redefined concept of *discourse community* suggests, those who are members of such a community and who use the same genres to produce written discourse with the same socio-rhetorical aims, are not necessarily members of a single culture. What is more, as the discourse community relies on common rhetorical goals, it is by nature international, which makes it possible for members of different cultures to exhibit differences in rhetorical patterns typical of their culture.

Some of these differences were shown in Caplan's (1966) analysis of different rhetorical patterns of English, Semitic, Oriental, Romance and Russian student essays. As his analysis shed light on different approaches to discourse organization and the ways these 'cultural styles' define the organization of text of any member of a linguistic community, contrastive rhetoric as a linguistic discipline which analyses differences in the style of authors of different national cultures (Blagojević 2012a: 25) began to inspire further academic research in this field. One of such studies was done by Duszak (1994), who studied cross-cultural variation between English and Polish introductions in linguistic research articles using Swales' (1990) CARS model, and found that Polish authors were more indirect and tentative with statements or criticism, but more elaborate with their descriptions of terminology. This pointed to differences between English and different Slavic languages, which were further exemplified in efforts to contrast English academic discourse with academic texts written in Serbian (Blagojević 2004; 2009), Czech (Čmejrková 1996), Russian and Bulgarian (Vassileva 1998; 2000; 2007), Russian and Ukrainian (Yakhontova 2006) and others. However, even in the multitude of analyses and data regarding said languages, the issue of calls for papers as a separate, or rather inter-related genre (Yang 2015) still remains under-researched, which allows for different rhetorical features to be analyzed and contrasted with its properties in the English language.

Even though Yang (2013), Yang (2015) and Mohammadi et al. (2013) all approached the CFP as a genre from different perspectives, either focusing on or featuring authorship and keyness, lexico-grammar and politeness strategies respectively, all three studies used the rhetorical structure as an important starting point for their research. Starting with Swales' (1990) CARS model for introductions as the model, different studies (Table 1) all arrived at different models for the CFP, although it should be noted that while Yang (2013; 2015) analyzed papers written in English, Mohammadi et al. (2013) based their research on the sample of Iranian CFPs.

Table 1 Variations in the rhetorical structure of the CFP

Mohammadi et al. (2013)	Yang (2013)	Yang (2015)
Move 1 Opening move	Move 1 Drawing attention	Move 1 Drawing attention
Move 2 Salutation move	1.1 Announcing a novel leitmotif	1.1 Announcing a novel leitmotif
Move 3 Informing move	1.2 Presenting well-established brands	1.2 Presenting well-established brands
3.1 Information on interested areas of the conference	1.2 Presenting well-established brands	Move 2 Identifying the discourse community coverage
3.2 Information on necessary dates	Move 2 Identifying discourse community coverage	2.1 Describing the history of the community
3.3 Information on the format of the submitted papers and devoted times for presentations	2.1 Addressing knowledge development	2.2 Addressing knowledge development
Move 4 Complementary close and signature	2.2 Revisiting current knowledge	2.3 Re-visiting current knowledge
	2.3 Presenting underrepresented knowledge	2.4 Filling gaps in existing knowledge
	2.4 Highlighting featured speakers	2.5 Highlighting featured speakers
	Move 3 Soliciting contributions	2.6 Presenting the committee
	3.1 Regulating submissions	Move 3 Soliciting contributions
	3.2 Scheduling key dates	3.1 Regulating submissions
	3.3 Locating channels for contribution	3.2 Scheduling key dates
	3.4 Listing types of contribution	3.3 Locating channels for contribution
	Move 4 Presenting incentives for participation	3.4 Listing types of contribution
	4.1 Inviting potential participants	Move 4 Presenting incentives for participation
	4.2 Explaining registration procedures and benefits	4.1 Inviting potential participants
	4.3 Arranging additional activities	4.2 Explaining registration procedures
	Move 5 Clarifying miscellanea	4.3 Arranging additional activities
	5.1 Acknowledging assistance	4.4 Printing the submissions
	5.2 Supplying contextualized notices	4.5 Nominating the beneficiaries
	5.3 Suggesting websites	Move 5 Clarifying miscellanea
	Move 6 Signing off	5.1 Acknowledging assistance
		5.2 Supplying contextualized notices
		5.3 Suggesting websites/multimedia
		Move 6 Signing off

As Table 1 shows, Move 1 in all three publications announces the theme of the conference and the main topics, although Yang's results also include the presentation of the organizations, venues, and dates. Although the Salutation move does not exist in Yang's findings, the data which his two studies contained suggested a more thorough approach of CFP authors to establishing a discourse community with their potential contributors and a promotional function of the CFP. Move 3 is informational in all three publications, but Yang's data again suggest a more thorough promotional approach in Move 4, as incentives for participation are offered to potential participants. Move 5 is again found only in Yang's data, and offers additional information for the participants, whereas the final move in all three publications is the same. The table also shows differences between Yang's own research, with the main cause for them being certain technological

advances and differences in corpus material, as Yang (2015) included samples from only language and education-related conferences.

This suggests that the model proposed in Yang (2015) is more likely to occur in the present study, as we expect the differences among disciplines belonging to the ‘soft sciences’ to be less pronounced than those between soft and hard sciences. An additional point to make is how much of the two different genres, informative and promotional (Yang 2013), coexisting within the CFP, will be found in this study, or whether they will coexist at all, given Bhatia’s (2000) findings of conflict arising from texts containing other combinations of genres, such as legislative and promotional.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

In order to find what is the rhetorical structure of Serbian calls for papers and to contrast Serbian and English rhetorical structures of this academic genre, 16 calls for papers in each language were chosen as the sample for this study. The average length of an English call in our sample was 256.7 words (in 13.9 separate paragraphs), whereas the Serbian sample was lengthier, with calls having an average of 449.9 words (in 36.4 separate paragraphs).

The 16 Serbian CFPs were downloaded from websites belonging to universities in Niš and Novi Sad, and their respective faculties of philosophy, while the CFPs in English were downloaded from the networks.h-net.org website, with only British and American calls included in the selection. All 32 calls belonged to international conferences and were restricted to disciplines belonging to Humanities and Social Sciences such as Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology, Media Studies and others, and the selection included publications only from the current decade, from 2011 to 2019. Even though most of the selected conferences occurred annually, only the most recent calls were chosen.

In a few cases, a distinction had to be made between conference calls and calls for papers, as not all conferences considered for our sample called for participation in those events and were merely notifications or invitations to a conference whose participants had already been determined by their participation in a project. Those calls that did not include Yang’s (2015) Move 3 (Soliciting Contributions) and, therefore, did not call for active participation in the event were excluded from the selection. As Yang’s (2015) move analysis provided more moves and steps that corresponded to our initial findings than Mohammadi et al.’s (2013), the nomenclature used for the present study was based on the former, but a different terminology was applied when needed.

In order to identify separate moves and steps in the texts, section boundaries, paragraph divisions and sub-headings were used as the major move identifiers, with connectors or paragraph divisions acting as identifiers of individual steps within major moves. The analysis consisted of a qualitative approach by which individual moves were described and later compared, and a quantitative approach that provided a statistical analysis of the two samples and the participation of their moves in the structure of the call.

The basis for comparison of the two languages is the common rhetorical function of the call for papers as a genre in different cultures, that of informing the academic community about an academic event and soliciting their contributions, with the main unit of comparison being a rhetorical move as a “defined and bounded communicative act that is designed to contribute to one main communicative objective, that of the whole text” (Lopes 2004, 282).

4. RESULTS

4.1 Serbian sample

The analysis of our Serbian sample provided a rhetorical structure which closely resembles Yang's (2013; 2015), but with notable differences in the organization of certain rhetorical moves and steps, as the following analyses will show.

Move 1 (Drawing Attention)

In our Serbian sample, Move 1 had the function of providing the readers with the introductory information about the conference, such as its name, theme and organizers. Two steps were identified within this move: Step 1 (Presenting well-established brands: organization/venue/date) and Step 2 (Announcing a novel leitmotif: main topic/theme/aim/catchphrase). Although this is the reverse order compared to Yang's, all 16 Serbian calls for papers had this move as the initial move and all 16 introduced the venue and organizers before introducing the theme or aims of the conference (Table 3).

- (1.1) *Međunarodna naučna konferencija pod nazivom „Društvo i prostor” biće održana 25. i 26. septembra na Filozofskom fakultetu u Novom Sadu, u organizaciji Odseka za sociologiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu, Srpskog sociološkog društva i Instituta za uporedno pravo iz Beograda.*
- (1.2) *Glavna tema konferencije je istraživanje značaja koji prostor ima za razumevanje društvenih pojava i promena u konkretnim sociološkim, politikološkim, geografskim, istorijskim, filozofskim, antropološkim, pravnim i drugim društveno-naučnim okvirima.*

Move 2 (Identifying the Discourse Community Coverage)

The second move has been compared by Yang (2015) to Swales' (1990) *Establishing a territory* move in article introductions, as it reviews previous knowledge and narrows its boundaries. It appeared in only 43.75% of our Serbian sample, but always followed Move 1, preceded any participation guidelines (Move 3), and was in 86% of the cases introduced as a separate paragraph. Four individual steps were identified within this move:

- 2.1 Describing the history of the community
- 2.2 Addressing knowledge development
- 2.3 Presenting underrepresented knowledge
- 2.4 Highlighting featured speakers.

Occurring in 57% of calls which contained this move, Step 1 in this sample had the function of presenting the venue's historical contribution to the discourse community, usually in the case of important anniversaries (2.1). It either appeared as a single step in this move, or was followed by Step 3, which may imply that either Step 1 or Step 2 are used in Move 2, as both refer to the discourse community from a diachronic perspective, with Step 1 performing a more promotional role than Step 2. Example (2.1) also shows why this particular step was included in Move 2 and not as the final step in Move 1, as it was in all cases complemented by a phrase or clause relating it to the history of the community, as the relative clause in (2.1) suggests.

Step 2 also appeared in every third instance of Move 3, and always before any of the remaining steps in Move 3. It introduced previous knowledge on the theme(s) of the

conference, up to and including present time, but without exposing any arising issues or gaps in that knowledge (2.2).

This was achieved in Step 3, which followed either Step 1 or Step 2, either as a separate paragraph, or a continuation of the paragraph in which one or both of the previous steps were used, but with the use of connectors such as *štaviše* or *ipak*. Its purpose was to promote the conference as a venue in which new ideas could be presented and to further narrow down the range of possible topics or approaches.

Surprisingly, Step 4 occurred only once in the corpus, and since it was not followed or preceded by any of the other steps, its place within the rhetorical structure of Move 3 was left undetermined and its placement as Step 4 was due to its infrequent inclusion in the corpus.

- (2.1) *Tekuće, 2018. godine navršava se 80 godina od osnivanja Društva za sociologiju i društvene nauke, iz koga se kasnije razvilo Srpsko sociološko društvo.*
- (2.2) *Istraživanje prostora je u poslednjih nekoliko decenija postalo sveprisutno u različitim društvenim naukama, a prostor se kao koncept, kao okvir i forma društvenih praksi sve više povezuje sa drugim važnim kategorijama poput istorije, vremena, kulture, medija, sećanja, roda, javnosti, privatnosti, tehnologije, novih medija, itd.*
- (2.3) *U savremenom svetu koje se ističe po mobilnosti i brzom protoku informacija, seobe postaju sastavni deo života i društva. Štaviše, njihov obim i obrasci postaju sve složeniji.*
- (2.4) *Plenarni predavači na STuP 2019 biće prof. dr Elizabeth Meins sa Univerziteta u Yorku (Velika Britanija), prof. dr Vincent Egan sa Univerziteta u Notingemu (Velika Britanija), prof. dr Lidija Arambašić sa Univerziteta u Zagrebu (Hrvatska) i prof. dr Nirvana Pištoljević sa Rutgers univerziteta (SAD).*

Move 3 (Soliciting Contributions)

Alongside Move 1, this was the only other move present in all CFPs in our sample, and the one with the most allocated space. Its rhetorical function is to regulate the abstract submission process by supplying all the information potential participants might need to successfully finish the application process, but the Serbian sample also included certain promotional steps. It is also the only move which appeared as a section with its own heading in the call, as well as subsections introducing its separate steps. The information that this move provided included:

- 3.1 Inviting potential participants
- 3.2 Regulating submissions
- 3.3 Scheduling key dates
- 3.4 Regulating submission channels and formats
- 3.5 Printing the submissions
- 3.6 Regulating payment

Perhaps the biggest change to Yang's model is the very first step, as it was previously classified as one of the steps in the promotional Move 4. However, our sample did not include any of the steps mentioned in Move 4 as a separate section or paragraph in the calls, and instead invited potential participants before giving any information regarding the application procedure, and included this call in the same paragraph as the following step (3.1).

Step 2, the first which introduced the informational function of this move, "explains the acceptable sub-topics and format of contributions in detail, including working language,

submissions, and policies of acceptance” (Yang 2015, 44) and was found in 12 out of 16 calls (3.2). Step 3 in all calls followed Step 1 and included important dates for the submission of abstracts, notifications and registration (3.3).

However, Step 4 in our sample had to be repurposed as the information on the channels for submitting abstracts (e-mail addresses, contacts) was combined with the expected formats of submissions or allocated time slots for presentations and working languages (3.4). Another step was included in some calls as information on the publication of accepted papers for publication, as well as any information on the format of the submissions (3.5). The final step in our sample, one that does not appear in any of the previous studies, is Step 6, in which any payment information is given to potential participants, as well as any pertinent contact information and details about other conference content covered or not covered by the fee (3.6) While Yang’s (2015) findings classified possible fee reductions as part of the promotional Move 4, the CFPs in our sample included this information in the section on regular fees and payments, while the promotional function of Serbian CFPs was significantly reduced.

- (3.1) *Ovim putem srdačno vas pozivamo da uzmete učešća u radu ove konferencije, te da svojim izlaganjem doprinesete njenom održavanju i kvalitetu.*
- (3.2) *Radovi na sledeće teme su naročito dobro došli:*
- (3.3) *Prijavu možete poslati najkasnije do 20. avgusta 2018. godine putem elektronskog formulara. Svi prijavljeni dobiće povratnu informaciju o učešću najkasnije do 30. avgusta 2018.*
- (3.4) *Na Konferenciju se možete prijaviti elektronskim putem preko formulara koji je dostupan na linku*
- (3.5) *Odabrani i recenzirani radovi biće objavljeni u Zborniku radova sa konferencije koji će biti štampan nakon Konferencije.*
- (3.6) *Participacija za učešće na konferenciji je 20 evra i ona pokriva troškove ručka i osveženje.*

Move 4 (Clarifying Miscellanea)

As Yang’s Move 4 (Presenting incentives for participation) was not found in our sample as a separate rhetorical unit, its place was taken by *Clarifying Miscellanea*. This is the move in which additional information not directly related to the application process or conference events is presented to potential participants. Based on our selection, three steps were identified, but as only the first two steps were seen together in only one CFP and the last two steps were seen together in two CFPs, their order may vary in any calls that might include all three steps. In addition to this, the number of calls where this move was seen was 50% of the total number.

- 4.1 Supplying contextualized notices
- 4.2 Acknowledging assistance
- 4.3 Suggesting websites/multimedia

Step 4.1 supplied additional information that reminded participants of any details that are easily overlooked or need mentioning, such as free and paid conference content, or which are not central to the conference event, such as book promotions and other academic events (4.1). Step 4.2 was used to acknowledge any inside or outside assistance regarding organization or funding (4.2) and Step 4.3 contained useful links and websites where more information regarding the application process could be found (4.3).

- (4.1) *У паузи конференције предвиђено је одржавање редовне Годишње скупштине Српског социолошког друштва. Сви који желе да пуноправно учествују у раду Скупштине у обавези су да до 1. септембра 2018. измире заостале обавезе у погледу чланарине.*
- (4.2) *Научни одбор и partneri*
Dubravka Valić Nedeljković, Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Dinko Gruhonić, Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Nikola Knežević, Centar za istraživanje religije, politike i društva, Novi Sad
- (4.3) *За све додатне информације можете контактирати Канцеларију за сарадњу са дијаспором Града Ниша на dijaspora.ni@gmail.com и путем телефона +381 18 520 509.*

Move 5 Signing Off

Move 5 was found in 12 out of 16 calls and in those cases it was the final move in the call. It contained no sub-steps and was used by the conference organizers to express their wishes for a well-attended conference, forthcoming submissions or to welcome future guests to their town. It contained usually a short cordial greeting and a mention of the conference organisers, in most cases without individual names and surnames (5.1).

- (5.1) *Nadamo se da će konferencija i ove godine okupiti veliki broj učesnika koji će svojim učešćem doprineti uspehu skupa. Očekujući vas u Nišu, šalјemo vam srdačne pozdrave.*

We should also note that even though the order of moves is presented here as it was seen in the majority of calls included in the sample, parts of steps belonging to different moves occurred in multiple positions in a single CFP once (Move 5), twice (Move 1), or even five times (Move 3) in 16 calls. This contributes to Duszak's (1994) claim that rhetorical moves are not strictly linear but cyclical and may reappear at various stages of a text.

4.2 English sample

Move 1 (Drawing Attention)

Surprisingly enough, the opening move in the English sample was not present in the entire selection, as only 13 papers contained it, and with only the most basic information, which in most cases belonged to just one of the two steps. Both steps occurred only once in the entire English sample (6.1).

- (6.1) *BASAS will hold its annual conference at University of Southampton between Wednesday, 1st of April and Friday, 3rd April 2020. Panel and paper submissions for the 2020 conference are now accepted.*
This year there is no specific theme for the conference – we invite proposals from across humanities, arts and social sciences for both panels and independent papers within the broadest reach of South Asian studies, and including work on diasporas and the Indian Ocean world.

Move 2 (Identifying the Discourse Community Coverage)

Occurring in 68.75% of the English sample papers, Move 2 was not as frequently found as Move 1, but was still one of the more prominent parts of English CfPs. Unlike the Serbian selection, only three steps were noticed here, as the English organizers did not focus on the history of the community, but rather on the knowledge development and

the significance of the event as a source of contributions. These two steps were not always separated into paragraphs, but mostly coexisted in the same paragraph, with phrases like *this panel*, *this volume* acting as topic announcers. On the other hand, the announcement of keynote speakers was always done in a separate paragraph, probably to express appreciation for the speaker and single out that information as one of the conference's most important selling points.

Move 3 (Soliciting Contributions)

Although the rhetorical function of this move, to provide necessary guidelines for participants regarding the submission process, was observed in both samples, only four steps were found in the English sample, as the final two did not appear in any of the calls in English. Furthermore, this was the move in which the division of information into separate paragraphs, lists and bullets was the most evident. This is potentially due to the need for absolute clarity and the importance of the information for the application process. This is supported by the fact that steps 2, 3 and 4 were all found in more than 93% of the English sample, while the move itself was indispensable in both samples, due to our selection parameters and the main function of the genre.

Move 4 (Presenting incentives for participation)

Unlike the Serbian calls, one example of Yang's Move 4 was found in the English sample, occurring after Move 3 and before Move 5, separated as a single paragraph (7.1). Its rhetorical function is to give incentives for participation such as reduced fees, or later registration. As this was the only case of this move being used in both languages, no generalizations can be made including whether any sub-steps should be included.

(7.1) *SWPACA offers monetary awards for the best graduate student papers in a variety of categories. Submissions of accepted, full papers are due January 1, 2020. For more information, visit <http://southwestpca.org/conference/graduate-student-awards/>*

Move 5 (Clarifying Miscellanea)

Within the English sample this was the second one of the two most frequent moves (100%), but mostly because of its third step (suggesting websites/multimedia) which was found in all English calls, whereas the first two were found only once (Step 1) and twice (Step 2). As in the Serbian sample, this step also contained useful links to websites and contacts for more information regarding the application process.

Move 6 (Signing Off)

Although this move was found in 75% of Serbian calls, it was found only once in the English sample, and even then it was just a brief sign-off (8.1), so it appears that the organisers of such events did not deem it necessary to make any special welcoming gestures, especially after all the important information has already been shared.

(8.1) *We look forward to receiving your submissions!*

4.3 Serbian and English calls

Having examined both Serbian and English calls, we made a comparison of the rhetorical structures of CFPs in both languages presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Rhetorical structure of Serbian and English calls

Serbian CFPs	English CFPs
Move 1 <i>Drawing Attention</i>	Move 1 <i>Drawing Attention</i>
1.1 Presenting well-established brands: organization/venue/date	1.1 Presenting well-established brands: organization/venue/date
1.2 Announcing a novel leitmotif: main topic/theme/aim	1.2 Announcing a novel leitmotif: main topic/theme/aim
Move 2 <i>Identifying the Discourse Community Coverage</i>	Move 2 <i>Identifying the Discourse Community Coverage</i>
2.1 Describing the history of the community	2.1 Addressing knowledge development
2.2 Addressing knowledge development	2.2 Presenting underrepresented knowledge
2.3 Presenting underrepresented knowledge	2.3 Highlighting featured speakers
2.4 Highlighting featured speakers	
Move 3 <i>Soliciting Contributions</i>	Move 3 <i>Soliciting Contributions</i>
3.1 Inviting potential participants	3.1 Inviting potential participants
3.2 Regulating submissions	3.2 Regulating submissions
3.3 Scheduling key dates	3.3 Scheduling key dates
3.4 Regulating submission channels and formats	3.4 Regulating submission channels and formats
3.5 Printing the submissions	
3.6 Regulating payment	
Move 4 <i>Clarifying Miscellanea</i>	Move 4 <i>Presenting incentives for participation</i>
4.1 Supplying contextualized notices	4.1 Supplying contextualized notices
4.2 Acknowledging assistance	4.2 Acknowledging assistance
4.3 Suggesting websites/multimedia	4.3 Suggesting websites/multimedia
Move 5 <i>Signing Off</i>	Move 6 <i>Signing Off</i>

Move 1

Although the basic structure of this move appears to be the same in both languages, the English sample contained this move in 13 out of 16 cases, while all 16 Serbian calls started with the opening move (Table 3). The importance of this move for Serbian calls can also be seen in the number of rhetorical steps dedicated to it with Serbian calls containing on average 2 steps (compared to 1.06 in English) arranged in 4.3 paragraphs on average, compared to English 1.5. Even the portion of the text devoted to this move in Serbian calls shows that giving out basic information about the conference plays a more significant role for Serbian authors, since more details contained within each of the two steps are used in Serbian calls, resulting in more content.

Table 3 Frequency of rhetorical moves and steps in Serbian and English CFPs

	Serbian CFPs	English CFPs
	Frequency in the sample	Frequency in the sample
MOVE 1	100	81.25
Step 1	100	50
Step 2	100	56.25
MOVE 2	43.75	68.75
Step 1	25	50
Step 2	25	56.25
Step 3	31.25	25
Step 4	6.25	/
MOVE 3	100	100
Step 1	31.25	18.75
Step 2	100	93.75
Step 3	100	100
Step 4	100	93.75
Step 5	81.25	/
Step 6	75	/
MOVE 4	56.25	6.25
Step 1	18.75	/
Step 2	25	/
Step 3	37.5	/
MOVE 5	75	100
Step 1	/	12.5
Step 2	/	6.25
Step 3	/	100
MOVE 6	/	6.25

Move 2

Appearing in 68.75% of English calls (only in 43.75% of Serbian calls), the rhetorical move which serves to ‘establish a territory’ appears more relevant to English authors, as it contains more words, more paragraphs and more individual steps per call. Step 1, however, was not the same in English and Serbian texts, since only Serbian texts addressed the history of the community or the conference’s significance, which could be a result of the chosen sample. Instead, Step 1 in the English calls performed the same rhetorical function as the Serbian Step 2, and in this respect was more prominent, as it appeared in 75% of the sample (33% in Serbian).

It is interesting to note that the rhetorical separation of this step and the following one, *Presenting underrepresented knowledge*, was also achieved differently, with English texts relying more on textual connectives (67%) while Serbian texts relied equally on textual connection and separation into paragraphs. In the English sample, phrases like *this panel*, *this conference* were used in 7 out of 12 cases in which Step 3 appeared alongside other steps, including the cases where it was introduced as a separate paragraph. The Serbian sample did not use metadiscourse to a considerable level, as only 2 cases of connectors (*štaviše; ipak*) were used for that purpose.

The final step in Move 2 in both languages was *Highlighting featured speakers*. Whereas our Serbian sample contained only one mention of keynote speakers, four such examples were found in the English sample (25% of the total number of calls) but, as in

Serbian, only in a single paragraph. However, in the English sample, an example with all three steps did exist, and it helped to place this Step as the last one in Move 2.

Move 3

Unlike Serbian calls, steps 2, 3 and 4 were often found in the single paragraph (68.75%) in the English sample, sometimes even all three (9.1), whereas Serbian calls separated the information. Both samples contained information about acceptable sub-topics (Step 1) as a separate paragraph, although not always as the first piece of information in the move. English samples also included only one call which contained sub-section titles, which is due to the greater average length of Serbian papers.

(9.1) Please submit abstracts of no more than 300 words by September 30, 2019, using the NeMLA link: <https://www.cfplist.com/nemla/Home/S/18059>

Move 4 (S) / Move 5 (E)

An evident difference between Serbian and English calls is the use of Move 5 in the English sample (Move 4 in Serbian), as it appeared in all 16 calls (56.25% in Serbian). Moreover, Step 3 appeared in all 16 calls (only 6 in Serbian), Step 2 only once (4 in Serbian) and Step 1 twice (3 in Serbian), suggesting differences in the purpose of this move between the two cultures.

Move 5 (S) / Move 6 (E)

The final move in both samples was Signing Off, and its function was the same in the English sample, but with only one example, whereas 75% of Serbian texts ended with a greeting, suggesting the cultural significance of hospitality in the Serbian culture, extending into its academic culture as well.

5. DISCUSSION

As our Serbian sample has shown, in comparison to earlier studies of this mixed genre, the rhetorical structure of calls for papers can be expected to differ with the change in the language, the underlying cultural patterns and the disciplines chosen for analysis. The importance of Move 1 for making the initial announcements and establishing the main themes was evident in the Serbian sample, which may be attributed to the need to establish the basic notions and terminology which Duszak (1994) found in her analysis of Polish research articles. That this may indeed be the case in Serbian as a Slavic language is shown by the volume and informativeness of Serbian Move 3, which contained more steps both in a single average call and the overall structure of the move.

On the other hand, a surprising result is the lack of plenary speakers in conferences both in Serbian and English, but even though this may be explained by the relatively small sample, the difference in the use of this move can be noticed in the two samples, as Serbian calls used this move rather inconsistently and to a small degree, while English calls relied on information about the discourse community, past and current knowledge and the conference's role in expanding it. Since Move 2 has been related to Swales' (1990) structure of article introductions (Yang 2015, 44) and their rhetorical function of

establishing a territory, we can stress the fact that our results are in line with previous findings on the subject of Serbian research article introductions (Blagojević 2012a, 114), which revealed inconsistency in their use and infrequent inclusion in this academic genre.

While establishing a territory in the previous move can be seen as a promotional, as well as informative move by which organizers may want to increase their event's relevance to the academic community, it is the intended informational Move 3 that surprisingly bore most of the promotional weight of both samples. Although multiple rhetorical functions of a single genre are not unknown (Bhatia 2000; Hyland 2004) and may coexist without misinterpretation, invitations were not expected at this stage, and may be a result of the reoccurrence of Move 1 even though our findings do not suggest it. The fact that the step *Regulating payment* was found only in our Serbian sample was also unexpected but may be due to different practices in regulating such financial matters in the two cultures.

However, another explanation may lie in the English Move 5 (Serbian Move 4), which always included suggested links and websites, whereas in the Serbian sample they appeared only in every other call, since Serbian calls included much more information in their Move 3. This testifies to the observation that genres and rhetorical situations are subject to changes due to the constant progress in the multi-media and the information technology, but without misunderstandings as long as some generic boundaries of the genre are maintained (Bhatia 2000, 148). This also allows any member of a discourse community to take part in its events, despite cultural or language barriers that may create peculiarities in their constitutive genres.

Regarding the last move in both samples, it can be argued that the omission of greetings in the English sample may be due to different politeness strategies. While Serbian authors tend to be more explicit or vocal in their expression of hospitality, it does not necessarily follow that the English calls lacking this move are insufficiently polite, although it may seem so from the perspective of a Serbian author. What English authors may view as polite in their calls is the very lack of additional information, as the current study has shown that even the most informative Move 3 is far less comprehensive, suggesting that the politeness strategy used is that of succinctness and, therefore, respect for the reader's time. This would support Mauranen's (1993) findings in her study of English and Finnish academic rhetoric that English authors tend to show academic politeness by trying to "respect the reader's time and effort" (Blagojević 2012b, 1935). However, as these claims exceed the scope of this study, further research tailored to this purpose may answer this question regarding CFPs with more precision.

6. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research, although limited in scope and volume, has shown that the cultural patterns which shape written and spoken academic discourse can be observed in the mixed genre of calls for papers, one of the initial links in the chain of academic production and one which deserves even more attention as its dissemination and content have been affected by various extra-linguistic factors affecting academic discourse to this day.

As CFPs are a genre in which authors address their readers directly, additional research could look more closely into the use of strategies for achieving persuasiveness or politeness, as these concepts are closely tied to any promotional genre, and may answer whether the increasing presence of promotional activities and content in academic events and discourse has left a mark on the promotional function of academic genres such as the CFP and others.

Acknowledgement: Prepared as a part of the project “Scientific Publications in Teaching English Linguistics and Anglo-American Literature and Culture”, conducted at the University of Niš – Faculty of Philosophy (No. 300/1-14-1-01).

REFERENCES

- Bhatia, Vijay K. 2000. “Genres in conflict.” In *Analysing professional genres*, edited by A. Trosborg, 147–162. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Blagojević, Savka. 2009. “Expressing Attitudes in Academic Research Articles Written by English and Serbian Authors.” *Facta Universitatis. Series: Linguistics and Literature* 7 (1): 63–73.
- Blagojević, Savka. 2010. “Upotreba eksplicitnih jezičkih sredstava u cilju postizanja persuazivnosti u akademskom diskursu.” *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Istočnom Sarajevu* 12 (1): 151–164.
- Blagojević, Savka. 2012a. *O engleskom i srpskom akademskom diskursu*, Niš: Filozofski fakultet.
- Blagojević, Savka. 2012b. “Some concepts differently treated in the multicultural discourse community (with the special reference to English and Serbian academic writing).” *Teme*, 36 (4): 1931–1943.
- Blagojević, Savka. 2017. “Metadiscourse in Academic Prose: A Contrastive Study of Academic Articles Written in English by English and Norwegian Native Speakers.” *Studies About Languages* 5: 60–67.
- Čmejková, Světlá. 1996. “Academic Writing in Czech and English.” In *Academic Writing: Introduction and Textual Issues*, edited by E. Ventola & A. Mauranen, 137–145. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Duszak, Anna. 1994. “Academic discourse and intellectual styles.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 291–313.
- Haggan, Madeline. 2004. “Research paper titles in literature, linguistics and science: Dimensions of attraction.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 36 (2): 293–317.
- Holmes, Richard. 1997. “Genre analysis and the social sciences: An investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines.” *English for Specific Purposes* 16 (4): 321–337.
- Kaplan, Robert B. 1966. “Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education.” *Language Learning* 76: 1–20.
- Lores, Rosa. 2004. “On RA abstracts: From rhetorical structure to thematic organization.” *English for Specific Purposes* 23 (3): 280–302.
- Mauranen, Anna. 1993. Contrastive Rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English Economic Texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12(1) (1993): 3–22.
- Mohammadi, Mohammad Javad, Bamshad Hekmatshoar Tabari, & Bizhan Hekmatshoar Tabari. 2013. “The Rhetorical Structure & Discursive Features of Call for Papers as a Genre.” *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature* 2 (4): 541–554.
- Novaković, Aleksandar and Nina Sudimac. 2017. “Diskursne funkcije zamenica ja i mi u akademskim člancima srbista i anglista.” *Nasleđe* 14 (38): 81–94.
- Purves, Alan C. 1988. “Writing Across Languages and Cultures.” In *Issues in Contrastive Rhetoric. Written Communication Manual 2*, edited by Alan C. Purves, 75–304. Newsbury Park: Sage.
- Samraj, Betty. 2002. “Introductions in research articles: Variations across disciplines.” *English for Specific Purposes* 21 (1): 1–17.
- Samraj, Betty. 2005. “An exploration of genre set: Research article abstracts and introductions in two disciplines.” *English for Specific Purposes* 24 (2): 141–156.
- Tošović, Branko. 2002. *Funkcionalni stilovi*. Beograd: Beogradska knjiga.
- Swales, John. 1981. *Aspects of Article Introductions*. Language Studies Unit: Aston University.
- Swales, John. 1990. *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, John. 2004. *Research genres: Exploration and applications*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Vassileva, Irena. 1998. “Who am I/who are we in academic writing? A contrastive analysis of authorial presence in English, German, French, Russian and Bulgarian.” *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 8 (2): 163–190.
- Vassileva, Irena. 2000. *Who is the author? A contrastive analysis of authorial presence in English, German, French, Russian and Bulgarian academic discourse*. Sankt Augustin: Asgard.
- Vassileva, Irena. 2007. “Some aspects of the rhetorical structure of specialized written discourse in English, Bulgarian and Russian.” *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 5 (2): 173–186.
- Yakhontova, Tatyana. 2006. “Cultural and disciplinary variation in academic discourse: The issue of influencing factors.” *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 5: 153–167.
- Yang, Ruiying and Desmond Allison. 2003. “RAs in applied linguistics: Moving from results to conclusions.” *English for Specific Purposes* 22 (4): 365–385.

Yang, Wenhsien. 2013. "Two folded messages behind CFP: A cross disciplinary study." *International Journal of Language Studies* 7 (2): 83–108.

Yang, Wenhsien. 2015. "“Call for papers”": Analysis of the schematic structure and lexico-grammar of CFPs for academic conferences." *English for Specific Purposes* 37: 39–51.

RETORIČKA STRUKTURA SRPSKIH I ENGLESKIH POZIVNIH PISAMA: SLUČAJ HUMANISTIČKIH I DRUŠTVENIH NAUKA

Zajedno sa međunarodnim istraživanjima u raznolikom polju žanrovske analize akademskog diskursa postepeno se povećavao i broj istraživanja srpskih akademskih tekstova i kontrastivnih studija srpskog i drugih jezika. Međutim, uprkos raznovrsnosti istraživanih akademskih žanrova, pozivna pisma (CFP) su privukla manje pažnje u odnosu na druge žanrove. U ovom radu, upoređujemo retoričku strukturu 16 pozivnih pisama na srpskom i 16 na engleskom jeziku međunarodnih konferencija u oblasti humanističkih i društvenih nauka in kako bi analizirali razlike u produkciji retoričkih koraka, po Svejzovom (Swales 1990) CARS (Create a Research Space) modelu i Jangovim (Yang 2013; 2015) modelima retoričkih koraka u pozivnim pismima. Rezultati kvalitativne i kvantitativne analize ukazuju na to da srpska pozivna pisma u humanističkim i društvenim naukama zaista poseduju set retoričkih koraka koji se razlikuje od engleskih poziva u rasporedu uvodnih 'stavova', sadržaja informativno-promotivnog Koraka 3 i zaključnih koraka, pošto su pozivna pisma na engleskom sadržala više veb sajtova za dodatne informacije dok se autori srpskih pisama više opredeljuju za srdačan pozdrav. Zaključujemo da rezultati otkrivaju da je praksa u dva jezika drugačija i verovatno kulturno uslovljena.

Ključne reči: pozivno pismo, retorički koraci, srpski, akademski diskurs, humanističke nauke, društvene nauke