

From Summarizing to Persuading: Comparative Analysis of English And Uzbek Scientific Discourse

 Abduganiyeva Zebuniso Abduhafizovna

PhD Student, Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Received: 22 May 2026 | Received Revised Version: 04 June 2026 | Accepted: 25 June 2026 | Published: 19 July 2026

Volume 08 Issue 07 2026 | Crossref DOI: 10.37547/tajas/Volume08Issue07-02

Abstract

Research article abstracts function as both informational summaries and access points to disciplinary knowledge. This study compares the rhetorical organisation and linguistic realisation of English and Uzbek research article abstracts, focusing on promotional and expository orientations. The corpus comprises 68 abstracts published between 2023 and 2025 and equally divided between the two languages. The texts were analysed using a five-move, fifteen-step model. Purpose and Results emerged as the most stable moves in both corpora, while Method and the complete five-move structure were more consistently represented in English abstracts. English writers more often separated communicative functions through finite research verbs, explicit data statements, reporting frames, and contribution claims. Uzbek abstracts more frequently integrated purpose, method, results, and evaluation through nominal-predicative constructions, action nominals, passive predicates, and extended enumerations. These differences are interpreted as discursive and institutional preferences rather than fixed cultural traits. The main contrast concerns rhetorical visibility and information packaging, not the communicative functions themselves.

Keywords: Academic writing, research article abstract, generic structure, move analysis, contrastive rhetoric.

© 2026 Abduganiyeva Zebuniso Abduhafizovna. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). The authors retain copyright and allow others to share, adapt, or redistribute the work with proper attribution.

Cite This Article: Abduganiyeva Zebuniso Abduhafizovna. (2026). From Summarizing to Persuading: Comparative Analysis of English And Uzbek Scientific Discourse. The American Journal of Applied Sciences, 8(07), 6–19. <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajas/Volume08Issue07-02>

1. Introduction

The research article abstract (RAA) is one of the most heavily compressed genres of academic communication. It is normally encountered before the full article and, in bibliographic databases, search engines, indexing services, editorial screening, and peer-review workflows, it may be encountered independently of the complete text. Its function is therefore not exhausted by summary. The abstract enables readers to determine the relevance of a study, permits editors and reviewers to identify its research logic, and presents the contribution in a form compatible with disciplinary expectations.

The importance of the abstract has been described through a series of metaphors. It has been treated as a screening device, a distillation of the research article, a crystalliser of its principal content, and a gateway to disciplinary knowledge (Huckin, 2001; Lorés, 2004; Salager-Meyer, 1990; Swales, 1990). These descriptions converge on one point: an effective abstract must reconstruct the problem, purpose, evidential basis, principal result, and significance of a study under severe spatial constraints. The communicative functions are therefore selected and ordered rather than mechanically copied from the full article.

Genre analysis explains recurrent organisation through communicative purpose. Swales (1990) defines a move as a functional unit contributing to the overall purpose of a genre. A move may coincide with a sentence, but sentence boundaries are not sufficient criteria for its identification. A single sentence can realise more than one function, and one move can extend over several clauses or sentences. Bhatia (1993), Paltridge (1994), and Biber et al. (2007) likewise emphasise that formal patterning must be interpreted in relation to the work performed by a segment in its local context.

Several models have been proposed for the analysis of RAAs. Santos (1996) identifies Situating the Research, Presenting the Research, Describing the Methodology, Summarising the Results, and Discussing the Research. Hyland (2000) proposes Introduction, Purpose, Method, Product, and Conclusion. Lorés (2004) distinguishes abstracts organised as condensed versions of the article from those organised through a problem–gap–response logic. Pho (2008) retains a five-move model but relates each move to grammatical subjects, tense, voice, and authorial stance. Tseng (2011) and Can et al. (2016) subsequently extend the analysis to move length, sequencing, embedding, recycling, and disciplinary variation.

Cross-cultural studies show that comparable communicative purposes do not necessarily produce identical textual forms. Kafes (2015) found broad convergence in the presence of purpose, method, and results in English and Turkish abstracts, but substantial differences in background information, gap statements, authorial visibility, passive constructions, and concluding claims. Yakhontova (2002) frames such contrasts through the distinction between “selling” and “telling”: some abstracts explicitly promote the novelty and value of the study, whereas others foreground comprehensive description and disciplinary contextualisation. Importantly, neither author treats genre variation as the simple product of national culture. Language structure, disciplinary epistemology, journal policy, academic writing instruction, and the target discourse community also shape rhetorical choice.

The contrast between English and Uzbek is methodologically significant because equivalent communicative functions may be realised through different grammatical resources. English often marks the current study through finite research verbs such as *this study investigates*, *we examine*, or *the analysis reveals*.

Uzbek frequently uses nominal-predicative constructions such as *tadqiqotning maqsadi ...dan iborat*, action nominals such as *aniqlash* and *tahlil qilish*, and passive predicates such as *qo‘llanildi* and *foydalanildi*. A comparison based only on sentence form would therefore obscure functional equivalence, while an exclusively quantitative comparison would fail to account for multifunctional sentences.

The present study addresses four questions.

RQ1: which moves constitute the stable and variable components of English and Uzbek RAAs?

RQ2: which move-sequence patterns characterise the two corpora?

RQ3: how are comparable moves linguistically realised and compositionally packaged?

RQ4: to what extent do the observed tendencies indicate a relatively stronger promotional orientation or a relatively stronger expository orientation?

2. Data and Methodology

2.1. Construction of the corpus

The study uses two numerically balanced subcorpora of English and Uzbek research article abstracts. The English subcorpus contains 34 abstracts, with 17 texts from English for Specific Purposes and 17 from TESOL Quarterly. The Uzbek subcorpus contains 34 abstracts, with 17 texts from Philology Matters and 17 from Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan. The texts were published between 2023 and 2025. Sampling was purposive and quota-balanced by journal rather than random. The 68 abstracts were drawn from a parent corpus of 68 full research articles comprising 422,767 words: 258,865 words in the English subcorpus and 163,902 words in the Uzbek subcorpus. Titles, keywords, author information, and reference lists were excluded from move coding.

The journals were selected to maintain disciplinary proximity within applied linguistics, language education, discourse studies, translation, and related linguistic fields. Only research articles with identifiable abstracts were included. Editorials, reviews, announcements, and conference materials were excluded. Each abstract was assigned an anonymised corpus identifier, E-01–E-34 or U-01–U-34, allowing every coding decision to be traced to its original segment (see Appendix A).

Table 1. Composition of the English and Uzbek abstract corpora

Subcorpus	Journals	Texts	Years	Median length
English	English for Specific Purposes; TESOL Quarterly	34 (17 + 17)	2023–2025	198 words
Uzbek	Philology Matters; Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan	34 (17 + 17)	2023–2025	254 words

Note. The two corpora are balanced by text count, not by total word count or median abstract length.

The analytical unit was the communicative segment rather than the sentence as a purely grammatical object. A segment could consist of a phrase, clause, sentence, or closely connected sequence of sentences when these jointly performed one dominant rhetorical function. The model integrates the functional core of Santos (1996), Hyland (2000), Lorés (2004), Pho (2008), and Can et al. (2016). Five moves were distinguished, and each move was divided into three operational steps.

Coding proceeded in two passes. During the first pass, preliminary boundaries were marked and each segment was assigned a dominant move and, where possible, a step code. During the second pass, every boundary was

audited against the control question associated with the move. A multifunctional segment received a combined code when different clauses performed distinct local functions. At abstract level, a move was counted as present when it occurred at least once; recurrent realisations did not increase its text-level frequency.

Move status was interpreted as central when present in all texts, conventional when present in 60–99 %, and optional when present in fewer than 60 %. The same functional criteria were applied to both languages, but formal equivalence was not required. Thus, this study investigates and tadqiqotning maqsadi ...dan iborat were coded as comparable realisations of Purpose.

Table 2. Operational model of abstract moves and steps

Code	Communicative move	Functional steps	Control question
M-1	Establishing the research territory	S-1: field/topic; S-2: relevance or need; S-3: problem, tension, or gap	Why is the study needed?
M-2	Presenting the research purpose	S-1: main aim; S-2: question or hypothesis; S-3: operational objectives	What was investigated?
M-3	Summarising methodology	S-1: material or participants; S-2: design or data collection; S-3: analytical method or framework	How was the study conducted?

Code	Communicative move	Functional steps	Control question
M-4	Reporting principal results	S-1: main finding; S-2: difference or tendency; S-3: resultant model or category	What was found?
M-5	Indicating conclusion and value	S-1: general conclusion; S-2: theoretical or practical implication; S-3: recommendation or application	Why do the findings matter?

2.2. Approach to the Analysis of Linguistic Realisation

Following Pho (2008), the qualitative analysis considered the relation between move function and recurrent linguistic form. Particular attention was paid to grammatical subjects, finite and non-finite research verbs, tense, passive and active voice, reporting frames, nominal-predicative constructions, action nominals, contrastive connectors, and evaluative predicates. The analysis did not treat any single marker as an automatic move label. For example, results could introduce an empirical finding, refer to a section of the paper, or occur in a citation; only the first use was coded as M-4.

English and Uzbek examples were interpreted within their original co-text. The analysis therefore distinguishes explicit omission from linguistic integration. A method is omitted when the reader cannot recover data or analytical procedure; it is integrated when that information is embedded within a purpose or result

sentence. This distinction is essential for typologically different languages. Promotional and expository orientations were not coded as independent moves. They were interpreted through the distribution and linguistic realisation of M-1 and M-5, the explicitness of methodological information, move segmentation, and the use of contribution claims.

3. Findings

3.1. Macrostructure and Move Frequency of Abstracts

The two subcorpora contained the same number of texts but differed in length and rhetorical completeness. The Uzbek abstracts were longer at the median, yet the English corpus contained a larger proportion of texts in which all five functions were separately recoverable. Length alone therefore did not predict structural completeness.

Table 3. Abstract length and number of structural moves

Measure	English, n (%)	Uzbek, n (%)
Median abstract length	198 words	254 words
Five moves	22 (64.7)	15 (44.1)
Four moves	11 (32.4)	13 (38.2)
Three moves	1 (2.9)	5 (14.7)
Two moves	0 (0.0)	1 (2.9)

Percentages are calculated within each 34-text subcorpus.

Purpose was the only move occurring in all 68 abstracts. Results occurred in all English texts and in 33 Uzbek texts. Method displayed the largest cross-corpus difference: it was present in 32 English abstracts but in

26 Uzbek abstracts. Research Territory and Conclusion/Value remained conventional in both corpora rather than universally obligatory.

Table 4. Frequency and genre status of abstract moves

Move	English, n (%)	Uzbek, n (%)	Genre status
M-1 Research territory	28 (82.4)	24 (70.6)	Conventional in both
M-2 Purpose	34 (100.0)	34 (100.0)	Central in both
M-3 Method	32 (94.1)	26 (76.5)	Conventional in both; more stable in English
M-4 Results	34 (100.0)	33 (97.1)	Central in English; conventional in Uzbek
M-5 Conclusion/value	29 (85.3)	27 (79.4)	Conventional in both

Note. Central = 100%; conventional = 60-99%; optional = below 60%.

The common core was therefore M-2 plus M-4, which appeared in every English abstract and all but one Uzbek abstract. When Method was added to this core, the three-move Purpose–Method–Results configuration covered 94.1 per cent of English and 76.5 per cent of Uzbek texts. The inclusion of Conclusion/Value produced a Purpose–Results–Value configuration in 85.3 per cent of English and 79.4 per cent of Uzbek abstracts.

3.2. Move-sequence patterns

Seven move-sequence patterns were identified (Table 5). The complete M-1–M-5 sequence was dominant in both corpora, but its dominance was considerably stronger in English. The most frequent reduced pattern omitted Research Territory and began directly with Purpose. Uzbek abstracts also showed a greater variety of shortened configurations, including patterns without Method, without Conclusion/Value, and one two-move abstract containing only Territory and Purpose.

Table 5. Move-sequence patterns in the English and Uzbek corpora

Move-sequence patterns	English, n (%)	Uzbek, n (%)
M-1 → M-2 → M-3 → M-4 → M-5	22 (64.7)	15 (44.1)
M-2 → M-3 → M-4 → M-5	5 (14.7)	7 (20.6)
M-1 → M-2 → M-4 → M-5	2 (5.9)	5 (14.7)
M-1 → M-2 → M-3 → M-4	4 (11.8)	1 (2.9)
M-2 → M-3 → M-4	1 (2.9)	3 (8.8)

Move-sequence patterns	English, n (%)	Uzbek, n (%)
M-1 → M-2 → M-4	0 (0.0)	2 (5.9)
M-1 → M-2	0 (0.0)	1 (2.9)

3.3. Opening and closing positions

Opening and closing positions confirm the same tendency. Research Territory opened 82.4 per cent of English and 70.6 per cent of Uzbek abstracts.

Conclusion/Value occupied the final position in 85.3 per cent of English and 79.4 per cent of Uzbek texts. Uzbek abstracts were therefore more likely to begin directly with Purpose and more likely to end at the result statement without a separately recoverable implication.

Table 6. Opening and closing moves

Position	Move	English, n (%)	Uzbek, n (%)
Opening	M-1 Research territory	28 (82.4)	24 (70.6)
Opening	M-2 Purpose	6 (17.6)	10 (29.4)
Closing	M-5 Conclusion/value	29 (85.3)	27 (79.4)
Closing	M-4 Results	5 (14.7)	6 (17.6)
Closing	M-2 Purpose	0 (0.0)	1 (2.9)

3.4. M-1: Establishing the research territory

M-1 establishes the disciplinary field, justifies the importance of the topic, or identifies a bounded problem or research gap. The move occurred in 28 English and 24 Uzbek abstracts. English texts frequently compressed established knowledge and a gap into a short concessive progression. The gap was commonly signalled by however, few studies, remains underexplored, or little is known. Such expressions make the transition from communal knowledge to the present research problem immediately visible.

(1) While self-mention has been widely researched in academic genres, its role in corporate communication across linguacultures remains relatively underexplored. [E-01; English for Specific Purposes, 2025]

The concessive frame acknowledges an established research area, while remains relatively underexplored creates a delimited niche. M-1/S-1 and M-1/S-3 are

therefore combined without a separate literature-review sentence. The sentence also displays a modest promotional function: the current study is made necessary by a clearly bounded deficiency in prior work.

Uzbek abstracts also used explicit deficit statements, but M-1 more often developed through broad contextualisation. Writers frequently began with contemporary professional demands, social conditions, or disciplinary relevance and only subsequently narrowed the problem. The gap was typically marked by ammo, biroq, yetarlicha o'rganilmagan, or tadqiq etilmagan.

(2) Frazelogiyani o'rganishga bag'ishlangan tadqiqotlarda kognitiv tahlil amalga oshirilgan, ammo antroponimik komponentli frazeologik birliklarning metaforik qo'llanilishi yetarlicha o'rganilmagan. [U-11; Philology Matters, 2025]

'Cognitive analysis has been conducted in studies of

phraseology; however, the metaphorical use of phraseological units containing anthroponymic components has not been studied sufficiently’.

The connector *ammo* and the agentless predicate *yetarlicha o’rganilmagan* perform a rhetorical operation comparable to English *however* and remains underexplored. The difference lies in information packaging: English often isolates the limitation as a brief gap statement, whereas Uzbek more often reaches it after a broader descriptive frame.

3.5. M-2: Presenting the research purpose

M-2 was the only move present in every abstract. It distinguishes the present research action from the general topic and answers the question *What was investigated?* English purpose moves were predominantly verb-centred. Subjects such as *this study*, *this paper*, *we*, or the analysis were combined with aims, investigates, examines, explores, addresses, or compares. Anaphoric phrases such as *to address this issue* and *to fill this gap* connected Purpose explicitly to the preceding niche.

(3) *To address this issue, this paper investigates the rhetorical impact on Results when the Methods section is placed at the end of the article.* [E-12; English for Specific Purposes, 2025]

The infinitival phrase *to address this issue* functions as a problem–response bridge, while *investigates* constitutes the finite nucleus of the move. The sentence identifies both the research operation and its object, producing a recognisable transition from M-1 to M-2.

Uzbek purpose moves were equally explicit but more frequently nominal-predicative. Formulas such as *mazkur maqolaning maqsadi ...dan iborat*, *tadqiqotning asosiy maqsadi ...ni aniqlashdir*, and *ishda ... ko’zda tutiladi* foreground the semantic content of the aim rather than the researcher as an agent. Coordinated action nominals commonly subdivided the purpose into several operational tasks.

(4) *Mazkur maqolaning maqsadi sohaviy tarjimani aniqlash, uning lingvodidaktik tamoyillarini asoslash hamda ta’lim jarayoniga tatbiq etishning amaliy modelini taklif qilishdan iborat.* [U-05; Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan, 2025]

‘The aim of this article is to define specialised translation, justify its linguodidactic principles, and

propose a practical model for its implementation in education.’

The verbs *aniqlash*, *asoslash*, and *taklif qilish* form an ordered research programme. The English pattern foregrounds a finite research act; the Uzbek pattern foregrounds the internal composition of the aim. Both are functionally explicit, but their authorial visibility differs.

3.6. M-3: Summarising methodology

M-3 occurred in 94.1 per cent of English and 76.5 per cent of Uzbek abstracts, creating the largest cross-corpus difference. English texts commonly identified material, design, and analytical procedure through separate clauses or through a compact material–procedure sequence. Non-finite clauses such as *drawing on*, *using*, *based on*, and *adopting a ... lens* allowed Method to be embedded within Purpose without losing visibility.

(5) *The dataset consists of seven PechaKucha presentations delivered at an architecture conference. Adopting a multimodal discourse-analysis lens, we analyse the presentations in terms of rhetorical structure and intersemiotic relations.* [E-21; English for Specific Purposes, 2024]

The first sentence specifies the dataset; the second identifies the analytical framework and procedure. The use of a concrete numeral, an explicit data noun, and an active research verb creates a transparent chain from material to analysis.

Uzbek methodology moves frequently used a locative frame, a list of methods, and passive predicates. The pattern *maqolada ... metodlar qo’llanilgan* explicitly announces methodology but may not specify which method was applied to which material. Theoretical studies often presented an inventory of frameworks rather than a data–procedure sequence.

(6) *“Maqolada tavsifiy, qiyosiy-tipologik, diaxron va sinxron, komponent tahlil, semantik maydon tahlili hamda lingvostatistik metodlar qo’llanilgan.”* [U-04; Philology Matters, 2024]

‘Descriptive, comparative-typological, diachronic and synchronic, componential, semantic-field, and linguostatistical methods were used in the article.’

The passive predicate *qo’llanilgan* (were used) suppresses the researcher and foregrounds the methodological apparatus. The long coordinated series

signals analytical breadth, but the relation between each method, data source, and research operation remains less linear than in the typical English pattern.

3.7. M-4: Reporting principal results

M-4 was present in all English abstracts and in 33 Uzbek abstracts. It was therefore the second component of the cross-linguistic rhetorical core. English result moves frequently began with an inanimate evidential subject such as the analysis, the results, or the findings, followed by show, reveal, indicate, demonstrate, or suggest. This frame separates the empirical source from the proposition presented as a finding.

(7) The analysis reveals that aviation-maintenance English prioritises informational density, minimises abstract content, and maintains sufficient elaboration for safety-critical clarity. [E-07; English for Specific Purposes, 2025]

The matrix clause identifies the epistemic source, while the coordinated predicates report a compact result profile. Comparative findings were commonly organised through whereas or however, enabling shared tendencies and group differences to be reported within one sequence.

Uzbek result moves were commonly introduced by tadqiqot natijalari shuni ko'rsatadiki, natijalarga ko'ra, tahlil natijasida aniqlandiki, or aniqlandi. The matrix frame marks the statement as evidence-based, while the following clause may integrate finding and evaluation.

(8) Tadqiqot natijalariga ko'ra, iqtisodiy nutqda ishlatiladigan frazeologik birliklar odatiy leksik birliklarga nisbatan ko'proq emotsional, ekspressiv va obrazli ma'no yuklaydi. [U-18; Philology Matters, 2025]

'The results show that phraseological units used in economic discourse carry more emotional, expressive, and figurative meaning than ordinary lexical units.'

The phrase ...ga nisbatan ko'proq provides an explicit comparative axis. The result is therefore fully recoverable, although Uzbek abstracts often package

several findings in an extended enumerative construction rather than in separately segmented sentences.

3.8. M-5: Indicating conclusion and value

M-5 occurred in 85.3 per cent of English and 79.4 per cent of Uzbek abstracts. English texts frequently shifted from evidential reporting to contribution and implication verbs such as contributes, enriches, offers, informs, highlights, and suggests. This lexical shift kept the empirical finding distinct from its theoretical or pedagogical interpretation.

(9) The findings enrich the literature on cross-linguacultural communication and offer valuable insights for ESP materials and genre-based pedagogy. [E-01; English for Specific Purposes, 2025]

The coordinated verbs enrich and offer assign two levels of value: contribution to a research domain and applicability to pedagogical practice. When suggests was used, the relation between evidence and implication was modulated rather than presented as absolute.

Uzbek conclusion moves more often employed evaluative nominal predicates and purpose constructions: muhim amaliy ahamiyatga ega, xizmat qiladi, imkon beradi, yordam beradi, and samaradorlikni oshiradi. Conclusion, evaluation, and recommendation were frequently integrated within one extended sentence.

(10) Ushbu tadqiqot natijalari media tadqiqotlar, iqtisodiy jurnalistika hamda migratsiya siyosati sohalari uchun muhim amaliy ahamiyatga ega. [U-01; Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan, 2025]

'The results of this study have important practical significance for media studies, economic journalism, and migration policy.'

The postpositional phrase ...sohalari uchun identifies the application domain, while muhim amaliy ahamiyatga ega evaluates the result. The move is explicit, but its integration with the preceding result is generally stronger than in English.

Table 7. Dominant linguistic realisations of comparable moves

Move	Typical English realisation	Typical Uzbek realisation	Primary discourse effect
M-1 Territory	<i>however; few studies; remains underexplored; present-tense field statement</i>	<i>ammo/biroq; yetarlicha o'rganilmagan; broad contextual relevance</i>	Constructs need and disciplinary niche
M-2 Purpose	<i>this study/paper/we + aims, investigates, examines, explores</i>	<i>tadqiqotning maqsadi ...dan iborat; ...ni aniqlashdir; action-noun series</i>	Announces present research operation
M-3 Method	<i>dataset/design statement; using/drawing on/adopting; active analysis verb</i>	<i>method inventory; passive predicate; ...dan foydalanildi; ...qo'llanildi</i>	Establishes evidential and procedural basis
M-4 Results	<i>analysis/results/findings + show, reveal, indicate, demonstrate</i>	<i>natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki; natijalarga ko'ra; aniqlandiki</i>	Marks new knowledge claim
M-5 Value	<i>contributes, enriches, offers insights, suggests, informs</i>	<i>muhim ahamiyatga ega; xizmat qiladi; imkon beradi; yordam beradi</i>	Interprets significance and application

Table 8. Principal structural contrasts between the two corpora

Analytical dimension	English tendency	Uzbek tendency
Move completeness	Higher rate of complete five-move sequence	Greater frequency of reduced four- and three-move configurations
Segmentation	One dominant function per sentence or clearly delimited clause	Several functions integrated within extended sentence complexes
Purpose realisation	Finite active research verb and explicit grammatical subject	Nominal-predicative purpose frame and coordinated action nominals
Method transparency	Material–design–analysis chain usually recoverable	Method/framework inventories often foregrounded through passive predication

Analytical dimension	English tendency	Uzbek tendency
Result framing	Inanimate evidence source plus reporting verb	Evidential matrix clause plus extended proposition or enumeration
Conclusion/value	Separate contribution or implication sentence frequent	Evaluation and recommendation commonly integrated with result

4. Discussion

4.1. The shared rhetorical core and its variable periphery

The findings confirm that Purpose and Results constitute the shared rhetorical core of English and Uzbek RAAs. Purpose occurred in every text, while Results was absent from only one Uzbek abstract. This pattern is consistent with earlier studies identifying the current research and its product as the least dispensable components of the genre (Martín, 2003; Pho, 2008; Samraj, 2005; Santos, 1996). It also resembles Kafes's (2015) finding that presenting the research, methodology, and results form a stable nucleus across English and Turkish abstracts.

The complete five-move sequence was nevertheless more frequent in English. The difference was distributed across several non-core moves rather than produced by one isolated category: English showed stronger realisation of Research Territory, Method, and Conclusion/Value. The largest gap concerned Method, which was absent from almost one quarter of the Uzbek abstracts but from only two English texts. This pattern may reflect stronger expectations of methodological visibility in the sampled international English-language journals, whereas some Uzbek abstracts devote more space to conceptual framing and method inventories.

The longer median length of Uzbek abstracts did not produce greater move completeness. This finding supports the view that genre effectiveness depends on the organisation of communicative functions rather than on the amount of text alone. Uzbek grammatical resources allow substantial conceptual material to be compressed into nominal groups, action-nominal series, participial modifiers, and sentence-final predicates. Such constructions may be coherent and economical, but extensive accumulation can reduce the visibility of boundaries between purpose, method, result, and value.

A multifunctional sentence is not inherently defective. It can be cohesive, economical, and fully compatible with Uzbek grammar. The problem arises when the central claim becomes difficult to distinguish from an inventory of supporting details. Conversely, English segmentation can become mechanical when every move is reduced to a formulaic sentence. The appropriate criterion is recoverability: can a specialist reader identify the need, purpose, method, principal result, and value without excessive inference?

4.2. Authorial agency and grammatical subject

English abstracts frequently used explicit grammatical subjects to identify the present study, the researcher, the data, or the findings. This study, this paper, we, the analysis, and the findings provide immediate thematic orientation. In Purpose, an animate or anaphoric subject foregrounds the research operation; in Results, an inanimate evidential subject helps objectify the claim without erasing its source. This pattern is consistent with broader research on self-mention and authorial identity in academic writing (Hyland, 2001).

Uzbek abstracts often reduced direct authorial visibility through nominal-predicative and passive structures. Tadqiqotning maqsadi ...dan iborat presents Purpose as an objectified component of the study, while maqolada ... metodlar qo'llanilgan foregrounds the methodological apparatus. Authorial presence may still be encoded through possessive morphology, as in tadqiqotimiz, but it is less likely to occupy the initial grammatical subject position.

4.3. Verb form, tense, and voice

The English examples show a functional distribution of verb forms. Present-tense verbs such as investigates, examines, and reveals present the article and its claims as currently available to the reader. Past-tense forms are more likely when a completed procedure or empirical

event is foregrounded. Non-finite clauses compress methodological information and create a visible hierarchy between the main research action and its procedural basis.

Uzbek purpose and method segments frequently replace a finite sequence with action nominals and sentence-final predicates. Aniqlash, asoslash, tahlil qilish, and taklif qilish package several research actions as coordinated nominal units. Passive or agentless predicates such as qo'llanilgan, foydalanilgan, and aniqlandi shift attention from the researcher to the procedure or result. This does not automatically produce greater objectivity; rather, it changes the distribution of agency and informational prominence. The contrast should therefore not be reduced to a simple active-passive opposition; it involves different ways of organising agency, process, and thematic focus.

4.4. Evaluative language and promotional visibility

The concluding language of English abstracts often made contribution and applicability explicit. Verbs such as contributes, enriches, offers, informs, and suggests position the finding within a disciplinary or pedagogical economy of value. Gap statements in M-1 and contribution claims in M-5 create a recognisable problem-response-contribution arc. Such contribution claims and hedged implications belong to the interactional dimension of metadiscourse (Hyland, 2005), and their growing prominence in research article

this tentative distinction.

abstracts has been documented in diachronic work on the genre (Gillaerts & Van de Velde, 2010).

Uzbek abstracts also used positive evaluation, but value was frequently expressed through nominal predicates or purpose constructions such as muhim amaliy ahamiyatga ega, xizmat qiladi, and imkon beradi. Promotional claims were often integrated into broader descriptions of results or recommendations rather than isolated as separate contribution statements. This organisation corresponds more closely to an orientation in which the study is legitimised through comprehensive content, contextual relevance, and explicit practical usefulness.

4.5. Promotional and expository orientations: tentative explanations

Interpreted through Yakhontova's (2002) distinction between "selling" and "telling", reformulated here as promotional and expository orientations, the English corpus exhibits a relatively stronger promotional orientation. Gap statements, direct purpose announcements, transparent methodological claims, and contribution verbs create a sequence in which the study is justified, differentiated, and its contribution made visible. The Uzbek corpus exhibits a relatively stronger expository orientation: broad contextualisation, terminological explanation, method inventories, and integrated result-value statements present the study through comprehensive exposition and practical relevance. Table 9 summarises the indicators supporting

Table 9. Tentative indicators of promotional and expository orientations

Rhetorical dimension	Relatively stronger English tendency	Relatively stronger Uzbek tendency	Interpretive caution
Need for the study	Concise gap or limitation statement	Broad disciplinary or social contextualisation	Both strategies can establish relevance
Present research	Finite research verb and explicit subject	Nominal-predicative aim and action-nominal series	Difference concerns agency and focus

Rhetorical dimension	Relatively stronger English tendency	Relatively stronger Uzbek tendency	Interpretive caution
Method	Visible material–design–analysis chain	Method or framework inventory with passive predication	Method type varies by discipline
Results	Segmented evidential claim and comparison	Integrated evidential frame, enumeration, and evaluation	Integration is not omission
Value	Separate contribution or implication statement	Practical value embedded in result or recommendation	Promotional intensity varies by journal
Overall orientation	More explicit differentiation and contribution display	More extensive description and contextual legitimation	Discoursal tendency, not cultural essence

The distinction must remain tentative. It does not imply that every English abstract is promotional or that every Uzbek abstract is purely descriptive, nor does it identify an immutable national rhetorical character. The two groups share the same fundamental move sequence, which indicates participation in a common international research-article genre. Their differences are more plausibly interpreted as the interaction of language structure, journal policy, disciplinary epistemology, local academic-writing instruction, and anticipated readership – an account consistent with Dahl’s (2004) argument that discourse community and discipline may outweigh national culture in shaping rhetorical patterning.

The sampled journals also occupy different institutional positions. English for Specific Purposes and TESOL Quarterly address an international readership and operate within a highly competitive publication environment. Philology Matters and Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan combine national and international communicative functions and include a broader range of theoretical, descriptive, and pedagogical studies. These institutional conditions may influence how strongly novelty, method, and contribution must be displayed in the abstract. The present data support this explanation only indirectly; journal instructions and editorial decision-making were not analysed.

5. Limitations

The corpus represents four journals and language-related disciplines; the results cannot be generalised to all English- and Uzbek-language scientific writing. The analysis is descriptive and does not establish a causal relation between language, national culture, journal policy, and move selection. Coding was conducted by one researcher, although all texts underwent a complete second-pass audit. Finally, linguistic realisation was analysed qualitatively; a separate coded dataset would be required for reliable frequency claims about grammatical subjects, tense, voice, and embedding.

6. Conclusion

This study compared 68 English and Uzbek research article abstracts through a unified five-move and fifteen-step framework. Purpose was central in both corpora. Results was central in the English corpus and conventional in the Uzbek corpus. Research Territory, Method, and Conclusion/Value were conventional components whose stability differed across the two academic traditions.

The complete sequence was identified in 64.7% of the English abstracts and 44.1% of the Uzbek abstracts.

English abstracts more frequently separated communicative functions through finite research verbs, explicit data statements, reporting frames, and implication markers. Uzbek abstracts more frequently integrated context, aim, method, finding, and evaluation through nominal-predicative constructions, action nominals, passive predicates, and extended enumerations.

The results support a cautious distinction between a relatively stronger promotional orientation in English and a relatively stronger expository orientation in Uzbek. English abstracts more explicitly justified the research niche and displayed contribution, whereas Uzbek abstracts more often legitimised the study through contextualisation, terminological breadth, and practical relevance. These are not fixed cultural properties but discursal tendencies produced by the interaction of language structure, discipline, journal policy, writing instruction, and readership.

The operational model provides a transparent framework for contrastive genre analysis and a practical instrument for doctoral writing, translation, journal editing, and academic-writing instruction. An effective abstract need not imitate the surface structure of another language, but it must enable the reader to reconstruct the complete problem-purpose-method-result-value chain with minimal inference.

Appendix A. Corpus identification

The identifiers used in the numbered examples correspond to the item-level corpus audit register. Codes E-01–E-34 denote the English subcorpus, compiled from English for Specific Purposes and TESOL Quarterly; codes U-01–U-34 denote the Uzbek subcorpus, compiled from Philology Matters and Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan. Each code is accompanied in the text by the journal title and publication year of the source article. Full bibliographic records of the source articles and the original files are retained in the research corpus archive and are available upon reasonable request.

References

1. Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition, culture, power. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
2. Bhatia, V. K. (1993). Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings. Longman.
3. Biber, D., Connor, U., & Upton, T. A. (2007). Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure. John Benjamins.
4. Can, S., Karabacak, E., & Qin, J. (2016). Structure of moves in research article abstracts in applied linguistics. *Publications*, 4(3), Article 23.
5. Cross, C., & Oppenheim, C. (2006). A genre analysis of scientific abstracts. *Journal of Documentation*, 62(4), 428-446.
6. Dahl, T. (2004). Textual metadiscourse in research articles: A marker of national culture or academic discipline? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1807-1825.
7. Gillaerts, P., & Van de Velde, F. (2010). Interactional metadiscourse in research article abstracts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(2), 128-139.
8. Graetz, N. (1985). Teaching EFL students to extract structural information from abstracts. In J. M. Ulijn & A. K. Pugh (Eds.), *Reading for professional purposes* (pp. 123-135). ACCO.
9. Hartley, J. (2003). Improving the clarity of journal abstracts in psychology. *Science Communication*, 24(3), 366-379.
10. Hartley, J. (2004). Current findings from research on structured abstracts. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 92(3), 368-371.
11. Huckin, T. N. (2001). Abstracting from abstracts. In M. Hewings (Ed.), *Academic writing in context* (pp. 93-103). University of Birmingham Press.
12. Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Longman.
13. Hyland, K. (2001). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20(3), 207-226.
14. Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Continuum.
15. Kafes, H. (2015). Cultural or discursal proclivity: Rhetorical structure of English and Turkish research article abstracts. *Anthropologist*, 21(1-2), 240-254.
16. Lorés, R. (2004). On research article abstracts: From rhetorical structure to thematic organisation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23(3), 280-302.
17. Martín, P. M. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22(1), 25-43.
18. Paltridge, B. (1994). Genre analysis and the identification of textual boundaries. *Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 288-299.

19. Pho, P. D. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realisations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies*, 10(2), 231-250.
20. Salager-Meyer, F. (1990). Discoursal flaws in medical English abstracts: A genre analysis per research- and text-type. *Text*, 10(4), 365-384.
21. Samraj, B. (2005). An exploration of a genre set: Research article abstracts and introductions in two disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(2), 141-156.
22. Santos, M. B. dos. (1996). The textual organisation of research paper abstracts in applied linguistics. *Text*, 16(4), 481-499.
23. Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
24. Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2009). *Abstracts and the writing of abstracts*. University of Michigan Press.
25. Tseng, F.-P. (2011). Analyses of move structure and verb tense of research article abstracts in applied linguistics journals. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 1(2), 27-39.
26. Yakhontova, T. (2002). "Selling" or "telling"? The issue of cultural variation in research genres. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp. 216-232). Longman.