



Research Article

Promotional and Expository Orientations: A Comparative Genre Analysis of English and Uzbek Research Article Abstracts

Abduganiyeva Zebuniso Abduhafizovna* 

Department of English Language and Literature, Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

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 contains 68 abstracts published between 2023 and 2025, equally divided between English and Uzbek and drawn from four language-related journals. The corpus was analysed through a five-move, fifteen-step model covering Research Territory, Purpose, Method, Results, and Conclusion/Value. Purpose occurred in all 68 abstracts, but Results was central in English and only conventional in Uzbek (100.0% against 64.7%), and a complete five-move configuration occurred in 70.6% of English abstracts against 29.4% of Uzbek abstracts; both differences were statistically significant. English abstracts more often constructed a concise research niche, identified data and analytical procedures, stated a recoverable study-specific finding, and separated the contribution from the result. These functions were commonly realised through finite active research verbs, explicit grammatical subjects, evidential reporting frames, and contribution verbs. Uzbek abstracts more frequently foregrounded disciplinary or practical relevance, coordinated operational objectives, inventories of methods, and recommendations, using nominal-predicative purpose constructions, action nominals, passive predicates, and extended sentence complexes. Consequently, the English corpus displays a relatively stronger promotional-completion orientation, whereas the Uzbek corpus displays a relatively stronger contextual-expository orientation. These are corpus-level tendencies rather than fixed cultural properties, and they reflect the interaction of linguistic resources, journal expectations, disciplinary practice, and anticipated readership.

Keywords

Academic Writing, Research Article Abstract, Generic Structure, Move Analysis, Contrastive Rhetoric

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

*Correspondence: Abduganiyeva Zebuniso Abduhafizovna (za.abduganiyeva@uzswlu.uz)

Received: 15 July 2026; Accepted: 25 July 2026; Published: 20 October 2026



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2026. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

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 [1-4]. Research on abstract clarity and genre structure further shows that explicit organisation improves information retrieval and makes a study's research logic more recoverable [5-7]. These accounts 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 [4] 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. Berkenkotter and Huckin [8], Bhatia [9], Paltridge [10], and Biber et al. [11] 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 [12] identifies Situating the Research, Presenting the Research, Describing the Methodology, Summarising the Results, and Discussing the Research. Hyland [13] proposes Introduction, Purpose, Method, Product, and Conclusion. Lor é s [2] distinguishes abstracts organised as condensed versions of the article from those organised through a problem-gap-response logic. Pho [14] retains a five-move model but relates each move to grammatical subjects, tense, voice, and authorial stance. Tseng [15] and Can et al. [16] subsequently extend the analysis to move length, sequencing, embedding, recycling, and disciplinary variation. Recent studies continue to connect move analysis with move-specific syntactic complexity, metadiscourse, and cross-journal variation [17-19]. The model used in the present study integrates the functional core of these accounts; its derivation, its relation to each of them, and the reasons for preferring an integrated scheme to any one of them are set out in Section 2.2.

Cross-cultural studies show that comparable communicative purposes do not necessarily yield identical textual realisations. Kafes [20] 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 [21] 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. More recent studies extend this argument. Can and Cangır [22] found that British doctoral writers in literary studies used self-mention markers more frequently than their Turkish counterparts, thereby constructing a more explicit authorial presence; Turkish writers, by contrast, tended to maintain a less overt and more impersonal authorial position. Similarly, Deng et al. [23] found that English applied-linguistics research articles displayed a stronger promotional orientation than their Chinese counterparts. English writers more frequently justified and reinforced the significance of the research topic or claims and explicitly evaluated their findings, whereas Chinese writers were more inclined to summarise and explain their results. Research on geo-academic location further indicates that evaluative resources, including expressions of confusion, may vary across author groups [24]. Taken together, these studies caution against reducing rhetorical variation to national culture alone: disciplinary conventions, institutional conditions, publication pressures, academic writing instruction, and anticipated readership 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 configurations 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 corpora of English and Uzbek research article abstracts. The English corpus contains 34 abstracts, with 17 texts from *English for Specific Purposes* and 17 from *TESOL Quarterly*. The Uzbek corpus 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 corpus and 163,902 words in the Uzbek corpus. Titles, keywords, author information, and reference lists were excluded from move coding. Table 1 summarises the composition of the two corpora.

The four journals were selected on three explicit grounds rather than by convenience. First, disciplinary comparability: all four publish research in applied linguistics, language education, discourse studies, and translation, so that variation attributable to disciplinary epistemology is minimised and the remaining variation can be related to language and publication culture. Second, institutional standing within their respective

communities: English for Specific Purposes and TESOL Quarterly are established international journals with anonymous peer review and explicit abstract guidelines, while Philology Matters and Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan are among the principal nationally accredited outlets in which Uzbek-medium linguistic research appears, and they are indexed by the national attestation system. Third, quota balance: an equal number of texts was drawn from each journal so that no single editorial policy dominates either corpus. The sample is therefore representative of mainstream published practice in each publication culture rather than of applied linguistics as a whole, and the findings are accordingly presented as characteristic of these publication contexts rather than of the languages in general. (See Appendix).

Table 1. Composition of the English and Uzbek abstract corpora.

Corpus	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.

2.2. Analytical Model and Coding Procedure

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 established five-move accounts [2, 12-16]. It was selected for three reasons. First, it retains both a territory/problem move and a conclusion/value move, which are required for examining promotional and expository tendencies. Second, it provides a common functional tertium comparationis for English and Uzbek forms that are not structurally identical. Third, the fifteen-step layer operationalises the internal organisation of each move and served as a coding aid during move assignment; step-level distributions are not reported in the present analysis. Five moves were distinguished, each with three operational steps and a control question, as set out in Table 2.

Coding was conducted in successive passes. The analytical unit was a communicative segment, and multifunctional segments received combined labels when separate clauses performed distinct local functions. A move was counted once per abstract regardless of recurrence. Particular attention was paid to the boundary between M-4 Results and M-5 Conclusion/Value. A segment was coded as M-4 only when it stated

an outcome obtained in the reported study and answered the question “What was found?”. Formulations that merely announced analysis, discussion, or future conclusions, restated the aim, or evaluated topic importance were not treated as Results unless a study-specific finding was recoverable.

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 because both explicitly announce the present research operation.

A second trained researcher independently recoded all 68 abstracts. Initial agreement across the 340 move-presence decisions was 96.5%, and Cohen’s kappa for moves with sufficient variation ranged from .783 to .951. The coders then reviewed disagreements against the control questions in Table 2 and established the final coding register used in the analysis. This verification led especially to a stricter distinction between an actual M-4 finding and statements that merely announced that results were discussed or conclusions would be drawn. Reliability is reported here as a quality-control procedure; the substantive analysis below focuses on the rhetorical and linguistic contrasts between the two corpora.

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?
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?

2.3. Approach to the Analysis of Linguistic Realisation

Following Pho [14], 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. No single lexical marker was treated as an automatic move label. For example, *natija* or results could introduce an empirical finding, announce that results would be discussed, or form part of a general claim; only the first function was coded as M-4.

English and Uzbek examples were interpreted within their original co-text. The analysis distinguishes linguistic integration from functional omission. A result was treated as integrated when a study-specific finding was embedded within a longer purpose, method, or evaluative segment; it was treated as omitted when the abstract did not state what the study found. Promotional and expository orientations were not coded as independent moves, mutually exclusive variables, or binary labels for individual abstracts. Promotional orientation was inferred at corpus level from explicit niche construction, visible research operations, study-specific result reporting, and separately formulated contribution claims. Expository orientation was inferred from broad contextualisation, terminological explanation, operational-objective series, method or framework inventories, and integrated explanation of practical relevance. These indicators were examined only after move coding and did not alter move assignments.

2.4. Statistical Analysis

Text-level move presence and complete five-move configuration frequencies were compared with two-tailed Fisher's

exact tests because several contingency-table cells were small. Odds ratios were calculated where estimable, and $p < .05$ was used as an exploratory significance threshold. The tests were applied to the post-verification consensus counts and were interpreted together with the qualitative coding evidence; they were not used to make causal claims about language or culture.

3. Findings

3.1. Macrostructure and Move Frequency of Abstracts

The corpora contain the same number of texts but differ markedly in rhetorical completeness. Uzbek abstracts are longer at the median, yet English abstracts more often contain all five communicative functions. A complete five-move configuration was found in 24 English abstracts (70.6%) but only 10 Uzbek abstracts (29.4%). Four-move configurations were most frequent in Uzbek, while seven Uzbek texts contained only three moves and one contained two (Table 3).

Table 3. Abstract length and number of structural moves.

Measure	English, n (%)	Uzbek, n (%)
Median abstract length	198 words	254 words
Five moves	24 (70.6)	10 (29.4)
Four moves	9 (26.5)	16 (47.1)
Three moves	1 (2.9)	7 (20.6)
Two moves	0 (0.0)	1 (2.9)

Percentages are calculated within each 34-text corpus.

The complete five-move configuration was significantly more frequent in English than in Uzbek (odds ratio = 5.76, two-tailed Fisher's exact $p = .001$). This result indicates that the difference is not limited to surface packaging: in the sampled English journals, the problem-purpose-method-result-value chain was substantially more likely to be fully recoverable from the abstract.

Purpose was the only move occurring in all 68 abstracts. Results occurred in all English texts but in only 22 Uzbek texts (64.7%). Method was present in 32 English and 29 Uzbek abstracts, while Conclusion/Value occurred in 31 and 25, respectively. Research Territory remained conventional in both corpora, occurring in 28 English and 27 Uzbek texts (Table 4).

Table 4. Frequency and genre status of abstract moves.

Move	English, n (%)	Uzbek, n (%)	Genre status
M-1 Research territory	28 (82.4)	27 (79.4)	Conventional in both
M-2 Purpose	34 (100.0)	34 (100.0)	Central in both
M-3 Method	32 (94.1)	29 (85.3)	Conventional in both; more stable in English
M-4 Results	34 (100.0)	22 (64.7)	Central in English; conventional in Uzbek
M-5 Conclusion/value	31 (91.2)	25 (73.5)	Conventional in both

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

Move-level Fisher's exact tests showed a statistically significant cross-corpus difference only for Results (English 34/34, Uzbek 22/34; $p < .001$). Research Territory ($p = 1.000$), Purpose ($p = 1.000$), Method ($p = .427$), and Conclusion/Value ($p = .109$) did not reach $p < .05$. The M-4 result therefore constitutes the strongest quantitative contrast in the dataset.

The shared universal core is M-2 Purpose. M-4 Results is central in English but only conventional in Uzbek, and twelve Uzbek abstracts do not report a study-specific outcome. M-3 Method and M-5 Conclusion/Value remain conventional in both corpora, although their higher English frequencies contribute to the significant difference in complete five-move configurations. The reduced configurations are not randomly composed. Of the thirty-three unrealised move slots in the Uzbek corpus, twelve are M-4, nine are M-5, seven are M-1, and

five are M-3; of the eleven unrealised slots in the English corpus, six are M-1, three are M-5, and two are M-3. Reduced Uzbek configurations therefore most often omit the result and value functions, whereas the English texts that are not complete most often omit the research territory.

3.2. Opening Positions

Opening positions show a clear but not categorical difference. Research Territory opened 82.4% of English abstracts and 70.6% of Uzbek abstracts, whereas Purpose opened 17.6% and 29.4%, respectively. English abstracts were therefore somewhat more likely to begin by establishing the research territory, while Uzbek abstracts more often moved directly to the study purpose (Table 5).

Table 5. Opening 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)

3.3. 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 27 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). *Frazeologiyani 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.

3.4. 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 tarjimoni 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.

3.5. M-3: Summarising Methodology

M-3 occurred in 94.1% of English and 85.3% of Uzbek abstracts, showing a modest descriptive advantage for English. 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.

3.6. M-4: Reporting Principal Results

M-4 was present in all 34 English abstracts and in 22 Uzbek abstracts (64.7%). It was therefore central in English but only conventional in Uzbek. 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.

3.7. M-5: Indicating Conclusion and Value

M-5 occurred in 91.2% of English and 73.5% 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. [Tables 6 and 7](#) summarise the dominant linguistic realisations of comparable moves and the principal structural contrasts between the two corpora.

Table 6. 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 7. *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
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

The following subsections address the four research questions in turn: 4.1 concerns the stability and configuration of moves (RQ1, RQ2), 4.2 concerns their linguistic realisation and compositional packaging (RQ3), and 4.3 and 4.4 concern the promotional and expository orientations inferred from them (RQ4).

4.1. A Shared Purpose but Unequal Completion of the Research Story

The findings show that Purpose, rather than Purpose plus Results, is the universal rhetorical core of the two corpora. Purpose occurred in all 68 texts, confirming that abstracts consistently identify the present research operation [12, 14, 25, 26]. Results, however, was central in English and only conventional in Uzbek. All English abstracts stated a study-specific outcome, whereas twelve Uzbek abstracts did not. This contrast indicates that the principal difference concerns the explicit recoverability of the empirical or analytical product rather than its grammatical packaging alone.

The complete five-move configuration was significantly more frequent in English (70.6%) than in Uzbek (29.4%). This pattern reflects the cumulative effect of universal Results reporting and higher descriptive frequencies for Method and Conclusion/Value in the English corpus. The finding suggests that English abstracts more consistently complete the problem-purpose-method-result-value research story, whereas Uzbek abstracts more often prioritise contextualisation, objectives, procedure, and practical relevance.

The longer median length of Uzbek abstracts did not produce greater move completeness. This supports the view that

genre effectiveness depends on the organisation and recoverability of communicative functions rather than on text length alone. Uzbek abstracts often devote considerable space to topic definitions, relevance claims, operational objectives, and method inventories. Such information may be useful, but it can displace the limited space required for a direct result statement.

The contrast between integrated and omitted Results also has a genre-level implication. Multifunctional sentences can be cohesive and economical when the principal outcome remains recoverable, but contextual explanation or recommendation cannot replace an explicit statement of what the study found. The lower stability of M-4 in the Uzbek corpus therefore points to a difference in communicative completeness rather than simply sentence length or syntactic complexity.

4.2. Grammatical Subject, Verb Form, and the Visibility of the Research Product

English abstracts 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 give immediate thematic orientation: in Purpose an animate or anaphoric subject foregrounds the research operation, while in Results an inanimate evidential subject presents the claim as grounded in an identifiable analytical source. Verb form covaries with function in the same way. Purpose statements typically use present-tense active verbs such as this study examines and this paper investigates; Method segments combine finite past-tense or passive forms with non-finite clauses such as using, drawing on, and adopting; and Results commonly uses evidential frames such as the analysis reveals and the findings show. This distribution, consistent with research on self-mention and authorial identity in academic writing [27],

keeps the relation between rhetorical function, evidential source, and proposition explicit.

Uzbek abstracts distribute the same functions differently. Nominal-predicative and passive structures reduce direct authorial visibility: *tadqiqotning maqsadi.dan* iborat presents Purpose as an objectified component of the study, while *maqolada. metodlar qo'llanilgan* foregrounds the methodological apparatus. Coordinated action nominals such as *aniqlash, asoslash, tahlil qilish*, and *taklif qilish* package several research actions as a single nominal programme, and in result reporting *aniqlandi* and *natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki* provide an effective transition to M-4. These structures create an appropriately impersonal academic tone.

The interpretive point is that the Uzbek pattern supplies no obligatory grammatical position for the research product. Where the English abstracts are built around a sequence of finite predicates, one of which must report what was found, a nominal purpose programme can be completed without a finite result predicate: the aim, its constituent tasks, and the methods applied to them may all be expressed while the outcome itself remains unstated. This offers a structural account of why M-4 was the only move to differ significantly between the corpora, and of why twelve Uzbek abstracts close without a study-specific finding. Because token-level frequencies for grammatical subject, tense, and voice were not counted, this account is presented as an interpretation of recurrent patterns rather than as a quantified claim.

4.3. 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, universal result reporting in M-4, and contribution claims in M-5 create a recognisable problem-response-contribution arc, although contribution claims were not counted as a separate variable. Such contribution claims and hedged implications belong to the interactional dimension of meta-discourse [28], and their prominence has been documented in both diachronic and recent move-metadiscourse research [18, 29].

Uzbek abstracts also used positive evaluation, often through *muhim amaliy ahamiyatga ega, xizmat qiladi*, and *imkon beradi*. In the Uzbek corpus, such evaluation was frequently integrated with broad exposition or recommendation. This produces a different rhetorical balance in which relevance and intended usefulness are foregrounded alongside the empirical product. Such evaluation should not automatically be interpreted as promotion in the English-language sense, because it is commonly embedded in contextual-expository development rather than formulated as a distinct evidence-based contribution claim.

4.4. Promotional and Expository Orientations: Revised Interpretation

Interpreted through Yakhontova's [21] distinction between "selling" and "telling", reformulated here as promotional and expository orientations, the English corpus exhibits a relatively stronger promotional-completion tendency. Concise gap statements, explicit research operations, universal result reporting, and separately formulated contribution claims make the research story and its value visible. The Uzbek corpus exhibits a relatively stronger contextual-expository tendency: broad relevance claims, detailed operational objectives, method inventories, and practical recommendations provide extensive explanation. The analysis nevertheless shows that expository detail cannot be treated as a functional equivalent of Results when no study-specific finding is stated.

The distinction remains a corpus-level tendency, not a classification of every abstract or a claim about immutable national rhetoric. Both corpora participate in the same research-article genre and use the same five functional resources. Their different distributions 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 [30] 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 highly competitive publication environments. 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 conditions may influence how explicitly novelty, method, findings, and contribution are required in the abstract. The present data support this explanation indirectly; journal instructions and editorial decision-making were not independently analysed.

5. Limitations

The corpus represents four journals in language-related disciplines; therefore, the findings cannot be generalised to all English- and Uzbek-language scientific writing. The sample remains modest despite full-dataset inter-coder verification, and the study does not establish a causal relationship between language, national culture, journal policy, and move selection. The qualitative analysis identifies recurrent linguistic realisations but does not provide exhaustive token-level frequencies for grammatical subjects, tense, voice, or evaluative expressions. Step-level distributions were not reported, since the fifteen-step layer was used as a coding aid rather than as an independent unit of quantification. Further studies should test the strict M-4 criterion in larger, discipline-matched corpora, quantify the step layer, and compare journal instructions with

actual abstract practice.

6. Conclusion

This study compared 68 English and Uzbek research article abstracts through a unified five-move, fifteen-step framework with independent double coding of all 68 abstracts. Purpose was central in both corpora. Results was central in English but conventional in Uzbek, occurring in 100.0% and 64.7% of the texts, respectively. Research Territory, Method, and Conclusion/Value were conventional in both corpora.

A complete five-move configuration occurred in 70.6% of English abstracts and 29.4% of Uzbek abstracts. The differences for Results and complete configuration were statistically significant. English abstracts more consistently separated the research problem, operation, evidential product, and contribution through finite research verbs, explicit data statements, reporting frames, and implication markers. Uzbek abstracts more frequently elaborated contextual relevance, operational objectives, methodological frameworks, and practical value through nominal-predicative constructions, action nominals, passive predicates, and extended enumerations. In twelve Uzbek abstracts, however, this exposition did not culminate in a study-specific result statement.

The results support a cautious distinction between a relatively stronger promotional-completion orientation in the English sample and a relatively stronger contextual-expository orientation in the Uzbek sample. These are not fixed cultural properties but discursial tendencies shaped by language structure, discipline, journal policy, writing instruction, and readership. For academic-writing and editorial practice, the principal implication is direct: an effective abstract may use language-specific grammatical resources, but it should allow readers to recover the problem, purpose, method, principal result, and value without inferring the finding from general discussion or recommendations [31].

Abbreviations

RAA	Research Article Abstract
M-1 - M-5	Moves 1 to 5 of the Analytical Model
S-1 - S-3	Functional Steps Within a Move

Author Contributions

Abduganiyeva Zebuniso Abdurahfizovna: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Appendix

The identifiers used in the numbered examples correspond to the item-level corpus audit register. Codes E-01-E-34 denote the English corpus, compiled from *English for Specific Purposes* and *TESOL Quarterly*; codes U-01-U-34 denote the Uzbek corpus, 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] Huckin, T. N. Abstracting from abstracts. In M. Hewings (Ed.), *Academic Writing in Context*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 2001, pp. 93-103.
- [2] Lorés, R. On research article abstracts: From rhetorical structure to thematic organisation. *English for Specific Purposes*. 2004, 23(3), 280-302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2003.06.001>
- [3] Salager-Meyer, F. Discursial flaws in medical English abstracts: A genre analysis per research- and text-type. *Text*. 1990, 10(4), 365-384. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1990.10.4.365>
- [4] Swales, J. M. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [5] Hartley, J. Improving the clarity of journal abstracts in psychology: The case for structure. *Science Communication*. 2003, 24(3), 366-379. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547002250301>
- [6] Hartley, J. Current findings from research on structured abstracts. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*. 2004, 92(3), 368-371.
- [7] Cross, C., Oppenheim, C. A genre analysis of scientific abstracts. *Journal of Documentation*. 2006, 62(4), 428-446. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410610700953>
- [8] Berkenkotter, C., Huckin, T. N. *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition, Culture, Power*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995.
- [9] Bhatia, V. K. *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. London: Longman, 1993.
- [10] Paltridge, B. Genre analysis and the identification of textual boundaries. *Applied Linguistics*. 1994, 15(3), 288-299. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/15.3.288>
- [11] Biber, D., Connor, U., Upton, T. A. *Discourse on the Move: Using Corpus Analysis to Describe Discourse Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sci.28>
- [12] Santos, M. B. dos. The textual organisation of research paper abstracts in applied linguistics. *Text*. 1996, 16(4), 481-499. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1996.16.4.481>

- [13] Hyland, K. *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. London: Longman, 2000.
- [14] Pho, P. D. Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realisations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies*. 2008, 10(2), 231-250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607087010>
- [15] Tseng, F.-P. Analyses of move structure and verb tense of research article abstracts in applied linguistics journals. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. 2011, 1(2), 27-39. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v1n2p27>
- [16] Can, S., Karabacak, E., Qin, J. Structure of moves in research article abstracts in applied linguistics. *Publications*. 2016, 4(3), Article 23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications4030023>
- [17] Gokturk, N., Saricaoglu, A. Examining teacher-written conference abstracts: Rhetorical functions and syntactic complexity features. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 2024, 72, 101454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2024.101454>
- [18] Chaisiri, P., Kumdee, S., Pramoolsook, I. An analysis of moves, hedges, and boosters in applied linguistics research article abstracts of Thai international journals. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*. 2025, 11, 101397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101397>
- [19] Nguyen, M. H. Rhetorical moves and linguistic realisations of economics research article abstracts in international and Vietnam-based journals. *SAGE Open*. 2025, 15(2), Article 21582440251338936. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251338936>
- [20] Kafes, H. Cultural or discursal proclivity: Rhetorical structure of English and Turkish research article abstracts. *The Anthropologist*. 2015, 21(1-2), 240-254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2015.11891813>
- [21] Yakhontova, T. "Selling" or "telling"? The issue of cultural variation in research genres. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic Discourse*. London: Longman, 2002, pp. 216-232.
- [22] Can, T., Cangır, H. A corpus-assisted comparative analysis of self-mention markers in doctoral dissertations of literary studies written in Turkey and the UK. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 2019, 42, Article 100796. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100796>
- [23] Deng, L., Cheng, Y., Gao, X. Promotional strategies in English and Chinese research article introduction and discussion/conclusion sections: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 2024, 68, Article 101344. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2024.101344>
- [24] Wang, Q., Hu, G. "This is perplexing because...": Examining the impact of gender and geo-academic location on expressions of confusion in research articles. *Language Sciences*. 2024, 105, Article 101647. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2024.101647>
- [25] Martín, P. M. A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purposes*. 2003, 22(1), 25-43. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(01\)00033-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(01)00033-3)
- [26] Samraj, B. An exploration of a genre set: Research article abstracts and introductions in two disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*. 2005, 24(2), 141-156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2002.10.001>
- [27] Hyland, K. Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*. 2001, 20(3), 207-226. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(00\)00012-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00012-0)
- [28] Hyland, K. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum, 2005.
- [29] Gillaerts, P., Van de Velde, F. Interactional metadiscourse in research article abstracts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 2010, 9(2), 128-139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.02.004>
- [30] Dahl, T. Textual metadiscourse in research articles: A marker of national culture or of academic discipline? *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2004, 36(10), 1807-1825. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.05.004>
- [31] Swales, J. M., Feak, C. B. *Abstracts and the Writing of Abstracts*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009.