Nataliia KRAMAR

Research and Educational Center of Foreign Languages of the National Academy
of Sciences of Ukraine
4 Triokhsviatztelska Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
E-mail: kra_nat@ukr.net
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5767-9200

Olga ILCHENKO

Research and Educational Center of Foreign Languages of the National Academy
of Sciences of Ukraine
4 Triokhsviatztelska Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
E-mail: olgilch@hotmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6090-4579

STYLISTIC FEATURES OF ENGLISH-LANGUAGE LINGUISTIC ABSTRACTS: A CORPUS-BASED STUDY

While the genre of research abstract has recently gained much attention in the field of English for Academic Purposes, there is an acute need for more profound research into its ever-changing stylistic conventions, particularly in the area of linguistics. The purpose of the present study was to determine the stylistic features of modern English-language abstracts based on a corpus of 300 abstracts from leading journals in the field of linguistics, published in 2020 to 2023. The methodology integrated corpus methods (frequency and collocation analysis) with qualitative methods (contextual and pragmatic analysis) to determine the rhetorical and communicative strategies correlating with the identified linguistic devices.

Relying on previous relevant studies, we primarily focused on the grammar categories of tense and voice. It was found out that present tense is predominant in the sample, though quite often authors choose to alternate tenses within one abstract, restricting past tense to the description of methodology and results. In these sections, it is also more common for authors to shift to passive voice, while the introduction, conclusion and implications are written mostly in active voice. Abstracts written entirely in passive voice are extremely rare in our corpus, which has important pedagogical implications. Also, we revealed that linguists are prone to non-personal use of active voice via self-referential nominals such as *the study investigates*, *the results show*. Thus, they diminish their own agency as researchers and reinforce the impression of scientific objectivity.

Another stylistic aspect that we addressed is referring to previous research in the field. While it is mostly associated with the opening rhetorical move (introduction/background), we demonstrate that authors frequently refer to other studies in the field in later stages of an abstract to situate their research within the global landscape. It is becoming common for linguists to indicate in the abstract the studies they have drawn upon and the studies that their outcomes agree or disagree with. This finding should also be taken into consideration in English academic writing courses for researchers in linguistics.

K e y w o r d s : research abstract, corpus, linguistics, voice, tense.

Introduction

Research abstracts are essential to clear scientific communication and proliferation of knowledge as they succinctly present the gist of a larger form of academic writing (a research article or a conference paper). They are the first thing (and sometimes the last one) that readers pay attention to when getting acquainted with a new piece of research in their field. R. Gladon, W. Graves and J. Kelly aptly observe that an abstract is «a miniature version, or microcosm, of the manuscript» [Gladon, Graves, Kelly : 229]. It is often viewed by researchers as essentially a promotional genre, intended to hook the reader from the outset [Hyland, Tse]. Apart from catching the interest of the audience, an abstract also helps them to filter through an avalanche of relevant scientific data, taking into consideration the exponential growth of accessible research literature over the past decade. Therefore, an abstract is largely different from a research article in terms of its overall purpose and rhetorical strategies.

Although abstracts are mostly very short, aspiring scientists often struggle with finding the right words and structure to present their findings in the most advantageous light. Moreover, conventions of abstract writing are highly discipline-specific and subject to change over time [Gillaerts; Jiang, Hyland 2022; Šandová]. Therefore, research into the best practices of writing abstracts in a particular field is relevant and has indisputable practical value in helping would-be or experienced scientists to master this tricky genre of writing, which can make it or break it in terms of getting the reader's interest. In this study, we set out to explore the features of modern abstracts published in top journals within the field linguistics, with a special focus on the use of tense and voice, as well as the ways of referring to other research, which can be implemented via various linguistic devices. By complementing quantitative corpus methods with in-depth contextual analysis of the identified trends, we intended to trace the rhetorical and communicative goals correlated with particular grammar and linguistic choices. We hope that our findings will contribute to better understanding of current trends in abstract writing in this field and will serve to inform the pedagogical practice in English academic writing courses.

Literature Review

Due to the pivotal role they play in scientific knowledge dissemination, abstracts have long become an object of research in linguistics, particularly in the field of English for Academic Purposes (EAP). Typically positioned as a subfield of English for Specific Purposes, English for Academic Purposes comprises both the practice of teaching English skills needed for academic study or research and applied linguistics concerned with the various genres of academic writing [see more on the history of this field and related terminology in Ilchenko, Kramar].

It is common to distinguish descriptive (indicative) and informative types of abstracts. While descriptive abstracts provide only a brief overview (purpose, methods, scope of the article), informative abstracts summarize the key findings in more detail. At present, most research abstracts are informative and consist of more than 250 words. However, researchers note that some abstracts combine the features of both types (brief description plus conclusion) and therefore point out a third type — the informative-indicative abstract [Lorés-Sanz]. Apart from traditional textual abstracts, visual and even video abstracts are becoming more common, especially in the domains of biology and medicine. Their advent and proliferation can be attributed to the ubiquitous process of narrativization, which has made its inroads into science [Ilchenko, Shelkovnikova].

Since 1990s, when research abstract was recognized as a stand-alone genre of academic writing, the main vantage point for its exploration has been the rhetorical moves and associated communicative functions. Thus, in 2000 Ken Hyland put forward his influential five-move structure that defined abstract as a genre:

1. Introduction (justifying topic significance, generalizing the topic, defining key terms, identifying the knowledge gap);
2. Purpose (stating the goal and potentially the hypothesis);
3. Method (describing sample and procedures);
4. Product (describing the main findings);
5. Conclusion (brief summary).

John Swales and Christine Feak suggested a classification that has different labels for each move, but is close to the Hyland's one in essence: it consists of background, goal, methodology, result, conclusion. The researchers note that not all of the moves may be present simultaneously: thus, it is common for conclusion to be left aside. However, the extent to which each move is considered obligatory or optional varies across the disciplines. Specifically, with regard to linguistics, it has been reported that the background/introduction move is often omitted and an abstract typically opens with the explication of purpose [Tseng]. Within the field of English literary studies, scholars have reported an eight-move structure, with four stable moves and four non-stable moves [Tankó]. Within each rhetorical move, various steps, or sub-moves can be distinguished. However, since their extraction is more subjective, there is no agreed-upon classification of these minor stages.

On the other hand, abstracts have been recently investigated from the diachronic perspective. For example, F. Jiang and K. Hyland [Jiang, Hyland 2023] have shown that over thirty years the argumentative style of abstracts in four different fields of study has undergone substantial changes. Thus, in the hard sciences they observe the declining use of passive voice and past tense, with quite the opposite tendencies in applied linguistics. Overall, use of active vs. passive voice is the aspect of abstracts that has garnered the most attention of scholars. Passive voice has long been considered a staple of academic writing, helping it to sound more credible, objective and informative. However, research reveals that over the past decades there has been a shift towards greater authorial presence in academic writing, with more self-mentions and fewer passives [Banks; Hyland, Jiang; Leong]. With regard to linguistics, F. Jiang and K. Hyland [Jiang, Hyland 2023] observe that the use of passive voice in research articles in this field is lower than in the areas of sociology, biology and engineering, having remained relatively stable in the last 30 years. Currently, many academic writing guides advise against the use of passive voice in research papers for the sake of achieving clarity [see, for example, Grand Canyon University]. Thus, it is important to consider to which extent these guidelines are relevant to writing research abstracts in linguistics.

Another lens that has been applied to research abstracts is the concept of authorial voice, which implies the extent of author's presence in the text through the use of self-mentions. Thus, in her diachronic corpus-based study, M. Bondi observed the trend of rising use of self-mentions in abstracts written between 1990 and 2010. However, in linguistics, self-mentions were mostly locational (i.e., *our*, *my*) rather than first-person (i.e., *I*, *we*). With regards to other markers of authorial voice, she points out fewer attitudinal adjectives and contrastive connectors in linguistics abstracts in comparison to other disciplines under study (history and economics). Another study that focused on linguistics abstracts from the au-

thoritative *Journal of Pragmatics* found that the use of self-mentions dropped in 2010s as compared to the previous decades [Šandová]. Therefore, the evidence is inconclusive and more research is needed into the construction of authorial voice in abstracts within this discipline. The dimensions of interpersonal positioning in abstracts explored in research literature also include evaluative *that* constructions [Hyland, Tse], hedges and boosters [Takimoto], negation [Jiang, Hyland 2022], which are likewise heavily dependent on the discipline.

Ukrainian linguists have also have long been interested in exploring various aspects of research abstracts, particularly from the viewpoint of their structural conventions and linguistic compression [Radziyevska; Selihei; Zhytnytska]. Tetyana Yakhontova has investigated cross-cultural variation in writing research abstracts, revealing significant differences in the patterns used by English-speaking and Slavic-speaking writers.

Despite the wealth of literature on the style of research abstracts, their discipline-specific and constantly shifting nature makes it necessary to explore the linguistic and rhetorical features of abstracts in various fields more profoundly. In particular, more research is needed into authorial voice of research abstracts in linguistics. Therefore, we aim to investigate the current practices of English-language abstract writing in this field, relying on the categories that have been distinguished and applied in previous studies.

Methodology

For the purposes of our research, we compiled a corpus of 300 abstracts, randomly selected from 30 top-rated journals in linguistics (10 abstracts from each of 30 journals), according to the ranking of SCImago, which takes into account the both the number of citations obtained by a journal and the prestige of journals citing it [SCImago]. The timeframe was limited to 2020-2023 so as to reflect the latest trends. The resulting corpus contains 50 200 words. The main features that we looked out for in the corpus were the use of tense (past vs. present) and voice (active vs. passive) as the markers that were most often explored in prior research [e.g., Jiang, Hyland 2023; Tseng]. Since there is frequent variation in the use of these categories within one abstract, we manually coded each abstract in our corpus as employing past tense only, present tense only, or both (mixed). Likewise, we coded each abstract as employing active voice only, passive voice only, or both (mixed). At the next stage of our study, we carried out automatic analysis in AntConc corpus manager [Anthony 2019], with preceding tagging of the corpus in TagAnt part-of-speech tagger [Anthony 2022]. Applying frequency, collocation and n-gram functions in the corpus manager helped us to establish the contextual patterns of verbs in different tenses and voices.

When analyzing the abstracts employing active voice, we distinguished between its personal and non-personal use, drawing upon M. Bondi's observations of the widespread use of self-referential nouns (such as *study*, *paper*, *article*), which have not received any further elaboration in research literature. Corpus tools were also instrumental here to identify the verbs that are used after personal pronouns versus the verbs following self-referential nouns.

In the course of skimming the abstracts for manual coding we noticed the high frequency of in-text citations in our material, which instigated us to focus more closely on referring to other research as a salient rhetorical feature of modern abstracts in linguistics. For these purposes, we coded each abstract as containing or not containing explicit references to other authors and studies. Subsequently, we

identified the positioning and wording of these references in light of the rhetorical strategies that authors pursue in their writing.

Results and Discussion

Past Tense vs. Present Tense

We analyzed the use of past tense and present tense as the most common tenses in research abstract writing, identified in previous research [Jiang, Hyland 2023]. Present tense was limited to present simple only, as preliminary semi-automatic analysis of verb forms in the corpus yielded a negligible number of present perfect forms, used mainly in the background section but not in the main sections, where the study itself is described. Avoidance of present perfect in abstracts is understandable in the light of its bulkier construction: writers opt for present simple or past simple, which have no auxiliary words and thus save space for more valuable information.

With regard to present and past tenses, we were primarily interested in how consistently they are used across abstracts in our corpus. According to our estimates, most of the abstracts (145) use present tense only, much fewer abstracts (86) stick to past tense, while 69 abstracts shift between the two tenses. These results (retrieved via manual analysis) correlate with the results of automated calculation of verb forms in present vs. past tense: 2142 verb forms in the present (including both 1ˢᵗ and 3ʳᵈ persons) as opposed to 1178 verb forms in the past. Therefore, present tense is almost twice more prevalent than past tense in our corpus. In a recent diachronic study, F. Jiang and K. Hyland [Jiang, Hyland 2023] revealed that the use of past tense in applied linguistics abstracts had risen in the last three decades, in contrast to other fields. However, our data show that, even despite this trend, present tense remains vastly predominant.

When the authors opt for mixed approach (combining present and past tenses within one abstract), they mostly apply the present to discuss the general focus of the work and its implications, while using the past to address methodological procedures involved. The structure of an abstract from the journal *Applied Linguistics* illustrates this approach:

*This study **explores** the overall nature of the vocabulary knowledge construct <…>. A total of 144 Spanish learners of English **were tested** on their recognition and recall knowledge of four word knowledge components <…>. All word knowledge components **were strongly intercorrelated**, and implicational scaling analyses **showed** that there is a consistent pattern of acquisition for these components <…>. Structural equation modelling (SEM) **revealed** that all components (both recognition and recall) contribute <…>. Overall, findings **suggest** that the distinction between recognition and recall knowledge is fundamental <…>* (AL 2020).

Here, present tense is used at the outset to introduce the subject matter of the study and at the end to point out generalizable findings that contribute to advancing the research in this field. In contrast, past tense is reserved for the description of the study's methodology, particular objectives and results, with reference to statistical data. Our findings here are consistent with an earlier corpus-based study [Tseng] that identified the prevalent use of past tense in rhetorical moves of «methods» and «results» within English-language linguistics abstracts.

More specifically, we have noticed the following trend: the more attention an author pays to explaining the methodology (samples, procedures, data), the broader use of past tense is involved. On the other hand, rhetorical intentions may also influence the tense choice. Jiang and Hyland [Jiang, Hyland 2022] ar-

gue that extensive use of past tense within linguistics serves writers to limit their claims to the study and mark the distinctiveness of their research. Thus, an author may consciously opt for the past tense to emphasize their unique study design or contribution.

At the next stage of our analysis, we used TagAnt part-of-speech tagger [Anthony, 2022] to identify the verbs in the corpus that are most commonly used in the present as opposed to the past. Table 1 demonstrates top 10 verbs used in present simple and past simple forms (in the present, both 1st and 3rd persons were taken into account). The number of instances of each verb is provided.

Table 1

Top 10 words in present tense vs. past tense in the corpus

Rank	Present tense		Past tense	
1	be	581	be	379
2	have	244	show	53
3	show	66	reveal	36
4	suggest	59	find	32
5	investigate	39	investigate	29
6	discuss	32	examine	26
7	argue	31	do	24
8	do	31	use	23
9	examine	27	have	22
10	present	27	indicate	20

The multifunctional verbs *be*, *have*, *do* are broadly used in both tenses, which was expected. Among notional verbs, one that is used to a similar extent across the two tenses is *to show*. It is mostly featured in clusters introducing the results of the study, e.g., *the results show/showed*, *the findings show/showed*. Also common in both tenses are the verbs *to examine* and *to investigate*, mostly featured in clusters like *this study examines/examined*, *we investigate/investigated*, placed at the beginning of an abstract. However, many words are used predominantly in one tense. Thus, the verb *to suggest* (primarily combined with *the results*, *the findings*) is almost exclusively used in present tense, e.g., *The results suggest the significance of examining the boomerang effect as an outcome distinct from a failure to persuade* (CM). This is probably due to the fact that *to suggest* is a discourse verb that introduces general implications of the study (placed at the end of an abstract), which are perceived as not being limited to a certain time frame. This verb helps the authors draw overarching inferences from their study and set the ground for further work in the field. Incidentally, the verb *to suggest* was found to be one of the most frequent verbs in the corpus, being used 91 times in total. The verbs *to discuss*, *to argue*, *to present* are likewise much more frequent in present tense, as they serve to draw attention to the focus of the study and its potentially timeless conclusions. Contrariwise, the verbs *to reveal*, *to find*, *to use* are much more common in past tense, as they refer to particular research procedures (*to use*) or results (*to reveal*, *to find*), e.g.:

Results revealed *that learning gains occurred at the level of form and meaning recognition* (SSLA).

We found *that students' English proficiency level did not predict either their reasoning or changes in their performance during the course* (IJBEB).

Therefore, while the present tense is generally much more common in our material, the use of tenses is highly correlated with the rhetorical moves within the abstracts. The past tense is still predominant in the sentences that explicate the methodology and results of a study.

Active (*personal and non-personal*) *vs. Passive Voice*

We have estimated the number of abstracts employing active voice, passive voice and those alternating between the two (mixed). Apart from differentiating between active and passive voices, however, we believe it is also necessary to differentiate between personal and non-personal active voice, which is an aspect that has been overlooked in previous studies, with M. Bondi being the only exception. By personal active voice we mean the use of first-person pronouns (*I*, *we*), while by non-personal active voice we mean avoidance of first-person pronouns and attributing agency to the study itself in phrases like *this study revealed*, *this paper presents*, etc. Marina Bondi designates the nouns *study*, *paper*, etc. used in this function as «self-referential nominal» [251]. For comparison:

We propose *two better ways to increase the instructional time: provide periods of intensive instruction later in the curriculum and integrate the teaching of language and content* (LT).

To advance this research, ***the present article proposes*** *a new way to think about social media with the Personal Social Media Ecosystem Framework* (*PS-MEF*) (JC).

Although both sentences use active voice, the first one foregrounds the authorial position of the writers, while the second one backgrounds it by positioning *the present article* as the subject of the sentence. When analyzing the corpus, we coded the abstracts in active voice without any use of first-person pronouns as «non-personal», and those with at least one use of first-person pronouns – as «personal». The results are presented in table 2.

Table 2

Distribution of active and passive voice in research abstracts in the corpus

Active voice		Passive voice	Mixed (both active and passive voice)
Personal (*we/I*) 103	Non-personal (*this study investigates*, etc.) 137	15	42

The most remarkable finding is that abstracts written exclusively in passive voice are extremely rare in our corpus (15 cases only), thus corroborating the results of previous literature in the field [Jiang, Hyland 2023]. In 42 instances (14% of all abstracts) authors choose to alternate between active and passive voices. As with the distribution of tenses, the distribution of voice in such cases clearly correlates with the rhetorical moves in their structure: the passive is much more common in the chunks that explicate methodological issues (sample collection, experiments, analysis of data, etc.). For example:

The present study investigates *the effects of two subsequent learning contexts, formal instruction* (*FI*) *at home and a 3-month stay abroad* (*SA*), *on vocabulary acquisition in English as a foreign language* (*EFL*) *writing and speaking.*

***Data were collected** from 30 Catalan/Spanish learners of English* […]. *These samples **were examined** in terms of* […]. *Native-speaker baseline data **were also obtained** through the same tasks for comparison purposes. **Results reveal** that SA is particularly beneficial for written productive vocabulary* […] (LTR).

This abstract opens with non-personal active voice (*the present study investigates*) to explain the subject matter of the article, then switches to passive voice in the description of particular methodological procedures before returning to non-personal active voice (*results reveal that*) to discuss the findings.

The vast majority of abstracts in our corpus (240 in total) are written in active voice. Of them, 103 abstracts contain direct references to the person of the author (*we/I*), while a yet larger number (137) do not have such references, positioning the nouns *study, article, results, data, findings* as subjects of the sentence. This means that in most cases writers in the field of linguistics choose not to position themselves explicitly as authors in what could be perceived as trying to diminish their responsibility for their scientific contribution. Moreover, impersonal phrases like *results show, findings reveal* may possibly serve to increase the perceived objectivity of the study, as if the data «spoke for itself». For example, here is an excerpt from an abstract in *Applied Linguistics*, which consistently employs non-personal active voice:

***Results showed** ongoing improvements over time on most measures, including accuracy. **Correlations indicated** long-term relationships between fluency and vocabulary only and that accuracy–complexity relationships emerged in instructed home contexts only. These **findings suggest** that the affordances of home and abroad contexts can shape learners' linguistic development and use differently* (AL 2021).

In three consecutive sentences, the authors assign non-human entities (results, correlations and findings) as agents. These entities not only «show» and «indicate» but also «suggest» various trends (a discourse verb denoting communication of an idea and thus inevitably related to human activity). This accumulation of non-personal instances of active voice creates an impression that human is not involved in the research process at all, despite the fact that it is always up to the author to interpret the data, selecting a particular interpretive frame and choosing to which extent the results are generalizable.

In her 2014 diachronic study, M. Bondi observed the rise of self-referential use of the noun *study* and similar nouns (*paper, article*) in the field of linguistics in her 2010 subcorpus as compared to the 2000 subcorpus. Furthermore, she noted that this tendency was highly discipline-specific, appearing to a much lesser extent in the fields of economics and history. Based on our results, we can infer that even now, a decade later, linguists are prone to backgrounding their authorial voice and endowing scientific process or data with human-like agency, thus employing the stylistic device of personification.

Zooming in on the lexical context of personal/non-personal use of active voice, we can point out some specific tendencies in the distribution of reporting verbs combined with them. The verbs that prevail in combination with personal pronouns (*we/I*) are *to find* (in either present or past tense), *to argue, to discuss, to propose* (in present tense only). These units serve to present the results of the study (*to find*) or to introduce the author's viewpoint and suggestions (*to argue, to discuss, to propose*). In contrast, self-referential nouns *study, paper,* etc. are typically followed by the verbs *to investigate, to explore, to examine, to report, to present*, which serve to introduce the general concern of the research.

Remarkably, in 3 abstracts (excluded from the count in Table 2) we have come across an uncommon pattern of the use of third-person phrases with *author*(*s*) to convey the researchers' viewpoints (e.g., *the authors argue that*). However, these instances were all restricted to one journal (*TESOL Quarterly*) and may thus be regarded as the style specificity of this particular venue.

Overall, with regard to the use of passive and active voices, we have established that passive verb forms are few and far between in English-language linguistics abstracts. Within active voice, which is largely predominant, non-personal expressions are more frequent than personal, which indicates the writers' tendency to background their agency, possibly to avoid sounding too assertive.

Referring to previous research in the field

Another dimension of research abstracts that is worth exploring is how authors mark the relation of their contribution to other studies in the field. Using manual analysis, we have identified 135 abstracts (slightly less than a half) that mention previous research in some way – either directly, by citing the studies the authors draw upon, or indirectly, by describing the extent of knowledge available and the research gaps they intend to fill. Of them, 92 abstracts refer to prior research at the beginning, within the rhetorical move of presenting the background and identifying shortcomings in available literature. In this vein, it is typical for authors to use concession clauses, which admit the existence of related research but at the same time point out its deficiencies:

Much has been written about the depiction of refugees in newspapers and television news, *yet far less is known about how refugees are portrayed in Internet news* (EJC).

The phrases that are often used to emphasize the knowledge gap that the authors intend to fill typically contain negation. In most cases this negation is non-affixal and is implemented on the syntactic level, e.g., *little attention has been paid*, *little is known*, *few studies have explored*, *no studies have used*, *has been neglected*, etc. In much fewer cases authors prefer affixal negations such as *X remains unexplored*, *X is underexplored/understudied*, *it remains unclear*.

However, the strategy of referring to previous research is not limited to the opening of an abstract (the rhetorical move of background): in a large portion of our corpus (43 abstracts) previously done research is mentioned in later stages, particularly when presenting the methodology or conclusions and implications. Authors frequently mention the theories, researchers or particular studies that they draw upon and elaborate on. Moreover, in closing sentences they may assertively claim to what extent their findings are consistent or inconsistent with the existing theories, e.g.

Our results also confirm previously-reported effects *of f0 and intensity on speech tempo perception*, *plus an effect of stimulus duration*, *but no effect of listeners' own tempo production tendencies*. (JPh 2022).

The most striking finding is the rise of the tendency to cite relevant studies within abstracts, which was previously the mainstay of research article introductions. In our corpus, we have found 19 abstracts (6% of the total) with in-text citations, which can be either author-prominent (example 1) or information-prominent (example 2):

(1) **As found in Marsden et al. (*2018*)**, *wide variability was observed across the sample in terms of* […] (ARAL).

(2) *This study extends previous work by analyzing the degree of coarticulation across several different communicative conditions in the LUCID corpus* (**Baker & Hazan**, **2010**) (JPh 2023).

(3) The growing use of references in abstracts is a vivid example of changing conventions in academic writing. In the world of overwhelming amount of scientific data, it may be indeed necessary to signal the relation of one's research to other right at the outset to avoid the violations of academic integrity and to help the reader grasp the connections they may be interested in.

Conclusion

In this study, we aimed to contribute to the growing body of literature on the stylistic features of English-language research abstracts in different fields, based on the corpus of 300 abstracts from top-notch journals in the area of linguistics. The main focus of our investigation was the use of grammar features, namely tense and voice. We found out that present tense is vastly predominant in linguistics abstracts, with authors frequently alternating between present and past tenses within one piece of writing. In such instances, past tense is typically reserved for the sections describing methodology and results, while present tense correlates with the presentation of purpose, conclusions and implications, which are more generalizable.

One of the most insightful findings of our study is that the prevalent use of active voice within linguistics abstracts is non-personal, meaning that the agency is attributed to non-human entities, such as study, results, etc. (e.g., *the study investigates*, *results suggest*). This may be indicative of the writers' trying to hedge their claims and reinforce the impression of scientific objectivity. The issue of agency in research writing is significantly underexplored and warrants further research. Another remarkable finding is that abstracts increasingly contain in-text citations, which were previously more associated with the genre of research article rather than abstract.

Our study has broad practical implications. Most notably, researchers in the field of linguistics should avoid exclusive use of passive voice when writing abstracts in English, though best practices support its use for the description of methodology and conclusion. Also, it is acceptable to alternate tenses and voices within an abstract, in line with the rhetorical moves and goals of the author. It is important to reconsider the guidelines about not explicitly citing previous literature within abstracts, as it has become common to provide in-text citations in abstracts in top-rated linguistics journals in order to situate one's research within the general scientific landscape.

However, it is crucial to acknowledge the limitations of our study. The relatively small sample size of 300 abstracts and the focus on English-language abstracts from top-notch journals in linguistics may limit the generalizability of our findings. Future research studies could apply a comparative design to explore cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural variations in abstract writing, providing a more holistic understanding of this essential aspect of scholarly communication.

REFERENCES

Anthony L. (2019). AntConc [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp (last accessed: 15.01.2023).
Anthony L. (2022). TagAnt [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software (last accessed: 24.02.2023).

Banks D. (2017). The extent to which the passive voice is used in the scientific journal article, 1985–2015. *Functional Linguistics*, 4(1), 21.

Bondi M. (2014) Changing voices: Authorial voice in abstracts. *Bondi M.*, *Lorés Sanz R.* (*Eds*.). *Abstracts in Academic Discourse*: *Variation and Change*. Bern: Peter Lang, 243–270.

Gillaerts P. (2014) Shifting metadiscourse: Looking for diachrony in the abstract genre. *M. Bondi and R. Lorés Sanz* (*Eds*.). *Abstracts in Academic Discourse: Variation and Change*. Bern: Peter Lang, 271–286.

Gladon R. J., Graves W. R., Kelly J. M. (2011). *Getting published in the life sciences*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Grand Canyon University (2022, April 28). How To Avoid Passive Voice in Your Dissertation. https://www.gcu.edu/blog/doctoral-journey/how-avoid-passive-voice-your-dissertation (last accessed: 19.02.2023).

Hyland K., Jiang F. (2016). Change of attitude? A diachronic study of stance. *Written Communication*, 33(3), 251–274.

Hyland K., Tse P. (2005). Hooking the reader: a corpus study of evaluative *that* in abstracts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(2), 123–139.

Hyland K. (2000). *Disciplinary Discourses*: *Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. London: Longman.

Ilchenko O., Kramar N. (2020). English for Academic Purposes: Keeping up with the times. *Studia Linguistica*, 16(1), 40–57.

Ilchenko O., Shelkovnikova Z. (2019). The evolution of an abstract. *Linhvistyka XXI stolittia*: *novi doslidzhennia i perspektyvy*, 5(1), 74–83.

Jiang F., Hyland K. (2022). «The datasets do not agree»: Negation in research abstracts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 68(1), 60–72.

Jiang F., Hyland K. (2023). Changes in research abstracts: past tense, third person, passive, and negatives. *Written Communication*, 40(1), 210–237.

Leong A. P. (2020). The passive voice in scientific writing through the ages: A diachronic study. *Text & Talk*, 40(4), 467–489.

Lorés-Sanz R. (2004). On RA abstracts: From rhetorical structure to thematic organisation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23(1), 280–302.

Radziievska T. (1993). Tekst yak zasib komunikatsii. Kyiv: Instytut ukrainskoi movy NANU. [In Ukrainian].

SCImago (n.d.). SCImago Journal & Country Rank: Linguistics and Language. https://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php?category=3310 (last accessed: 15.02.2023).

Selihei P. (2016). Svitlo i tini naukovoho styliu. Kyiv: Vydavnychyi dim «Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia». [In Ukrainian].

Swales J. M., Feak C. B. (2009). *Abstracts and the writing of abstracts*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Šandová J. K. (2021). Interpersonality in research article abstracts: a diachronic case study. *Discourse and Interaction*, (14), 77–99.

Takimoto M. (2015). A corpus-based analysis of hedges and boosters in English academic articles. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 95–105.

Tankó G. (2017). Literary research article abstracts: An analysis of rhetorical moves and their linguistic realizations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 27(1), 42–55.

Tseng F. (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.

Yakhontova T. (2002). Titles of conference presentation abstracts: A cross-cultural perspective. *Ventola E.*, *Thompson C.*, *Shalom C.* (Eds.). *The Language of Conferencing*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 277–300.

Zhytnyska A. (2014). Anotatsii naukovykh robit: zhanrovi oznaky, dyferentsiatsiia ta komunikatyvno-prahmatychni kharakterystyky. *Nova filolohiia*, (60), 67–71. [In Ukrainian].

SOURCES

ARAL   Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 2020, 40(1).
AL 2020   Applied Linguistics, 2020, 41(4).
AL 2021   Applied Linguistics, 2021, 42(1).
CM   Communication Monographs, 2021, 88(3).
EJC   European Journal of Communication, 2021, 36(6).
IJBEB   International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 2022, 25(6).
JC   Journal of Communication, 2023, 73(1).
JPh 2022   Journal of Phonetics, 2022, 95(1).
JPh 2023   Journal of Phonetics, 2023, 97(1).
LT   Language Teaching, 2020, 53(4).
LTR   Language Teaching Research, 2021, 25(2).
SSLA   Studies in second language acquisition, 2020, 42 (4).

Наталія КРАМАР
Центр наукових досліджень та викладання іноземних мов НАН України
вул. Тьохсвятительська, 4, м. Київ, 01001, Україна
E-mail: kra_nat@ukr.net
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5767-9200

Ольга ІЛЬЧЕНКО
Центр наукових досліджень та викладання іноземних мов НАН України
вул. Тьохсвятительська, 4, м. Київ, 01001, Україна
E-mail: olgilch@hotmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6090-4579

СТИЛІСТИЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ АНОТАЦІЙ АНГЛОМОВНИХ СТАТЕЙ У ГАЛУЗІ ЛІНГВІСТИКИ: КОРПУСНЕ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ

Хоча жанр наукової анотації здобув значну увагу вчених у галузі англійської мови для академічних цілей, існує гостра потреба у подальшому дослідженні його стилістичних конвенцій, особливо у галузі лінгвістики. Метою нашої розвідки стало виявлення стилістичних особливостей сучасних англомовних анотацій на матеріалі корпусу з 300 анотацій з провідних лінгвістичних журналів, опублікованих у 2020–2023 роках. Методологія дослідження поєднує корпусні методи (аналіз частотності та колокацій) з контекстуальним та прагматичним аналізом задля висвітлення риторичних та комунікативних стратегій, які корелюють з виявленими мовними засобами.

Спираючись на попередні дотичні дослідження, ми насамперед зосередилися на граматичних категоріях часу та стану. З'ясувалося, що у вибірці переважає теперішній час, хоча досить часто автори поєднують теперішній та минулий часи в межах однієї анотації, переважно застосовуючи минулий час для опису методології та результатів дослідження. У цих секціях анотації автори також частіше переходять з активного до пасивного стану, тоді як вступ, висновки та висновки написані переважно в активному стані. Анотації, які дотримуються виключно пасивного стану, надзвичайно рідкісні в нашому корпусі, що має важливе педагогічне значення. Крім того, ми виявили, що лінгвісти схильні до уникнення особових займенників та вико-

ристання замість них самореферентних номінативів, таких як *the study investigates*, *the results show*. Таким чином, вони применшують власну суб'єктність як дослідників і посилюють враження наукової об'єктивності.

Ще один стилістичний аспект, розглянутий у статті, — це посилання на попередні дослідження у відповідній галузі. Хоча вони здебільшого асоціюються зі першим риторичним ходом анотації (вступом), ми продемонстрували, що автори часто посилаються на дотичні дослідження на пізніших етапах анотації, вводячи свої результати в загальний науковий контекст. Лінгвісти все частіше вказують в анотаціях дослідження, на які вони спиралися, а також дослідження, результати яких узгоджуються або не узгоджуються з їхніми результатами. Цей висновок також варто взяти до уваги в курсах академічного письма для майбутніх дослідників у галузі лінгвістики.

Ключові слова: наукова анотація, корпус, лінгвістика, стан дієслова, час дієслова.