RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Meaningful Passive Verbal in International Research Articles' Abstracts

Djuwari Djuwari[1], Sukesi[2], Edi Pujo Basuki[1]
[1]Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Surabaya, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Dokter Soetomo, Surabaya, Indonesia

Abstract

Many authors often receive notifications while typing sentences on their computers and checking grammar using the review and spelling checking menu. These notifications usually appear when sentences are in the passive voice, prompting the authors to consider rewriting them in the active voice. Some authors also question whether they should use active sentences in the abstract of research journal articles. This study aims to investigate the prevalence of passive verbal in abstract research articles by international journal authors, with the sample through purposive technique. It is assumed that all the articles, having been published, underwent blind review, ensuring the publishable scientifically in their status as research articles. The data for analysis were collected from 20 research articles that met specific criteria, such as being published in international journals. The results indicate that the authors use passive verbal mostly in Move 3 (methodology) and Move 4 (research results). Another piece of evidence, the more passive verbal used, the more efficient the abstract is. Using passive verbal for writing a research article abstract is advisable to make it efficient.

INTRODUCTION

In academic and research, even corporate settings, writing is intricately linked to various complex social activities (Magulod et al., 2021; Piamsai, 2020; Suthiwartnarueput & Wasanasomsithi, 2012). Mastering writing is essential for success in one's academic and professional journey. Suthiwartnarueput and Wasanasomsithi (2012) found that while using Microsoft Word, e.g., writers who use passive sentences in English often receive notifications prompting them to consider revising. A suggestion to transform passive sentences into active ones is provided by right-clicking with the cursor. As a result, some writers follow this advice and rephrase their sentences in an active voice. However, there are instances when writers choose to right-click and select the alternative "ignore all" instead.

Generally, authors of scientific papers often face uncertainty when deciding whether to utilize active or passive sentences, even when crafting the abstract of their research articles (Baum et al., 2022). Confusion arises when writers use the review menu in Microsoft Word and receive notifications suggesting transforming passive sentences into active ones. It is essential to acknowledge that passive sentences can be helpful, as they shift the focus to the object under discussion rather than emphasizing the subject or actor involved. This is especially relevant when the passive voice is used without explicitly mentioning the agent, directing attention to the topic or object being addressed. When the writer employs passive sentences, the sentence's subject is not specified (passive without actors). In cases where the sentence is passive without mentioning the subject, the statement is anticipated to become more objective than when the subject is mentioned explicitly (Wankhade et al., 2022). As a result, the passive voice conveys a more objective message.

Passive sentences convey a more objective meaning when expressed verbally. The author's subjectivity is absent in these constructions, and sentences are written without explicitly mentioning the actor (Horbowicz et al., 2019). Instead, the passive voice focuses on the topic rather than the agent. Nevertheless, the agent in the sentence remains relevant and generalized. Consequently, verbal in passive sentences differ from other sentence forms, particularly reflexive ones. The writer uses the passive voice to emphasize the dialectical relationship between objects and the presented logical conditions. More precisely, the purpose of employing passive voice is to characterize an object, determine its inherent features, and provide specific information based on this characterization.

Generally, information appears when an object undergoes a passive state, signifying a specific process (Ghosh, 2023). Sentences with passive constructions often lack an explicit mention or requirement of the logical subject. Hence, passive constructions are considered a distinct type of language. Such affirmative statements are understood as descriptions of action outcomes, which involve observing the relationship between objects and states (Kone, 2020). This is why sentences are sometimes written without mentioning the actor or subject. However, it is reasonable to acknowledge the existence of actors, as every action, including research, results from the direct influence of the subject (Strelan, 2020).

Again, Ghosh (2023) mentioned that information is typically presented when an object assumes a passive state, indicating a specific process. Passive constructions in sentences often lack an explicit mention or requirement of the logical subject, making them a distinct type of language. These affirmative statements are seen as descriptions of action outcomes, focusing on the relationship between objects and states (Kone, 2020). This is why sentences are sometimes written without mentioning the actor or subject. However, it is essential to recognize the existence of actors (Strelan, 2020) since every action, including research, is the result of the direct influence of the subject.

As some researchers have advocated in the same field of this present study, it is essential considering passive sentences and, very specifically, in research particles. For example, Park et al. (2023) emphasized that passive sentences are favored in academic writing due to their practicality and efficiency in shifting the focus onto the object or topic being considered. This allows authors to emphasize the subject matter effectively. However, specific academic articles highlight the subject's activity using active sentence structures. In passive constructions, the agent responsible for the action is often less specific or omitted entirely (Meluzzi et al., 2021). In contrast, the active voice provides maximum specificity by clearly indicating the doer of the action. Ultimately, the decision to use passive or active voice depends on the writer's intentions and what they wish to emphasize in their writing.

Regarding the syntactic-functional scopes in sentences involving actors as primary or secondary elements, passive sentences limit the agent's role semantically, and the agent is not always explicitly mentioned. For academic writing, thoughtful consideration of using passive and active voice is crucial, as both approaches

have advantages and disadvantages. Passive voice is sound when focusing on the object or topic, while active voice becomes more explicit and engaging when highlighting the doer of the action.

This study analyzes subgenres of research articles, particularly examining abstract sections related to the passive voice of sentence, clause, and or phrase levels. The study's primary aim is to provide valuable insights to authors of research journal articles, helping them make informed decisions about their writing. Additionally, this research can benefit journal editors and reviewers' evaluation process (Park et al., 2023).

Theoretical Framework
Previous research has been conducted on passive sentences, and grammar books have dedicated chapters to this topic. These sources can serve as valuable references for formulating a framework concerning passive sentences, particularly within the context of management research articles as a subgenre. By focusing on this subgenre of the research article abstracts, the research aims to determine whether passive sentences still dominate or remain applicable in writing academic articles for publication in international journals. To achieve this objective, a well-established theoretical framework is essential.

Some previous studies should also be considered for proposing the idea of passive sentences in academic writing for international research articles focusing on the abstract sections. For this purpose, various researchers have carried out previous studies on passive sentences. For instance, Crossley et al. (2020) analyzed passive and active sentences, comparing native and non-native speakers of spoken language. They found that both groups faced similar difficulties in processing passive constructs, suggesting that passive sentences are still prevalent in academic writing. Paolazzi et al. (2019) revealed that passive sentences were considered more challenging to comprehend in writing. However, they were read faster than active sentences, making them efficient for readers. On the other hand, Warren et al. (2021) conducted experiments and text analyses on articles in leading marketing journals. Their findings indicated that passive writing was harder to understand in academic writing. However, interestingly, marketing research articles primarily utilized passive voice for description, contradicting the results from Paolazzi et al.'s study. Additionally, Lghzeel and Radzuan (2020) conducted a study on passive sentence usage among Arabic EFL learners, revealing that they frequently employed the passive voice in their writing.

Several grammarians have described the construction of passive voice in their books. For example, Davidson (1982) stated that passive sentences involve using passive voice verbal, achieved by shifting the direct object position to the subject position. In addition, Strunk and White (2009) advocated using passive sentences for appropriateness and to preserve research goals, as it focuses on the object rather than the subject, reducing subjectivity in arguments (Pho, 2008; Sigel, 2009). In academic discourse, especially journal articles, passive sentences are widely accepted, particularly in expository writing. The Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (2001) emphasizes the usefulness of passive sentences when the focus is on the object or recipient of the action, allowing authors to avoid subjectivity in their arguments.

Various grammarians have extensively discussed passive sentences in their works. Celce-Murcia (2002) provides a detailed classification of passive construction in phrases, clauses, and sentences. Shaw (2012) describes passive sentences with or without agents, commonly found in academic writing, especially in academic journals (Hyland, 2008; Msuya, 2019), and also observed passive sentences commonly appearing in students' theses and dissertations. Omelyanenko and Sytnikova (2018) explain that passive voice is used when the agent is unimportant, unknown, or obvious. Swan (2001, 2005). Another one is also by Ivanič and Camps (2001). Again, it can also be referred to Mack et al. (2013), Krasnowska-Kieraś and Wróblewska (2019), and Lasersohn (2016), who delves into the usage of passive sentences across different nations or people, emphasizing their efficiency and focus on the object of discussion rather than the agent.

Overall, previous studies and grammarians' descriptions shed light on the significance and prevalence of passive sentences in academic writing, particularly in the context of research articles. By incorporating these findings into the theoretical framework, the research aims to determine passive sentences' current dominance and applicability in writing academic articles for international journal publications.

METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a Genre-perspective analysis, drawing data from research article abstracts published in international journals, explicitly focusing on the sub-genre of theoretical framework sections (Rabie & Boraie, 2021; Guba et al., 1994). This qualitative research employs content analysis to identify passive sentences within the theoretical framework sections of management research articles (Scholastica, 2018).

The utilization of the genre approach in research was pioneered by influential scholars like Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993), as well as Hyland (2008), Djuwari (2009), and Bhatia (2012). Genre, in this context, refers to communicative events with specific communicative purposes embraced by the community members. Analyzing genres entails examining the formal and functional aspects of the language used, aiming to grasp the underlying communicative intentions they convey (Bhatia, 2012).

This research analyzes a specific sub-genre of research articles, namely research article abstracts published in international journals. The selection of these articles was purposeful, considering that they underwent blind review before publication. The study concentrates explicitly on the sub-genres within the abstract's rhetorical moves sections of international journal articles as selected purposively. It is a qualitative research study, and the data were collected from journal articles (RAs) that have undergone the review process by journal reviewers.

To conduct the analysis, the researcher employed a passive construction analysis. They carefully examined the sentences in each rhetorical move of the abstracts and identified instances of passive construction. The identified passive sentences were then recorded in tables and analyzed in terms of frequency and percentage and the rhetorical move they employed. This strategy was also done by Lakic (2010), Hyland (2008), Djuwari (2009, 2013), and Mohammed and Abdalhussein (2015).

The primary focus of this study was on passive sentences, which were analyzed at the sentence, clause, and phrase levels within each rhetorical move of the abstracts. The collected data were then examined using patterns related to passive verbal. Through this analysis, the researchers determined the proportion of sentences written in the passive voice and the purposes for which authors utilized the passive construction.

The findings of this research are expected to hold implications for authors, reviewers, and journal editors regarding their consideration of academic writing for publication. By understanding the prevalence and purposes of passive sentences in research article abstracts, this study is also expected to provide valuable insights that can inform academic writing practices and improve the overall quality of journal publications.

The process of analysis is as follows. First, each abstract RAS is identified the passive verbal and grouped into each Move, such as Move 1 (situating the topic), Move 2 (expressing the purpose of the research), Move 3 (expressing Methodology), Move 4 (expressing the result of the research), and Move 5 (Occlusion or recommendation) (Djuwari, 2009, 2013; Hyland, 2008; Swales, 1990). As the following:

Move	Linguistic Expression
1	Situating the topic
2	Expressing the purpose of the research
3	Expressing methodology
4	Expressing the results of the research
5	Conclusion or recommendation

Then, the passive verbal is identified and grouped according to the Move. It can be referred to Staples (2016) and Somphong (2013) in connection with the passive verbal. In this study, all the verbs that are used as the functions of the passive can be (a) sentence level such as (e.g., **the data were collected …**), (b) clause (e.g., the research **that was done by** …), passive verbal as a modifier before and after nouns such as (e.g., the **analyzed data …**), and (e.g., **the evidence found in** this study …) as described by Celce-Murcia (2002), Swan (2005), and Wiredu (2012).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Findings of the Total 20 RAS between Biology and Economics
Based on the findings (Table 1), it shows that mostly the 20 authors of Research Articles (RAS) of the abstracts use their passive verbal in Move 3, expressing methodology, and in Move 4, expressing the results that are 35, 59% and 32, 20% respectively. Then, they use passive verbal in Move 1, situating the topic (18, 64%) and the purpose of the research (10, 16%). Only four passive verbals (6, 77%) express the conclusion or recommendation. In total, among 20 authors, there are 59 passive verbals in their abstracts. Another finding is related to the number of words in each abstract. The lowest number of words is RAS no 1, which is 66 words, while the highest number of the word is RAS No 11, which is 274 words. The average number of words among 20 RAS is 203 words.

It can be described as follows. Based on the findings presented in Table 1, this evidence discusses the usage of passive verbal in different sections of research article abstracts (RAS). The analysis is based on 20 research

article (RAS) abstracts as the following. First, Passive Verb Usage is mostly in Move 3 and Move 4. Move 3: Authors predominantly use passive verbal when expressing the methodology of their research articles. This accounts for 35 cases, representing 59% of the total instances of passive verb usage. Then, Move 4: The second most common usage of passive verbal is in expressing the results of the research articles. There are 32 instances, making up 20% of the total passive verb usage.

Secondly, Passive Verb Usage is in Move 1. Move 1: Passive verbal is also used in Move 1, which is dedicated to situating the research topic. This accounts for 18 cases, representing 64% of the total instances of passive verb usage in this move. Then, Purpose of the research: Passive verbal is used in Move 1 to express the purpose of the research, with ten instances making up 16% of the total passive verb usage in this move. In the Conclusion/Recommendation, Authors use only four passive verbals (6%) to express their research articles' conclusion or recommendation. Among the 20 authors and their abstracts, 59 instances of passive verbal use are used in the total Passive Verb Usage.

There is an additional finding related to the word count of each abstract. For example, the research article abstract with the fewest words is "RAS no 1", containing 66 words, while the research article abstract with the highest word count is "RAS No 11", containing 274 words. Then, the average number of words among the 20 research article abstracts is 203. In general, the evidence provides insights into the preferred usage of passive verbal in different parts of research article abstracts and the word count variation among them.

Table 1. All RAS of 20 Abstracts

RAS No:	Move 1	Move 2	Move 3	Move 4	Move 5	Total	∑ Words
1			3		1	4	66
2	2					2	214
3	2			1		4	313
4	2	1				3	124
5		1	4	2		7	245
6	1			1		2	159
7	1		1	4	1	7	150
8			2			2	90
9			2			2	271
10				2	1	3	200
11	1					1	274
12			1	2		3	170
13				1	1	2	250
14	2					2	243
15			3			3	156
16				5		5	170
17			2			2	196
18			3				264
19		2				2	140
20		2		1		3	366
Total	**11**	**6**	**21**	**19**	**4**	**59**	**Tot: 4061**
%	**18,64**	**10,16**	**35,59**	**32,20**	**6,77**	**2,95**	**Ave:203**

Findings in Terms of the Above Average

Table 2 shows the RAS with Passive Verbal above the average, four passive verbal, and the above. It indicates that the authors of RAS No 1, No 3, No 5, No 7, and No 16 (5 authors) also show that mainly the passive verbal is used for expressing Move 3 (methodology) and Move 4 (results of the research). They use passive verbal for expressing methodology, and the research results are 29, 63%, and 44, 44% % respectively. Then they use it in Move 1 (situating the topic) of 11, 1%, and Move 5 (conclusion or recommendation) of 7 %.

Another finding, in terms of the RAS above the average of the passive verbal, is related to the number of words sued in this group which is 188 words for each. It shows that the more the authors of abstract RAS use passive verbal, the more efficient words they use in the abstract. This can be compared to the previous evidence in Table 1, in which the average number of words is 203.

It can be described as the following. Based on the evidence provided above, it appears that this study analyzed a set of abstracts (RAS) and focused on using passive verbal expressions in different moves of the abstracts. Here is an interpretation of the evidence. First, Passive Verbal Usage indicates some RAS (abstracts) with a higher-than-average use of passive verbal expressions. The average for passive verbal is 4, and they have identified 5 RAS with a value above this average (e.g., RAS No 1, No 3, No 5, No 7, and No 16).

Another interpretation deals with Passive Verbal Usage in Different Moves. In this case, the study provides evidence of how the RAS authors use passive verbal expressions in different parts of their abstracts. The results

show that these authors predominantly use passive verbal expressions to convey information in Move 3 (methodology) and Move 4 (research results). Specifically, they used passive verbal for expressing methodology of 29.63% and for results of the research 44.44%. Additionally, passive verbal is used less frequently in Move 1 (situating the topic), with a usage rate of 11.1%, and even less in Move 5 (conclusion or recommendation), with a rate of 7%.

More interestingly, it concerns the relationship between Passive Verbal Usage and Abstract Length. The evidence suggests a relationship between passive verbal expressions and the efficiency of words used in the abstracts. Specifically, abstracts with higher usage of passive verbal expressions (above the average) tend to use fewer words. For the RAS above the average of passive verbal, the number of words used is 188 for each abstract. This is in comparison to Table 1, where the average number of words in the abstracts was 203.

The evidence indicates that specific abstracts (RAS) use more than average passive verbal expressions. These abstracts use passive verbal predominantly to express the research methodology and results. Additionally, these abstracts are more efficient in terms of word usage compared to the average abstract length in Table 1.

Table 2. Above the Average Passive Verbal Usage (RAS > 4 Passive Verbal)

RAS No:	Move 1	Move 2	Move 3	Move 4	Move 5	Total	∑ Words
1			3		1	4	66
3	2			1		4	313
5		1	4	2		7	245
7	1		1	4	1	7	150
16				5		5	170
Total	**3**	**1**	**8**	**12**	**2**	**27**	**944**
%	**11,11**	**3,70**	**29,63**	**44,44**	**7,45**	**100**	**188**

Findings in Terms of the Below Average (less than 4 Verbal)

Regarding the group of abstract RAS that have passive verbal below the average (less than 4), as in Table 3, it shows that mostly the RAS authors use passive verbal in Move 3 (methodology) 40,62% and then followed by Move 1 (situating the topic) that is 25%, followed by Move 4 (expressing the results of the research) that is 21, 87% and Move 5 (conclusion or recommendation), which is 6, 25%.   This below-average is employed by the 16 abstract RAS, such as RAS No 2,4, 6, 8, 9,10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 20.

The finding also shows that the number of words in each abstract RAS is 207. This also indicates that the less the authors use passive verbal, the greater the number of words they employ in their abstracts. It can also be compared to Table 1 and Table 2. The authors of abstracts (RAS) have a below-average usage of passive verbal expressions (less than 4), providing evidence as the following. First of all, it is Passive Verbal Usage in Different Moves. In this case, the authors with passive verbal expressions (less than 4) tend to use passive verbal expressions most frequently in Move 3 (methodology), with a usage rate of 40.62%. The second most common usage is in Move 1 (situating the topic), with a rate of 25%. Move 4 (expressing the research results) is the third most common, with a usage rate of 21.87%. Lastly, Move 5 (conclusion or recommendation) has a minor usage of passive verbal, with a rate of 6.25%.

Another piece of evidence is about the Abstract Length: The evidence also reveals that the abstracts with a below-average use of passive verbal expressions have an average length of 207 words for each abstract. This indicates that, on average, this group's abstracts are longer than the average abstract length in Table 1 (203 words). This finding further supports the notion that the use of passive verbal expressions is inversely related to the length of the abstract. When passive verbal is used less, the abstracts tend to be longer.

To summarize, the evidence shows that abstracts with a below-average usage of passive verbal expressions (less than 4) tend to utilize passive verbal most frequently in Move 3 (methodology) and less in Move 1 (situating the topic), Move 4 (expressing the results of the research), and Move 5 (conclusion or recommendation). Additionally, these abstracts have a higher average word count than the average abstract length in Table 1, reinforcing the inverse relationship between passive verbal usage and abstract length.

Table 3. Below the Average Passive Verbal (RAS < 4 Passive Verbal)

RAS No:	Move 1	Move 2	Move 3	Move 4	Move 5	Total	∑ Words
2	2					2	214
4	2	1				3	124
6	1			1		2	159
8			2			2	90

						Total	Words
9			2			2	271
10				2	1	3	200
11	1					1	274
12			1	2		3	170
13				1	1	2	250
14	2					2	243
15			3			3	156
17			2			2	196
18			3				264
19		2				2	140
20		2		1	2	3	366
Total	8	5	13	7	2	32	Tot:3117
%	25	15,62	40,62	21,87	6,25	100	Av:207

Discussion

All of 20 abstract RAS: This evidence, in Table 1, discusses the usage of passive verbal expressions in various sections of research article abstracts (RAS). The analysis includes 20 research article abstracts, revealing several key points. Passive verb usage is most prominent in Move 3 and Move 4. Move 3 expresses the methodology, showing the highest usage of passive verbal, with authors employing it in 35 cases, accounting for 59 of the total instances of passive verb usage. Move 4, which expresses the results of the research articles, follows with 32 instances, making up 21 of the total passive verb usage. As abstract should be efficient, the passive pattern is used because this pattern leads to efficiency in academic writing (Park et al., 2023). Besides, methodology and results are considered more objectively stated when using a passive pattern, especially without mentioning the agent or the doer (Meluzzi et al., 2021).

Secondly, Passive Verb Usage is also observed in Move 1, where authors situate their research topic. In this move, passive verbal is used in 11 cases, representing 18.64% of the total instances of passive verb usage. Furthermore, passive verbal is utilized in Move 2 to express the purpose of the research, with six instances making up 10.16% of the total passive verb usage in this move. Finally, in the Conclusion or Recommendation section, authors use only four passive verbal (6%) instances to express their conclusions or recommendations in the research articles. Among the 20 authors and their abstracts, 59 instances of passive verbal usage exist. Again, for making an abstract brief, situating the topic and expressing the purpose of the research requires efficiency too. Therefore, passive verbal is required (Park et al., 2023; Meluzzi et al., 2021).

Another significant finding relates to the word count of each abstract. The research article abstracts with the fewest words, "RAS no 1," contains 66 words, while the one with the highest word count, "RAS No 11," contains 274 words. The average number of words among the 20 research article abstracts is 203. In this case, Djuwari (2009) provides evidence that the best abstract should consist of the words between 150 and 200 words. It can also refer to Askehave and Swales (2001) for more information.

In general, this evidence provides insights into the preferred usage of passive verbal expressions in different parts of research article abstracts and the variation in word counts among them. It highlights the prevalence of passive verbal in Move 3 and Move 4, as well as its presence in Move 1 and the Conclusion/Recommendation section. Additionally, it emphasizes the diverse lengths of abstracts in the studied set of research articles. Finally, passive verbal is suitable for making the abstract brief and efficient.

Above the Average abstract RAS: Very specifically in the group of abstracts that happen to be above the average (≤ 4), it appears that the set of abstracts (RAS) uses passive verbal expressions in different moves of the abstracts. For example, the average for passive verbal is 4, and the study identified 5 RAS with values above this average (RAS No 1, No 3, No 5, No 7, and No 16). The authors predominantly use passive verbal expressions in Move 3 (methodology) and Move 4 (research results). Specifically, they use passive verbal for expressing methodology 29.63% of the time and for results of the research 44.44% of the time. In comparison, passive verbal is used less frequently in Move 1 (situating the topic), with a rate of 11.1%, and even less in Move 5 (conclusion or recommendation), with a rate of 7%. In this case, this study can be related to the function of passive verbal. It is the construction of sentences or words and phrases that are condensed. Therefore, the author can probably be inclined to use this practical way, using passive verbal without agents, which can be either sentences, clauses, or phrases. This pattern makes texts more efficient and briefer (Celce-Murcia, 2002; Swan, 2005).

The following evidence concerns the relationship between passive verbal usage and abstract length. More interestingly, the higher usage of passive verbal expressions (above the average) tends to be more efficient regarding word usage. For the RAS above the average of passive verbal, the number of words used is 188 for each abstract, compared to the average abstract length in Table 1, which is 203 words. It saves about 15

words in an abstract (Kone, 2020). It is precisely when indicating the process (Move 3 Methodology) as stated by Ghos (2023) and Strelan (2020).

In summary, the evidence indicates that some abstracts use passive verbal expressions more, and authors tend to use passive verbal predominantly in Move 3 and Move 4. Moreover, abstracts with higher use of passive verbal tend to be more concise regarding word count. These findings shed light on the relationship between passive verbal usage and abstract characteristics, offering valuable insights for further analysis.

Below the Average Abstract RAS: From Table 3, a group of abstracts (RAS) have a below-average usage of passive verbal expressions (less than 4). The authors of abstracts with below-average passive verbal usage also predominantly use passive verbal expressions in Move 3 (methodology) with a usage rate of 40.62%. The second most common usage is in Move 1 (situating the topic), with a rate of 25%. Move 4 (expressing the research results) follows with a usage rate of 21.87%, and Move 5 (conclusion or recommendation) has minor usage at 6.25%. Thus, in terms of using passive verbal, it can also be referred to Park et al. (2023) and Meluzzi et al. (2021) and for making any texts more efficient (Celce-Murcia, 2022; Swan, 2005).

About the abstract length, it reveals that abstracts with below-average usage of passive verbal expressions have an average length of 207 words for each abstract. This indicates that, on average, these abstracts are longer compared to the average abstract length in Table 1 (203 words). This finding further supports the inverse relationship between passive verbal usage and abstract length. When passive verbal is used less, the abstracts tend to be longer.

To summarize, the evidence suggests that abstracts with below-average passive verbal usage tend to use passive verbal expressions most frequently in Move 3 (methodology), followed by Move 1 (situating the topic), and less in Move 4 (expressing the results of the research) and Move 5 (conclusion or recommendation). Additionally, these abstracts are longer on average compared to the average abstract length in Table 1, reinforcing the relationship between passive verbal usage and abstract length. Therefore, using the passive verbal pattern in any Move of the abstract would be preferable suggested. It makes texts more efficient and briefer (Tripp, 2022; Crossley et al., 2020).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The analysis of 20 research article abstracts (RAS) reveals that passive verbal expressions are commonly used, particularly in Move 3 (methodology) and Move 4 (results of the research). Passive voice is preferred in academic writing due to its efficiency and objectivity. Move 1 (situating the topic) and Move 2 (expressing the purpose of the research) also employ passive verbal, albeit to a lesser extent. The abstracts above the average in passive verbal usage tend to be more concise, saving about 15 words per abstract compared to the average length. On the other hand, abstracts below the average in passive verbal usage are longer on average.

Overall, passive verbal usage in the abstracts is associated with different moves and affects the length of the abstract. Authors seem inclined to use passive verbal for condensing sentences and phrases, leading to more efficient and brief abstracts. Further research on this relationship between passive verbal usage and abstract characteristics would provide valuable insights into academic writing patterns.

Future studies should aim for more extensive and diverse samples, consider multiple types of academic writing, incorporate a more comprehensive analysis of linguistic features, and account for contextual factors that may influence writing style and voice usage. Additionally, replicating the study in different disciplines and regions would enhance the generalizability of the findings.

Suggestions can also be for the authors, editors, and journal publishers as the following: First, consider Passive Voice for expressing Move 3: Methodology and Move 4: Results: Since passive verbal expressions are commonly used in Move 3 (methodology) and Move 4 (results of the research), authors can consider employing passive voice when describing the methods used in the study and presenting the research findings. This can enhance objectivity and efficiency in conveying these sections of the abstract.

Then they can use it for Situating the Topic and Purpose: While passive voice is prevalent in academic writing, it is used to a lesser extent in Move 1 (situating the topic) and Move 2 (expressing the purpose of the research). Authors may choose to use active voice for these parts of the abstract to provide clarity and directness in stating the context and objectives of the study. Considering the abstract length, passive voice may have advantages; balancing its usage with the need for brevity is essential. By following these suggestions and

considering the research findings, authors can enhance the quality of their research article abstracts, making them more efficient, clear, and appealing to readers and reviewers alike.

REFERENCES

Askehave, I., & Swales, J. M. (2001). Genre identification and communicative purpose: A problem and a possible solution. *Applied linguistics*, *22*(2), 195–212.

Baum, C. M., Low, S., & Sovacool, B. K. (2022). Between the sun and us: Expert perceptions on the innovation, policy, and deep uncertainties of space-based solar geoengineering. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 158*, 112179.

Biber, D. (2012). Register as a predictor of linguistic variation. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory, 8*(1), 9–37.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2002). On the use of selected grammatical features in academic writing. *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power*, 143-158.

Crossley, S., Duran, N. D., Kim, Y., Lester, T., & Clark, S. (2020). The action dynamics of native and non-native speakers of English in processing active and passive sentences. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism, 10*(1), 58–85.

Davidson, A. (1982). On the form and meaning of Hindi passive sentences. *Lingua, 58*(1-2), 149-179.

Djuwari, D. (2009). Genre Analysis of International Conference Paper. *Belantika Pendidikan, 1*(2).

Djuwari, D. (2013). Comparative Study on Textual Space of Journal Articles. *Liceo Journal Higher Education Research, 7*(1), 154.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Ghosh, D., Bhateja, C. A., & Levine, S. (2023, July). Reinforcement learning from passive data via latent intentions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 11321-11339). PMLR.

Horbowicz, P., Skrzypek, D., Sobkowiak, M., & Kołaczek, N. (2019). The use of passive voice in academic writing. Evidence from Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish as L1 and L2. *Folia Scandinavica Posnaniensia, 26*, 4-26.

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

Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(1-2), 3-33.

Kone, N. (2020). Speech acts in UN treaties: A pragmatic perspective. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, *10*(6), 813-827.

Krasnowska-Kieraś, K., & Wróblewska, A. (2019, July). *Empirical linguistic study of sentence embeddings*. In Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (pp. 5729-5739).

Lasersohn, P. (2016). Subjectivity and perspective in truth-theoretic semantics (Vol. 8). Oxford University Press.

Lakic, I. (2010). Analyzing genre: Research article introductions in economics. *Journal of Linguistic Intercultural Education, 3*.

Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Sage Publications.

Lghzeel, F. A., & Radzuan, N. R. M. (2020). The cross-linguistic influence of Arabic on the English passive voice. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 10*(3), 182-190.

Mack, J. E., Meltzer-Asscher, A., Barbieri, E., & Thompson, C. K. (2013). Neural correlates of processing passive sentences. *Brain Sciences, 3*(3), 1198-1214.

Magulod, G. C., Jr., Capulso, L. B., Delos Reyes, R. J. V., Luna, A. R. F., Orte, C. J. S., Maglente, S. S., Pentang, J. T., Olitres, B. J. D., Vidal, C. J. E., & Samosa, R. C. (2021). *How to write and publish your thesis*. Beyond Books Publication.

Mohammed, M. S., & Abdalhussein, H. F. (2015). Grammatical error analysis of Iraqi postgraduate students' academic writing: The case of Iraqi students in UKM. *International Journal of Education and Research, 3*(6), 283-294.

Msuya, E. A. (2019). Analysis of Citation Verbal in EFL Academic Writing: The Case Study of Dissertations and Theses at the University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies, 11*(2), 141-164.

Meluzzi, C., Pinelli, E., Valvason, E., & Zanchi, C. (2021). Responsibility attribution in gender-based domestic violence: A study bridging corpus-assisted discourse analysis and readers' perception. *Journal of pragmatics*, *185*, 73-92.

Omelyanenko, O. V., & Sytnikova, V. K. (2018). The Passive Voice.

Park, M., Leahey, E., & Funk, R. J. (2023). Papers and patents are becoming less disruptive over time. *Nature*, *613*(7942), 138-144.

Piamsai, C. (2020). The effect of scaffolding on non-proficient EFL learners' performance in an academic writing class. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *13*(2), 288-305

Paolazzi, C. L., Grillo, N., Alexiadou, A., & Santi, A. (2019). Passives are not hard to interpret but hard to remember: evidence from online and offline studies. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience, 34*(8), 991-1015.

Pho, P. D. (2008). Research article in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies, 10*(2), 231-250.

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5th ed.). (2001). American Psychological Association.

Rabie, H., & Boraie, D. (2021). The rhetorical structure of literature reviews in Egyptian-Authored English research articles in linguistics. *Asian Social Science and Humanities Research Journal*, *3*(1), 55-72.

Swales, J. M. (1990). Discourse analysis in professional contexts. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *11*, 103-114.

Strelan, P., Van Prooijen, J. W., & Gollwitzer, M. (2020). When transgressors intend to cause harm: The empowering effects of revenge and forgiveness on victim well-being. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *59*(2), 447-469.

Scholastica, C. A. (2018). Learning the English passive voice: Difficulties, learning strategies of Igbo ESL learners and pedagogical implications. *International Journal of English and Literature, 9*(5), 50-62.

Shaw, P. M. (2012). Grammar in academic writing. The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics.

Sigel, T. (2009). How passive voice weakens your scholarly argument. *Journal of Management Development*.

Somphong, M. (2013). An analysis of errors in passive sentence structures by Thai EFL university students. In The Asian Conference on Education 2013: Official Conference Proceedings (pp. 662-675).

Suthiwartnarueput, T., & Wasanasomsithi, P. (2012). Effects of using Facebook as a medium for discussions of English grammar and writing of low-Intermediate EFL students. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 9*(2).

Staples, S., Egbert, J., Biber, D., & Gray, B. (2016). Academic writing development at the university level: Phrasal and clausal complexity across level of study, discipline, and genre. *Written Communication, 33*(2), 149-183.

Strunk, W., Jr., & White, E. B. (2009). The elements of style (Fiftieth Anniversary Edition). Pearson Longman.

Swan, M. (2001). Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problems (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.

Swan, M. (2005). Practical English usage (Vol. 688). Oxford University Press.

Tripp, A., Daxberger, E., & Hernández-Lobato, J. M. (2020). Sample-efficient optimization in the latent space of deep generative models via weighted retraining. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *33*, 11259-11272.

Warren, N. L., Farmer, M., Gu, T., & Warren, C. (2021). Marketing ideas: How to write research articles that readers understand and cite. *Journal of Marketing, 85*(5), 42-57.

Wiredu, J. F. (2012). A grammar of newspaper editorial language: The complex Sentence. *Legon Journal of the Humanities, 23*, 75-124.

Wankhade, M., Rao, A. C. S., & Kulkarni, C. (2022). A survey on sentiment analysis methods, applications, and challenges. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, *55*(7), 5731-5780.