Abstract

This research paper presents a comprehensive contrastive analysis of abstracts from scientific journals in both Chinese and English, with the aim of identifying and understanding the linguistic and structural differences that may affect the clarity and effectiveness of academic communication. The study involved a meticulous review of 80 abstracts across 20 diverse fields, categorized into authentic English abstracts (Ea1), translated abstracts from Chinese (Ta2), and the original Chinese abstracts (Ca\*3).

The analysis was structured around Bhatia's (1993) model, which segments abstracts into four key sections: introduction, methods, results, and conclusions. Each section was examined for specific linguistic features, including verb tense, passive voice usage, modal verbs, first-person pronouns, and section length. The study revealed that Chinese writers tend to be less varied in their use of verb tenses, particularly favoring the present simple tense in the introduction and past tense in the methods section. In contrast, English abstracts demonstrated a more balanced distribution of tenses, reflecting a nuanced understanding of the functional roles of different tenses in various abstract sections.

The findings also highlighted a higher frequency of passive voice constructions in English abstracts (Ea) compared to the translated abstracts (Ta). This discrepancy may be attributed to the influence of Chinese language characteristics, which are more meaning-centered than form-centered, leading to a different rhetorical style in academic writing.

The study concludes that there is a need for targeted educational interventions to help Chinese graduate students enhance their English academic writing skills. Understanding the subtleties of tense usage and the strategic application of passive voice in English abstracts can significantly improve the quality and impact of their research presentations. The results of this study provide valuable insights for scholars, educators, and academic writers seeking to bridge the linguistic and cultural gap in international academic publishing.
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