

Exploring authorial voice in English language medical journal abstracts in the age of AI

Katalin Doró 

dorokati@lit.u-szeged.hu

University of Szeged, Hungary

Doró, Katalin (2025). Exploring authorial voice in English language medical journal abstracts in the age of AI. *Language Value*, 18(1), 49-78. Universitat Jaume I ePress: Castelló, Spain. <http://www.languagevalue.uji.es>.

July 2025

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.6035/languagev.8812>

ISSN 1989-7103

ABSTRACT

Authorial voice in medical journal abstracts has been widely studied; however, there is a clear research gap concerning how Hungarian authors place themselves in their English-language abstracts. This study examines the differences in the authorial voice used by Hungarian authors publishing in a local journal and international authors publishing in widely read journals. One hundred abstracts on Covid19 from three journals were extracted and searched for personal pronouns, possessive determiners, noun phrases indicating implicit authorial presence and passive voice. The results suggest a similar frequency of the personal pronoun *we* across the corpora, but a more frequent use of the possessive determiner *our* by Hungarian authors, whereas first-person singular pronouns are almost non-existent. While noun phrase usage shows the most variability in the Hungarian abstracts, the passive voice ratio is between those found in the two international corpora. Pedagogical implications are drawn, especially concerning the observation of published abstracts as models for L2 academic writing versus the growing tendency to use artificial intelligence to generate abstracts.

Keywords: *Journal abstracts; Authorial voice; Medical journals; L2 writers; AI-assisted writing*



I. INTRODUCTION

The term *authorial voice* describes the distinct tone and style used by researchers to communicate their findings in academic writing. This voice shows a degree of objectivity, accuracy, and clarity, while closely observing field-specific norms (Mhilli, 2023; Santos & Da Silva, 2016). The authorial voice in health science articles usually takes on a formal, impersonal tone, using specific terms and the passive voice to describe research methods, findings, and conclusions in the limited space provided (Millar, Budgell & Fuller, 2013; Rundblad, 2007). These abstracts typically have a conventional structure that includes an Introduction, Aims, Methods, Results, and Conclusions. Keeping this structure in mind, authors need to find a balance between readability and complex content. Human-authored abstracts frequently highlight important points and have language choices that show authors' knowledge and familiarity with the subject, express their viewpoints, and stress the importance of their findings. This may be difficult for writers, especially those who publish in a foreign language (L2). They usually observe expert texts to learn the norms of their fields or the specific requirements of journals in which they wish to publish. They may also translate an L1 version or turn to proofreading by a proficient (native) speaker or colleague. More recently, authors have received help from AI writing assistance in general or tools that offer abstract generation in particular. Although AI-generated abstracts may be grammatically and structurally sound and capture the general content of the manuscript, they do not have the depth of comprehension of the authors. For AI-based tools, it may also be difficult to mimic and reproduce the differences in tone and emphasis used by the authors.

This article aims to add to the expanding body of research on the linguistic realization of medical abstracts by comparing abstracts written by Hungarian authors as part of their Hungarian articles with those published in leading medical journals by international authors with various language backgrounds. The analysis focuses on key aspects of authorial voice, including first-person pronouns, passive voice, and noun phrases

referring to the author and the article. This study also discusses the growing reality of authors turning to artificial intelligence for translating, generating, or proofreading their texts, including the abstracts. From an academic writing pedagogy perspective, it is discussed how AI assistance can be exploited, what types of results can be obtained, and why caution should be taken against excessive reliance on these tools and blind copy-pasting.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

II.1. Academic journal abstracts

As English has become an academic lingua franca, English-language abstracts play a key role in disseminating researchers' work. Authors with different first languages (L1s) must learn the rhetorical and linguistic conventions of abstract writing (Hyland, 2000a; Tverdokhlebova & Makovskaya, 2022). All articles published in journals include an abstract, typically between 150 and 250 words, summarizing the aims, methods and main findings of the accompanying article. Even non-English manuscripts have English-language abstracts or summaries that can reach a wide international audience. Due to their important roles and functions in research communication, abstracts are a genre of their own rights. In health care research, a recently emerged subgenre is a video abstract that has additional elements to express an authorial voice and help reach its audience (Edo-Marzá & Beltrán-Palanques, 2023). In the growing flood of scientific information, readers can rely on abstracts, in addition to titles, to filter out content that seems relevant and help them decide what is worth reading (Jiang and Hyland, 2017). In a recent study by Shiely et al. (2024), more than 98% of science and health care researchers reported that they read the abstract first to get an overview of the content and to see whether to read on or not. However, AI-assisted writing offers ready-made solutions for sources to be placed in abstracts without careful selection or close reading by authors. This may speed up the background reading and the writing process but jeopardizes the real academic dialogue between scholars and raises ethical concerns.

Medical abstracts are more important than research publications in many other fields because they often have a direct impact on clinical decisions. Their significance arises from the time constraints that health care professionals often face; therefore, they may rely on these concise summaries to stay informed about the latest developments in their field and make decisions concerning patient care (Nascimento et al., 2021). Within the health care and linguistic literature, various studies have explored its structure, content, quality, and impact on clinical decision-making. Studies have shown that the quality and content can vary significantly. For example, O’Donohoe et al. (2019), analyzed systematic review abstracts in neurosurgical journals and found that the overall reporting quality was suboptimal for over half of the abstracts. This is alarming because medical abstracts can potentially impact clinical decision-making. Quality and clear content are even more important when abstracts are scanned and evaluated using AI for both research and clinical work. Among others, Bragazzi and Garbarino (2024) suggested that the integration of AI in clinical decision-making could potentially expand the use of medical abstracts, provided that AI-generated insights are verified and explained to both clinicians and patients.

From a linguistic perspective, abstracts have been widely studied for their rhetorical structure, lexical and syntactic complexity, metadiscourse functions and verb use, highlighting cross-linguistic, disciplinary and diachronic differences (Hyland, 2008; Hyland et al., 2022). Structural and linguistic choices may have a strong impact on the way abstracts are selected and perceived, and can inform readers not only about the content, but also the quality of articles. Jon et al. (2021) further emphasized that abstracts with higher readability scores (calculated based on thirty-nine lexical and syntactic complexity indices) received better online attention; therefore, they gave the articles a significantly higher scientific impact.

II.2. Authorial voice

Authorial voice represents one of the most intriguing aspects of academic writing that combines authors’ intentions, writing conventions, and linguistic choices. Tardy and Matsuda (2009, p. 34) defined authorial voice as “the amalgamative effect of the use

of discursive and non-discursive features that language users choose deliberately or otherwise from socially available yet ever-changing repertoires". Drawing on Hyland's (2008) interactional model, researchers typically interpret voice as the interplay between two interconnected, yet often indistinct, components: the stance one adopts and the strategies used for engagement. Stance is largely conveyed through hedges, boosters, self-references (Hyland, 2000a, 2000b, Liu et al., 2024), and the choice of rhetorical move structures within specific genres (Pho, 2008; Swales, 1990). On the other hand, engagement can be shown through questions, listener mentions, directives, level of formality, or references to shared knowledge (Hyland, 2004, 2005). Hedges and boosters stand out as particularly significant among the linguistic tools available to authors to convey their opinions. These are defined as "communicative strategies for increasing or reducing the force of statements" (Hyland, 2004, p. 87). These metadiscursive elements play a crucial role in conveying meaning and promoting interpersonal connections between writers and their audiences (Hyland & Tse, 2004; Hyland, 2005). Hedges (e.g., may, could) can be used to indicate uncertainty or show respect to the research community, whereas boosters (e.g., must, significantly) can signal a strong commitment to the information being presented (Hyland, 2004).

In academic writing, authors have the choice to present themselves explicitly or hide their presence; in other words, they emphasize or hide their responsibility for their own propositions, and convey epistemic judgements, opinions, and degrees of commitment (Bondi, 2014). Explicit presence can be expressed through first-person singular and plural pronouns, possessive determiners of nouns, first-person verbal suffixes and self-citation (Fife, 2021; Hyland & Jiang, 2017). By contrast, implicit presence is formed with self-reference words (the author, the researcher), reader-inclusive *we*, impersonal means (such as nominalizations, anticipatory *it*), inanimate subjects (e.g., this study) and passive voice (Hyland, 2002; 2004; Hyland & Tse, 2004; Bondi, 2014).

The excessive use of passive voice in medical writing has been thoroughly studied and compared to other fields, such as the humanities. Research conclusions are mixed, particularly when examining diachronic studies that track changes in writing strategies.

Those comprising periods until the 1980s or the 1990s have usually concluded an increase in the use of passives (Banks, 2008). Others, examining more recent periods, have found a move away from the overuse of passive forms, explaining it with the need for authority, clarity, and conciseness (Banks, 2017; Leong, 2020; Seoane, 2006; 2013). While investigating a large diachronic corpus of four disciplines, Hyland and Jiang (2017) found notable differences across disciplines and in specific linguistic features. Among the impersonal constructions, the use of first-person pronouns *I* and *we* has increased in three of the four disciplines (except for applied linguistics, which already showed a higher frequency).

Roundblad (2007) investigated impersonalization strategies in the Methods sections of nine medical articles, looking at both passive voice and metonymy. She argued that metonymy is used either for generalization (any researcher could have done the study) or socialization (e.g., other researchers or the hospital). The study found that using metonymy to refer to the authors as the study, trial, or aim occurred less often than references to tables or results. Roundblad in another study (2008) also noted that the use of metonymy and passive voice depends on whether the authors are referring to themselves or someone else involved in the research. Swales (2015) calls this metonymy an attended noun phrase (NP) that refers to either the article itself (study/article/paper/research) or the methodology (method, technique, procedure). They may appear with the determiner *the* to fully disguise the author, or be preceded by the possessive determiners *my* and *our* or the demonstrative pronoun *this*. The latter two options may also function as strong attitudinal signals and cohesive devices that facilitate the flow of reading (Swales, 2015; Hyland & Jiang, 2017).

II.3. Abstract writing pedagogy and writing support: Human vs. computer-assisted abstract writing

Academic writing has long been viewed as impersonal, objective and purely empirical, one that should refrain from informal language, including the use of first-person pronouns, especially in medical texts (Seoane & Hundt, 2018). Some scholars have noted that writing manuals and courses do not adequately observe disciplinary

differences or empirical research results (Isik-Tas, 2010; Hyland & Jiang, 2017). Over a decade ago Millar et al. (2013) noted that some leading medical journals advised their authors to use the active voice and first-person personal pronouns instead of the passive voice. The same guidance is echoed in the House Style Guide (HSG) for the British Medical Journal (2025) that advises: “Write in the active and use the first person where necessary”, which is part of the general request to “write in a clear, direct, and active style.” However, Millar et al. (2013) argued that there are misconceptions about the perceived verbosity and readability difficulty of the passive voice. The use of passive constructions may not only be a stylistic choice, but also a better option to keep the agent and the verb closer; therefore, information processing becomes easier.

Despite the importance of abstracts in authors’ academic achievement, usually little attention is paid to developing writing skills in this area (Campbell, 2019; Tverdokhlebova & Makovskaya, 2022; Veszelszki, 2018). This aspect of academic writing is typically learned explicitly. Researchers form an idea for themselves of what an abstract looks like and what structural and linguistic expectations it should meet based on the abstracts they read. In the health sciences, a growing number of journals require structured abstracts that provide a framework and orient the authors very closely regarding the main sections and length requirements. O’Donohoe et al. (2019) highlighted the importance of standardized guidelines and the influence of journal prestige on abstract quality. However, some other medical journals and many other research fields do not use structured abstracts, and it is up to the authors to decide what to include, although the aims, methods, and results seem to be mandatory in abstracts (Pho, 2008).

Even if the authors received training in English writing pedagogy at the university or early in their careers, they are unlikely to have received adequate information about abstract writing. Doctoral students or researchers typically encounter this genre when applying for conferences or submitting papers, but it is mostly length and editing expectations that they receive, with few content-related or rhetorical suggestions. English-language manuals on the teaching of scientific writing or course materials of

university writing centers specializing in writing pedagogy and language support say little about abstracts; they usually specify only a few aspects such as length, clarity, and well-formedness.

In recent years, an increasing number of authors have turned to computer-assisted translation or language checking when writing their manuscripts. AI-supported academic writing has revolutionized the ways in which authors approach publishing. For example, they may help by generating drafts, rewording complex arguments, summarizing larger sections, suggesting citations, improving clarity, coherence, and style, and checking a manuscript for grammar and plagiarism. Free translation software and large language model-based chatbots such as ChatGPT, are increasingly available and effective, and their use is widespread. In the last few years, there has been a rapid substitution of human resources for machine assistance, even though this too requires authorial editing and decision making. Supporters of AI-assisted writing argue that, while AI cannot substitute human thinking, it may work as a strong complement, allowing writers to concentrate more on their research content and analysis rather than the writing itself.

Recent studies have explored the use of ChatGPT to produce various academic genres, including case reports (Buholayka et al., 2023) and research article drafts (Macdonald et al., 2023). They also addressed the quality and recognizability of machine-generated and human-written abstracts. For example, Gao et al. (2023) found that computer-generated abstracts are fuzzier, appear formulaic, and fail to meet journal format expectations. The authors reported that AI detectors were able to identify these abstracts well, and readers involved in the study were able to filter out an average of 68% of them. In contrast, the linguist participants of Casal and Kessler (2023) correctly judged the authorship of only 39% of abstracts. Similarly, 40% of participants in a health science study conducted by Nabata et al. (2025) were able to correctly identify the authorship of the abstracts, with 63% expressing a preference for generated abstracts. Likewise, Pressmann et al. (2025) reported that their participants favored ChatGPT-generated plastic surgery abstracts, which they described as well-written, clear, and concise.

Alongside accuracy, ethical concerns are often voiced in connection with writing assistance, especially generative artificial intelligence (GAI). Some of the journal editors in Casal and Kessler's (2023) study had no ethical objections to the use of artificial intelligence, whereas other studies have indicated a growing concern regarding GAI in research publications (Butson et al., 2024; Lund et al., 2023; Tai et al., 2023).

II.4. Summary and research aims

Authorial voice is a key area in abstract writing. While there are a wealth of studies on abstract writing in different disciplines and concerning authors from various backgrounds, a clear research gap exists concerning how Hungarian authors place themselves in their English-language abstracts. Similar studies on Hungarian linguists' research article abstracts (both in Hungarian and English) show more frequent self-mentioning and lexical variation concerning inanimate subject (*paper, study, article*) choices (Doró, 2023; 2024). There is also debate on how general writing manuals, disciplinary traditions, and journal guidelines (or a lack of these) should be observed by authors and how much help they can and should be obtained from AI. Based on the literature reviewed above, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What differences can be observed in the authorial voice used in English-language abstracts written by Hungarian authors publishing in a local medical journal and international authors publishing in widely read journals?
2. More specifically, how are the following three linguistic markers used in the three corpora: first-person pronouns, inanimate noun phrase subjects referring to the article, and passive voice?
3. What pedagogical implications can be drawn from the results and how can AI writing assistance be incorporated into researchers' abstract production and academic writing instruction?

III. METHODS

III.1. Corpus

Three corpora of medical journal abstracts published on the topic of Covid19 in prestigious, peer reviewed, and open-access journals were compiled using the WoS database. The first 100 abstracts for each journal were subtracted from the WoS database, which matched the following selection criteria: open access, Covid19, empirical research. Only empirical research papers were chosen because they have a more typical abstract structure and content across journals than short notices or review articles.

A leading Hungarian medical journal, *Orvosi Hetilap*, and two leading international journals, all publishing studies in general medicine were selected for comparison. The anchor journal, *Orvosi Hetilap* (OH), is the oldest Hungarian press product and is part of the Hungarian Cultural Heritage, and the only scientific journal published weekly. The majority of the articles were in Hungarian with abstracts provided in both Hungarian and English. Currently, it has a Q4 ranking.

For the comparative analysis, two online Q1 journals were selected. The *British Medical Journal Open* (BMJ Open) has a policy of publishing research as soon as an article is ready. The *Journal of Clinical Medicine* (JCM) is published semi-monthly online. All three journals are open access, included in PubMed and Web of Science and have a mixed abstract format. Table 1 indicates that OH and JCM are closer in terms of overall corpus length, but there is large individual variation within a single journal. For example, BMJ Open abstracts range from 31 to 493 words.

Table 1. *Characteristics of the three corpora*

Journal	Number of abstracts	Tokens	Abstract format
Orvosi Hetilap (OH)	100	20.965	mixed
British Medical Journal Online (BMJ Open)	100	26.482	mixed
Journal of Clinical Medicine (JCM)	100	20.874	mixed

III.2. Data analysis

The analyses were conducted using the Sketch Engine tool. The corpora were first searched for the frequency of first-person singular and plural pronouns *I* and *we* and possessive determiners *my* and *our*. The occurrences of *we* were then manually checked by the author twice to separate reader-exclusive *we* from reader-inclusive *we*. Reader-exclusive *we* and *our* may refer to multiple authors as subjects of sentences, while reader-inclusive *we* and *our* may refer to a larger social context of researcher and medical personnel, the hospital in general, and issues involving a larger society. An analysis of the inanimate NPs and grammatical passive voice was also carried out using Sketch Engine.

Finally, as part of the discussion on pedagogical implications, three experimental sessions of abstract generation were conducted using two AI tools. The non-subscription, free version of ChatGPT 3.5 and subscription-based Paperpal were used to test the responses they generated to the request to write abstracts for the uploaded academic texts. ChatGPT was chosen for its availability and popularity, and Paperpal was chosen as an example of an AI tool specifically designed for academic writing support. As a chatbot, ChatGPT must be carefully prompted to obtain the desired response and may require additional rounds for refinement. Paperpal has the option of generating an abstract and title based on the text typed in. It also has the option of interacting with a full article uploaded in a PDF format, and a summary is written automatically, but an abstract (with optional specifications regarding length and format) can also be requested in a dialogue box. The first session included abstract generation based on the full-text submission of one of the articles of the OH corpus using both tools. The article was written in English with abstracts in two languages. This allowed for a direct comparison between human-written Hungarian and English abstracts and generated abstracts. Both AI tools were given the following prompt: "Write an English structured abstract for the uploaded article with the following sections: introduction, objective, methods, statistical analysis, results, conclusion." In the second session, another published medical article, this time without its structured abstract, was uploaded to

both tools, again in a PDF file, as ChatGPT does not allow for a full manuscript to be placed in the chat box. For the third session, the direct abstract generator tool of Paperpal was tested based on the Introduction, Methods and Conclusion chapters, as the full article would have been difficult to transfer because of its length and the use of tables and charts.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

IV.1. Pronoun and possessive determiner use

The first set of analyses concerned the use of reader-exclusive and reader-inclusive pronoun and determiner use. Table 2 indicates that the frequency of *we* as a reader-exclusive subject shows similar tendencies across the three corpora, with 42 to 48 occurrences per ten thousand words. Hungarian authors most often used this option.

Table 2. *First-person plural pronoun and determiner use in the three corpora*

	OH	BMJ Open	JCM
<i>we</i> as subject (reader exclusive)	100 (47.62*)	112 (42.26*)	93 (44.5*)
reader inclusive <i>we</i>	3	1	0
<i>our</i> (reader exclusive)	58 (27.62*)	31 (11.7*)	34 (16.27*)
<i>our</i> (reader inclusive)	7	3	0

*normalized per 10,000 words

The pronoun *we* seems to be a common option for describing what the authors did to complete the research; therefore, it typically appears in the Aims and Methods sections (see Excerpts 1 and 2 below).

- (1) *We investigated clinical data, laboratory findings and determined the major risk factors.* (OH)
- (2) *We performed a retrospective study that included all SARS-CoV-2-positive patients with DM who were admitted to two Italian hospitals.* (JCM)

The instances of reader-inclusive *we* were very uncommon in the three corpora with only four clear cases, three in the OH, and one in the BMJ corpus. They typically occur together with the modal verb *can*, *need*, or *must*, as shown below.

(3) *We also need to find new ways, methods, and platforms to deal with this pandemic.* (OH)

(4) *We must not forget the limitations of this method...* (OH)

As for the possessive *our*, even clearer dominance is seen in the Hungarian corpus. Hungarian scholars emphasized themselves as active agents more than twice as often as colleagues publishing in BMJ Open. This possessive determiner emphasizes a direct connection with the data, participants, methods, results, and the larger clinical settings.

(5) *Our experience indicates that convalescent plasma therapy is well tolerated and could potentially improve clinical outcomes.* (OH)

(6) *Our data did not support the association between COVID-19 infection and the subsequent development of active TB.* (BMJ Open)

(7) *Our results reveal that most patients with post-COVID-19 syndrome suffer from multiorgan disorders.* (JCM)

In contrast, the reader-inclusive *our* indicated general observations, such as the one in Excerpt 8, conclusions drawn from the data for a larger population (Excerpt 9), or reference to issues surrounding the whole society, as in Excerpt 10. These were more than twice as common in the BMJ Open corpus as in the OH corpus and were absent from the JMC abstracts.

(8) *The pandemic might be close to over, but it is not out of our lives yet ...* (BMJ Open)

(9) *May affect our ability to respond ...* (BMJ Open)

(10) *These colleagues, our national heroes we can say, are facing after working in COVID-19 health care units.* (OH)

The first-person singular pronoun *I* and determiner *my* were found only once, appearing together in the same sentence in one of the Hungarian abstracts:

(11) *In my paper, I summarize the acute and chronic effects of viral infection ...*

(OH)

It is also possible to find a few examples in which reader-inclusive and reader-exclusive forms are mixed, as in Excerpt 12.

(12) *With our results we would like to raise awareness of the challenges and severe psychological consequences that these colleagues, our national heroes we can say, are facing after working in COVID-19 health care units.* (OH)

IV.2. Inanimate noun phrases referring to the given studies

The four most common noun phrases used to refer to the given studies were *study*, *article*, *paper* and *research*. As Table 3 indicates, *study* is the leading NP with over two and three times as many occurrences in the two international corpora than in the Hungarian one. The noun *article* is used ten times in the OH corpus and only once in BMJ Open. It is important to note that not all of these are metonymies hiding authors. As shown in Excerpts 13 to 16, they may refer to the study as a location or time period. If used as a prepositional phrase (e.g., *in this study*, *in our paper*), a main clause with an active verb or a passive construction can follow.

(13) *A cross-sectional survey was used in this study.* (BMJ Open)

(14) *In the study period, 1343 appendectomies were performed.* (OH)

(15) *In this retrospective study, we included 79 patients admitted to ...* (OH)

(16) *In this first article, we describe ...* (BMJ Open)

The noun *paper* was four times more frequent in the Hungarian corpus than in the other two, with a similar leading position for *article*. The word *research* was chosen only three times in the OH and JCM corpora and six times in BMJ Open. Frequent sentence starters for refining aims are as follows: *the aim of this paper is*, *this paper presents*, *the aim of the study was*.

Table 3. First-person plural pronoun and determiner use in the three corpora

	OH	BMJ Open	JCM
study	61 (29*)	203 (89*)	136 (109*)
article	10	1	2
paper	8	2	2
research	3	6	3

*normalized per 10.000 words

Upon examining the extent to which the four noun phrases serve as metonymy for an active human agent, we found that the numbers decrease, yet the overall patterns remain inconsistent. One important difference is seen in *research* that is exclusively used to state future research directions in the BMJ Open corpus (as in Excerpt 17) compared with Excerpts 18 and 19 in the other two corpora.

(17) *Further research is needed to confirm ...* (BMJ Open)

(18) *The goal of our research is to analyze the direct and indirect effects of the pandemic.* (OH)

(19) *The research aimed to compare...* (JCM)

IV.3. The passive voice

On an average, three to four passive constructs were used per abstract in all three corpora. When the raw figures shown in Table 4 were normalized per 10,000 words, the numbers showed very similar tendencies to the JCM leading the line. The OH values are between those of the other two corpora.

Table 4. Frequency of the passive voice

	OH	BMJ Open	JCM
passive voice	344 (163.8*)	405 (152.8*)	372 (178*)

*normalized per 10,000 words

Passive voice usually appears in the Methods and Results sections, as shown in Excerpts 20 to 23.

(20) *A descriptive study was started on August 2021 at a tertiary care hospital*
(BMJ Open)

(21) *The presence of the virus was not detected* (OH)

(22) *It was found that prior COVID-19 infection and vaccination do not confer immunity from infection.* (BMJ Open)

(23) *A nation-wide, cross-sectional online questionnaire was sent to ...* (OH)

The first three of these examples could be turned into active sentences, and an explicit authorial voice, with the pronoun *we*: *we started, we could not detect, we found*. Excerpt (23) is a case in which the passive is more natural, as the agents are less important than the results of the action.

IV.4. AI-generated abstracts

As explained in the Methods section, a full published article was first uploaded to both Paperpal and ChatGPT and a structured abstract divided into the sections of the article was asked for. In response, Paperpal provided a paraphrased version of the original abstract, keeping all five passive structures, four of the five occurrences of *we* alongside the one instance of *our*. The only notable difference in terms of academic voice was a shift from *In the present work, we sought to explore* to *This study aimed to uncover*. Meanwhile, ChatGPT failed to perform this task. It generated an abstract with the required format, but on an unrelated topic. When asked to correct itself, it generated a shorter, unstructured abstract-like text on a third, unrelated topic.

For the second experiment, a published paper without its abstract was uploaded, and a structured abstract of 250 words was asked for, without specifying what “structured” meant. Paperpal missed the task at first, as it did not seem to grasp the term *structured abstract* and instead provided a summary of bullet points. This time, ChatGPT was able to generate an abstract, related to the uploaded text. Both generated abstracts

had a more absent authorial voice, no use of personal pronouns or the demonstrative pronoun *this* with the noun *study*.

The third experiment, which only had key sections of an article copied into the text boxes of the tools (Introduction, Methods, and Conclusions), was more successful for Paperpal than for ChatGPT in terms of content. Because AI does not have the intentions of a human author, authorial invisibility was expected. Similarly to the first two rounds of abstract generation, noun phrases such as *the study* and *the research*, together with *the authors* were used as subjects. The demonstrative *this* was used only once in both abstracts.

V. DISCUSSION AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The analysis of the selected voice markers in medical journal abstracts revealed interesting patterns. First-person pronoun use was significantly more frequent in Hungarian-authored abstracts than in those published by authors from a variety of backgrounds. This difference is especially evident for *our*, as if Hungarian authors wish to stress the ownership of their studies. However, this could be a language transfer, as plural verbal suffixes and possessive pronouns are markers of neutrality in Hungarian academic speech and writing, even when regularly used by single authors, because passive constructions are rare. The first-person singular pronoun use also supports this language transfer phenomenon from Hungarian (*In my paper, I summarize*). What can be felt as a neutral academic voice in Hungarian, however, when directly transferred to English, can easily sound like an exaggerated voice marker. A similar phenomenon has been observed in relation to linguistic abstracts (Doró, 2024). In this study, small changes from *in our study, we examine* to *in this study, we examine* may shift the degree of explicitness and create a more natural academic tone. In the case of reader-inclusive *we* and *our*, zero occurrences were observed in one of the international corpora and only four altogether in the other. The two phrases *we may conclude* and *we can say* in the Hungarian abstracts may, again, represent the language

transfer phenomenon that appears informal in English and might be better conveyed through passive constructions or omitted entirely. This is supported by the fact that the Hungarian corpus was subtracted from Hungarian articles that contained both Hungarian and English abstracts. In this case, it is assumed that a Hungarian abstract was written first and then a human or machine translation was made with possible human post-editing. By closely examining the original L1 abstracts and their English counterparts, researchers can identify patterns of translation strategies and linguistic, cultural, and disciplinary adaptations. Earlier research has supported the role of the lingua-cultural transfer of authorial presence, pointing to the tendency of L1 authors to blend their L1 and L2 English academic conventions (Dontcheva-Navratilova, 2023; Doró, 2024; Pahor et al., 2023; Vassileva, 1998), transfer their pragmatic competence (Chen, 2020) or cultural norms (Chen & Yang, 2024).

In terms of function, Hyland (2002) suggested a typology of four discourse functions for self-mentions in research articles that can be directly mapped onto abstracts: explaining an aim/purpose, discussing a procedure, elaborating an argument, and summarizing results/claims. Hyland explained that the first two show a lower degree of authorial exposure, while the latter two express stronger and more explicit authorial presence. The examples listed in the results section of the present study, however, indicate that the aims and procedures could be as strongly explicit as the discussion of the results. Robust argumentations or claims are rare in abstracts owing to space limitations, but all four functions in Hyland's typology appear in the three corpora. First-person pronouns are seen as the most powerful option for an explicit representation of the author's voice, stance and attitude (Biber et al., 1999; Li, 2021).

As Hungarian is an active-voice-dominant language, it was anticipated that the passive voice would appear less frequently in the Hungarian corpus than in the other two. Instead, impersonal constructions or adjectival forms (such as *látható*, *hallható*, "can be seen, heard") are used to express passive-like meanings. An alternative is to use agentless constructions or the active agents *we* when English uses a passive form. However, this was only partially confirmed in our data, as the usage of the passive was

similar to that of the international corpora, whereas active agents were more evident in the OH corpus.

The dominance of the noun *study* to replace explicit authorial presence was seen in all three corpora, with the Hungarian corpus showing a greater variety of alternative noun phrases compared to the others. Again, this can be interpreted as a literal translation from Hungarian nouns frequently employed to describe a study, reflecting the L2 author's voice. However, in academic writing training, it is important to call (future) authors' attention to similar small differences to make them aware that academic writing is not simply a matter of grammatical and lexical choices but that small changes may alter readers' perception of authorial voice and intentions. Research has shown that L2 authors, especially students, may consider voice markers as grammatical or lexical choices and concentrate on a few of these that have been stressed during writing instruction. One prominent example is the avoidance of the first-person singular and the use of passive voice and impersonal constructs (Fife, 2018; Rundblad, 2018; Vassileva, 1998).

During academic writing instruction, especially when field-specific, it is worth building a small corpus of the targeted genres, in this case abstracts, to show field-specific conventions alongside variations. It is even more beneficial if students observe the target texts and build their own mini-corpora to observe conventions and variability. This practice can be more educational and direct than working with writing course book material. This is something that authors, especially those publishing in an L2, implicitly do when drafting academic texts, especially targeted sections such as abstracts. Small differences between conference abstracts and journal abstracts also need to be observed, as the latter are shorter and contain more condensed information. As journal guidelines can vary greatly in their explicitness or formal requirements, students and novice scholars need to learn to carefully check these.

The three small experiments with AI writing assistance indicated various degrees of success when general prompts were provided. Some aspects of the texts resembled summaries, either in the form of running texts or bullet points, but did not fully capture

academic abstracts pertaining to the given manuscripts. ChatGPT also produced hallucinated results by offering unrelated abstracts. These observations are in line with what Kong and Liu (2024) noted, namely that ChatGPT struggles to replicate certain aspects of human writing in academic texts. ChatGPT-generated abstracts in their study also often failed to effectively describe background information, identify knowledge gaps, or describe the aims of the study. These aspects require human reasoning and background knowledge that AI does not have. Moreover, AI tends to overemphasize summaries of content and recommendations for future research, which are aspects that can be easily extracted from academic texts.

With the rapid advancement of AI tools, their use needs to be experimented with and discussed in academic writing classes, as well as in other English Medium Instruction (EMI) courses. Testing AI writing assistants, grammar checkers and citation tools may enhance students' academic writing, general language proficiency and research skills. In doing so, ethical considerations should be discussed to promote their critical thinking and academic integrity and to make them more aware of both the strengths and limitations of such tools. It should also be noted that large language-model-based applications generate different texts any time they are given the exact same prompt; therefore, for classroom use, it is advisable to save a few anchor examples to be analyzed with students before they generate their own versions. A comparison of these is also a valuable task.

While integrating AI tools into the curriculum, we need to keep in mind that students' level of AI literacy and their attitude towards and use of AI tools for study and research purposes may vary greatly. Wang et al. (2024) found that in a group of Chinese medical undergraduate students 26% admitted using ChatGPT. These students completed their assignments quicker, received better assessment and showed higher confidence, satisfaction, and positive attitude towards the future use of ChatGPT for writing tasks. Writing strategies connected to GAI-powered writing tools are also important. For example, doctoral students in Nguyen et al.'s (2024) study had better writing when actively interacting with tools compared to those who only performed linear writing

and used GAI as a source of information. In a recent Hungarian survey, Fajt and Schiller (2025) documented university students' general positive attitude towards ChatGPT use but also a concern about its potential misuse. Other studies have highlighted users' computer literacy level, comfort levels with technology in general, and perceived ease of use (Arthur et al., 2024; Gilmore et al., 2025) and academic pressure (Abbas et al., 2024; Kofinas et al., 2025) that influence their readiness to interact with AI as a learning or research tool.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This study offers an explanatory analysis of authorial voice markers used by Hungarian researchers who published their medical research in L1 containing abstracts in English. The findings indicate that Hungarian authors follow the conventions of English academic writing specific to their field, despite the potential influence of their first language. Additionally, even the two international corpora demonstrate differences in the markers of authorial voice. It has also been discussed how similar results can be applied in teaching academic writing and how AI writing tools handle straightforward abstract writing prompts.

It is undeniable that chatbots such as ChatGPT have great potential to assist L2 writers in overcoming language difficulties. By relying on their help, researchers can communicate their findings more quickly and effectively in English. In addition, they can use chatbots' personalized feedback to improve their writing style and gain new ideas about content. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the accuracy of AI's suggestions is limited; it invents a text based on other texts fed into it, and can hallucinate and generate incorrect or stylistically inappropriate texts. Therefore, it is always advisable to make human decisions when using ChatGPT for writing assistance. Based on the experiments carried out and the cited publications, it can be concluded that abstracts generated from English articles, although they may sometimes pass the human reader filter, cannot fully replace authorial judgements in producing an

informative abstract specific to the research and the journal in question. The AI-assisted content should always be carefully evaluated, reviewed and edited. Understanding ongoing intellectual property debates surrounding the use of GAI is also critical for students and researchers alike.

This study was limited in several respects. First, one specific L1 and three journals were targeted; therefore, the results cannot be generalized to other academic contexts and languages. International authors cover a wide range of language backgrounds, many of whom are also non-native speakers of English. Nevertheless, small-scale experiments such as this one can aid local researchers in understanding L1-specific tendencies and make them more aware of the importance of seemingly marginal linguistic decisions. Another limitation is that we did not have information on the abstract writing strategies of the authors, and the final texts may be beyond the authors' decision only. Major publishing companies offer language editing services or ask for a native speaker or a native-like proficient English user to confirm that proofreading has been done prior to submission or after the reviewers have requested so. Alternatively, the authors may use translation tools to write their English texts based on their L1 manuscripts. Similar proofreading services or translations significantly affect authorial voice. Third, only selected aspects of authorial voice markers were analyzed. Future research could expand to metadiscourse markers such as boosters and hedges, which are widely studied in other contexts. A closer look at the structural differences between human-authored and AI-generated abstracts could also help us to understand the extent to which GAI can be used for writing assistance.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, Muhammad, Jam, Farooq A., & Khan, Tariq I. (2024). Is it harmful or helpful? Examining the causes and consequences of generative AI usage among university students. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(10). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00444-7>
- Arthur, Francis, Salifu, Iddrisu, & Abam Nortey, Sharon (2024). Predictors of higher education students' behavioural intention and usage of ChatGPT: the moderating roles of age, gender and experience. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 33(2), 993–1019. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2024.2362805>
- Banks, David (2008). *The development of scientific writing: Linguistic features and historical context*. Equinox.
- Banks, David (2017). The extent to which the passive voice is used in the scientific journal article, 1985–2015. *Functional Linguistics* 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-017-0045-5>
- Bondi, Marina (2014). Changing Voices: Authorial Voice in Abstracts, In Marina Mondì & Rosa Lorés Sanz (eds.), *Abstracts in Academic Discourse: Variation and Change*, 243–269. <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-0351-0701-2/23>
- Bragazzi, Nicola L., & Garbarino, Sergio (2024). Toward clinical generative AI: Conceptual framework. *JMIR AI*, 3, e55957. <https://doi.org/10.2196/55957>
- British Medical Journal House Guide (2025). <https://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/house-style>. Access 30 April, 2025
- Buholayka, Maryam, Zouabi, Rama, & Tadinada, Aditya (2023). Is ChatGPT ready to write scientific case reports independently? A comparative evaluation between human and artificial intelligence. *Cureus*, 15(5). <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.39386>

- Butson, Russell, & Spronken-Smith, Rachel (2024). AI and its implications for research in higher education: A critical dialogue. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 43(3), 563–577. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2280200>
- Campbell, Madelaine (2019). Teaching academic writing in higher education. *Education Quarterly Reviews*. 2(3), 608–614. <https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1993.02.03.92>
- Casal, Elliot J., & Kessler, Matt (2023). Can linguists distinguish between ChatGPT/AI and human writing?: A study of research ethics and academic publishing. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 2(3), 100068. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2023.100068>
- Chen, Rong (2020). Single author self-reference: Identity construction and pragmatic competence. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 45, 100856. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100856>
- Chen, Rong, & Yang, Dafu (2024). Conventions of author self-reference in Chinese academic writing: Modesty as motivation. *Pragmatics and Society*, 15(3), 425–447. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.19065.che>
- Dontcheva-Navratilova, Olga (2023). Self-mention in L2 (Czech) learner academic discourse: Realisations, functions and distribution across master's theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 64, 101272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2023.101272>
- Doró, Katalin (2023). Retorikai szerkezet és igehasználát angol absztraktokban [Rhetorical structure and verb use in English abstracts]. *EduLingua*, 9(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.14232/edulingua.2023.1.1>
- Doró, Katalin (2024). Explicit and implicit authorial presence in parallel Hungarian and English linguistics abstracts: A corpus-based study. Presented at the Contemporary Crossroads Conference, Budapest, 14 June, 2024.
- Edo-Marzá, Nuria, & Beltrán-Palanques, Vicent (2023). The authors' voice in health sciences written and video abstracts: How do modes combine to interact

with audiences?, *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación* 93, 39–52.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/clac.85564>

Fajt, Balázs, & Schiller, Emese (2025). ChatGPT in Academia: University Students' Attitudes Towards the use of ChatGPT and Plagiarism. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09603-5>

Fife, Jane (2018). Can I Say 'I' in My Paper?: Teaching metadiscourse to develop international writers' authority and disciplinary expertise. *Across the Disciplines*, 15(1), 61–70. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2018.15.1.05>

Gao, Catherina A., Howard, Frederick M., Markov, Nikolay S., Dyer, Emma C., Ramesh, Siddhi, Luo, Yuan, & Pearson, Alexander T. (2023). Comparing scientific abstracts generated by ChatGPT to original abstracts using an artificial intelligence output detector, plagiarism detector, and blinded human reviewers. *npj Digital Medicine* 6, 75. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00819-6>

Gilmore, James N., Whims, Timothy, Blair, Browning W., Katarzynski, Ben, & Steffen, Lindsey (2025). Technology acceptance, moral panic, and perceived ease of use: Negotiating ChatGPT at research one universities. *Convergence*, Online first. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13548565251337576>

Hyland, Ken (2000a). *Disciplinary discourse: Social interactions in academic writing*. Longman.

Hyland, Ken (2000b). Hedges, boosters and lexical invisibility: Noticing modifiers in academic texts. *Language Awareness*, 9(4), 179–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410008667145>

Hyland, Ken (2002). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(8), 1091–1112. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00035-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00035-8)

Hyland, Ken (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. University of Michigan Press.

- Hyland, Ken (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365>
- Hyland, Ken. (2008). Genre and academic writing in the disciplines. *Language Teaching*, 41(4), 543-562. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444808005235>
- Hyland, Ken, & Jiang, F. K. (2017). Is academic writing becoming more informal?. *English for Specific Purposes*, 45, 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.09.001>
- Hyland, Ken, & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156–177. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.156>
- Hyland, Ken, Wang, Wenbin, & Jiang, Feng (Kevin). (2022). Metadiscourse across languages and genres: An overview. *Lingua*, 265, 103205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103205>
- Isik-Taş, Eda E. (2010). “In this paper I will discuss...”: Current trends in academic writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 121–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.022>
- Jiang, Feng (Kevin), & Hyland, Ken (2017). Metadiscursive nouns: Interaction and cohesion in abstract moves. *English for Specific Purposes* 46, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.11.001>
- Jin, Tan, Duan, Huiqiong, Lu, Xiaofei, Ni Jing, & Guo, Kai (2021). Do research articles with more readable abstracts receive higher online attention? Evidence from Science. *Scientometrics* 126, 8471–8490 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-04112-9>
- Kofinas, Alexander K., Tsay, Crystal Han-Huei, & Pike, David (2025). The impact of generative AI on academic integrity of authentic assessments within a higher education context. *British Journal of Educational Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13585>
- Kong, Xinwan, & Liu, Chengyu (2024). A comparative genre analysis of AI-generated and scholar-written abstracts for English review articles in international

- journals. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 71, 101432. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2024.101432>
- Leong, Alvin P. (2020). The passive voice in scientific writing through the ages: A diachronic study. *Text & Talk*, 40(4), 467–489.
- Li, Zhijun (2021). Authorial presence in research article abstracts: A diachronic investigation of the use of first person pronouns. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 51, 100977. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.100977>
- Liu, Kanglong, Yin, Hao, & Cheung, Andrew K. (2024). Interactional metadiscourse in translated and non-translated medical research article abstracts: a corpus-assisted study. *Perspectives*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2024.2328756>
- Lund, Brady D., Ting, Wang, Mannuru, Nishith R., Nie, Bing, Shimray, Somipam, & Wang, Ziang (2023). ChatGPT and a new academic reality: Artificial Intelligence-written research papers and the ethics of the large language models in scholarly publishing. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 74(5), 570–581. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24750>
- Macdonald, Calum, Adeloye, Davies, Sheikh, Aziz, & Rudan, Igor (2023). Can ChatGPT draft a research article? An example of population-level vaccine effectiveness analysis. *Journal of Global Health*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.7189/jogh.13.01003>
- Mhilli, Olga (2023). Authorial voice in writing: A literature review. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 8(1), 100550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100550>
- Millar, Neil, Budgell, Brian, & Fuller, Keith (2013). ‘Use the active voice whenever possible’: The impact of style guidelines in medical journals. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(4), 393–414. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams059>
- Nabata, Kylie J., AlShehri, Yasir, Mashat, Aabdullah & Wiseman, Sam M. (2025). Evaluating human ability to distinguish between ChatGPT-generated and original scientific abstracts. *Updates in Surgery*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13304-025-02106-3>

- Nascimento, Dafne P., Ostelo, Reymond W., van Tulder, Maurits W., Gonzalez, Gabriella Z., Araujo, Amanda C., Vanin, Adriane A., & Costa, Leonardo O. (2021). Do not make clinical decisions based on abstracts of healthcare research: A systematic review. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, *135*, 136-157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.03.030>
- Nguyen, Andi, Hong, Yvonne, Dang, Belle, & Huang, Xiaoshan (2024). Human-AI collaboration patterns in AI-assisted academic writing. *Studies in Higher Education*, *49*(5), 847–864. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2323593>
- O'Donohoe, Tom J., Dhillon, Rana, Bridson, Tahnee L., & Tee, Jin (2019). Reporting quality of systematic review abstracts published in leading neurosurgical journals: A research on research study. *Neurosurgery*, *85*(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/neuros/nyy615>
- Pahor, Tadej, Smodiš, Martina, & Peterlin, Agnes P. (2021). Reshaping authorial presence in translations of research article abstracts. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, *18*(1), 169–186. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.18.1.169-186>
- Pho, Phuong D. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: A study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies*, *10*(2), 231–250. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1461445607087010>
- Pressman, Sophia M., Garcia, John P., Borna, Sahar, Gomez-Cabello, Cesar A., Haider Syed A., Haider, Clifton, R., & Forte, Antonio J. (2025). Man versus machine: A comparative study of human and ChatGPT-generated abstracts in plastic surgery research. *Aesthetic Plastic Surgery*. Online ahead of print. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00266-025-04836-6>
- Rundblad, Gabriella (2007). Impersonal, general, and social: The use of metonymy versus passive voice in medical discourse. *Written Communication*, *24*(3), 250–277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088307302946>

- Rundblad, Gabriella (2008). We, ourselves and who else?: Differences in use of passive voice and metonymy for oneself versus other researchers in medical research articles. *English Text Construction*, 1(1), 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.1.1.04run>
- Santos, Joana V., & Da Silva, Paulo N. (2016). Issues with publishing abstracts in English: Challenges for Portuguese linguists' authorial voices. *Publications*, 4(2), 12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications4020012>
- Seoane, Elena (2006). Changing styles: On the recent evolution of scientific British and American English. In Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Dieter Kastovsky, & Nikolaus Ritt (eds.), *Syntax, style and grammatical norms: English from 1500–2000*, 191–211. Peter Lang.
- Seoane, Elena (2013). On the conventionalisation and loss of pragmatic function of the passive in late Modern English scientific discourse. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 14(1), 70–99. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.14.1.03seo>
- Seoane, Elena., & Hundt, Marianne (2018). Voice alternation and authorial presence: Variation across disciplinary areas in academic English. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 46(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0075424217740938>
- Shiely Frances, Gallaghe, Kerrie, & Millar, Sean R. (2024). How, and why, science and health researchers read scientific (IMRAD) papers. *PLoS ONE* 19(1), e0297034. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0297034>
- Sketch Engine. <http://www.sketchengine.eu>
- Swales, John M. (2005). Attended and unattended “this” in academic writing: A long and unfinished story. *ESP Malaysia*, 11, 1–15.
- Tai, Andy M. Y., Meyer, Maximilian, Varidel, Mathew, Prodan, Ante, Vogel, Marc, Iorfino, Frank, & Krausz, Reinhard M. (2023). Exploring the potential and limitations of ChatGPT for academic peer-reviewed writing: Addressing linguistic injustice and ethical concerns. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 17(1), T16-T30. Retrieved from <https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/903>

- Tardy, Christine M., & Matsuda, Paul K. (2009). The construction of author voice by editorial board members. *Written Communication*, 26(1), 32–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088308327269>
- Tverdokhlebova, Irina, & Makovskaya, Liliya (2022). Abstract writing: Challenges and suggestions for non-English researchers. *Humanising Language Teaching*, 24(4). <https://www.hltmag.co.uk/aug22/abstract-writing>
- Vassileva, Irena (1998). Who am I/who are we in academic writing? L: A contrastive analysis of authorial presence in English, German, French, Russian and Bulgarian. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 163–185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.1998.tb00128.x>
- Veszelszki, Ágnes (2018). Konkrétan az absztraktól [Concretely about abstracts]. *JEL-KÉP: Kommunikáció Közvélemény Média*, 2018(4), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.20520/jel-kep.2018.4.71>
- Wang, Jingyu, Liao, Yuxuan, Liu, Shaojun, Zhang, Decai, Wang, Na, Shu, Jiankun, & Wang, Rui (2024). The impact of using ChatGPT on academic writing among medical undergraduates. *Annals of Medicine*, 56(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/07853890.2024.2426760>

Received: 15 May 2025

Accepted: 09 July 2025