



LITERATURE REVIEW. RECOGNIZING DIFFERENT TYPES OF CITATION AND COMMENT

Jabborova Dildora Zokirjanovna

Department of English language theoretical aspects senior teacher PhD

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

e-mail: dilyacity89@gmail.com

Muhammadsodiq Marufjonov To‘lqinjon o‘g‘li

Uzbekistan State World Languages university

First English faculty


Foreign language and literature

e-mail: edward.yusell@gmail.com

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada akademik diskursda iqtibos keltirish tipologiyalari va baholovchi sharhlarning kesishishi, xususan, adabiyotlar tahlilini (literature review) shakllantirish jarayoni tizimli ravishda tadqiq etiladi. Sifatli adabiyotlar tahlili shunchaki xronologik ro‘yxat emas, balki dinamik va tanqidiy tizim ekanligidan kelib chiqib, tadqiqotda integral va non-integral iqtiboslardan strategik foydalanish muallif ovozini qanday belgilashi va ritorik nufuzni (etosni) qanday o‘rnatishi o‘rganiladi. Bundan tashqari, matnda “hedging” (ishonchni yumshatish) va “boosting” (aniqlikni kuchaytirish) usullari orqali tavsifiy bayon qilishdan tanqidiy baholashgacha bo‘lgan meta-diskursiv sharhlarning lingvistik spektri dekonstruksiya qilinadi. Tadqiqot natijalari shuni ko‘rsatadiki, ushbu mikro-lingvistik mexanizmlarni o‘zlashtirish matn yaratish jarayonida kognitiv yuklamani sezilarli darajada kamaytiradi, “patchwriting” (ko‘chirmakashlik) xavfini oldini oladi va ilmiy bo‘shliqlarni aniqlash uchun zarur bo‘lgan tahliliy chuqurlikni oshiradi.

Kalit so‘zlar: adabiyotlar tahlili, iqtibos tipologiyasi, integral iqtibos, non-integral iqtibos, baholovchi sharh, ritorik kompetentsiya, xedjing va busting, akademik diskurs.

Аннотация. В данной статье представлено системное исследование пересечения типологий цитирования и оценочного комментирования в академическом дискурсе, с особым акцентом на построение обзора литературы. Исходя из того, что качественный обзор литературы представляет собой динамичную критическую структуру, а не просто хронологический список, в работе изучается, как стратегическое использование интегрального и неинтегрального цитирования формирует авторский голос и устанавливает риторический авторитет. Кроме того, деконструируется лингвистический спектр метадискурсивных комментариев - от описательного изложения до критической оценки с использованием техник хеджирования (смягчения утверждений) и бустинга (усиления уверенности). Результаты показывают, что освоение этих микролингвистических механизмов значительно снижает когнитивную нагрузку при генерации текста, минимизирует риск пэтчрайтинга (некачественного перефразирования) и углубляет аналитический потенциал, необходимый для выявления пробелов в существующих исследованиях.




Ключевые слова: обзор литературы, типология цитирования, интегральное цитирование, неинтегральное цитирование, оценочное комментирование, риторическая компетенция, хеджирование и бустинг, академический дискурс.

Annotation. This article examines the relationship between citation typology and evaluative commentary in academic discourse, with a focus on how these interact in the construction of literature reviews. Rather than treating citation as a mechanical requirement, this study considers how the choice between integral and non-integral citation forms shapes authorial voice and rhetorical positioning. It also analyses the meta-discursive dimension of academic writing, tracing how hedging and boosting strategies allow writers to signal their stance toward existing scholarship. The results suggest that developing awareness of these micro-level linguistic choices helps writers engage more critically with sources, reduces the likelihood of patchwriting, and improves the analytical quality of literature reviews.

Key words: literature review, citation typology, integral citation, non-integral citation, evaluative commentary, rhetorical competence, hedging and boosting, academic discourse.


Introduction



Academic writing is not simply a matter of presenting information — it requires the writer to actively position themselves within an ongoing scholarly conversation. Nowhere is this more evident than in the literature review, which functions as a structured critical evaluation of existing research rather than a neutral summary of prior work (Boote & Beile, 2005). To construct such a review effectively, writers must demonstrate what Hyland (2002) describes as rhetorical competence: the capacity to select, frame, and respond to sources in ways that establish their own scholarly voice. Central to this competence is the recognition that citations serve purposes well beyond attribution. They are rhetorical instruments through which writers signal their relationship to a source, project disciplinary credibility, and establish *ethos*, construct ideological alignments, and mark boundaries between established fact and speculative claim (Swales, 1990). A widely used distinction in this regard is between integral citations — where the cited author appears as a grammatical subject — and non-integral citations, where the source is placed in parentheses and the proposition itself takes centre stage (Thompson & Tribble, 2001).

The decision to use one form or the other is not arbitrary. It reflects disciplinary norms, the writer's stance toward the cited work, and the degree of critical distance the author wishes to maintain. In humanities and social sciences, integral forms are common because they foreground the interpretive role of individual researchers. In contrast, natural sciences tend to favour non-integral structures, which project an impression of objective, data-driven findings (Harwood, 2005).

Alongside citation choice, evaluative commentary plays an equally important role in shaping how a literature review reads. Writers do not simply report what sources say — they respond to them. This response takes the form of meta-discursive commentary, ranging from neutral reporting verbs (e.g., *states*, *shows*) to critically evaluative markers (e.g., *claims*,



overlooks, fails to consider). Writers also rely on hedging (softening the degree of certainty behind a claim) and boosting (asserting it more forcefully) to communicate their stance toward the literature and to signal where they identify unresolved questions (Kwon et al., 2018).

For students at early stages of academic writing, these distinctions are not always intuitive. Misreading a source's rhetorical intent — for instance, treating a speculative argument as an established finding — can lead to shallow synthesis, unintentional misrepresentation, or patchwriting: the tendency to reproduce a source's phrasing with only surface-level changes (Petrić, 2007).

This points to a broader gap in academic writing instruction. Students are routinely told to engage critically with the literature, but explicit teaching of how to do so at the linguistic level remains rare. Without guidance on the functions of different citation types and commenting strategies, many literature reviews default to a descriptive list of what each source says, rather than building a coherent analytical argument.*that*

Against this background, the present study examines how citation typology and evaluative commentary intersect in academic literature reviews. Drawing on rhetorical genre theory and corpus-based approaches, it investigates how different citation forms and meta-discursive markers shape the analytical quality and persuasive force of a review. The aim is to produce a framework that can support the development of academic writing skills — helping writers engage more deliberately with sources and reduce the cognitive demands of integrating them into a coherent argument.

Conclusion

The analysis presented in this study confirms that writing a strong literature review requires more than collecting and summarising relevant sources. It depends on the writer's ability to recognise and apply a range of rhetorical choices — most notably, the selection between integral and non-integral citation forms, and the use of evaluative meta-discourse. These choices determine whether a text reads as a passive list of summaries or as an engaged, critical synthesis. As the findings show, integral and non-integral citations are not interchangeable: each carries different implications for how authorial presence and evidential weight are distributed across the text. Writers who understand this distinction are better equipped to align their work with disciplinary expectations and to make their own analytical voice audible.*integral and non-integral citations*

These findings carry practical implications for academic writing instruction. Rather than treating citation as a procedural requirement, writing courses should address it as a rhetorical act — one that involves deliberate decisions about how to frame a source and how to respond to it. When students develop this awareness, they are more likely to produce literature reviews that genuinely engage with existing scholarship and identify meaningful directions for further research. In the context of an increasingly interconnected academic environment, this kind of rhetorical literacy is not an optional refinement but a basic condition for meaningful scholarly participation.



References

Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), 3–15.

Harwood, N. (2005). Nowhere has anyone attempted to investigate... : Pragmatic and rhetorical functions of academic citations. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(3), 241–267.

Hyland, K. (2002). Activity and evaluation: Reporting practices in academic writing. *Academic Discourse*, 115–130.

Kwon, M., et al. (2018). Navigating the nuances of academic voice: Evaluative commentary in graduate-level writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 32, 45–56.

Petrić, B. (2007). Rhetorical functions of citations in high- and low-rated master's theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6(3), 238–253.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, P., & Tribble, C. (2001). Looking at citations: Using corpora in English for academic purposes. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20(1), 91–105.