**NGUYEN THI TUYET MAI**

# SUMMARY OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

# MEDICAL CASE REPORTS IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE: A GENRE – BASED ANALYSIS

**MAJOR: ENGLISH LINGUISTICS**
**CODE: 9220201.01**

HANOI – 2018

**The dissertation has been completed at the Faculty of Postgraduate studies – University of Languages and International Studies,**
**Vietnam National University, Hanoi**


**SUPERVISORS**
**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Le Hung Tien**


**EXAMINATION BOARD**

Examiner 1:…………………………………………

Examiner 2: …………………………………………..

Examiner 3:…………………………………………

This doctoral dissertation will be defended at the VNU-level Board of Examiners at

………………………………………………………………………......

……………………………………………at………on………………

This doctoral dissertation can be found at:

- National Library of Vietnam
- Library and Information Centre, Vietnam National University, Hanoi

# ABSTRACT

The current study uses Swales' (1990) framework of move analysis to analyze English and Vietnamese medical case reports (MCRs) encompassing *Abstract, Introduction, Case presentation* and *Discussion* sections. The study is carried out with two main aims: (i) to explore how the moves and lexical signals of the moves work in English and Vietnamese MCRs and (ii) to compare these moves to establish the similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese MCRs. The moves are analyzed in terms of frequency, length and steps while the lexical signals are analyzed concerning the lexical items and reporting verbs (RVs). The RVs are examined based on Hyland's (2002) classification. The reasons for the similarities and differences of the identified items between the two corpora are explained using the contrastive rhetoric framework. The study is designed as a descriptive, qualitative, quantitative and comparative study.

The results obtained from the analysis of 80 MCRs in each language published within 2010 and 2015 lend weight to the following general conclusions: First, the genre of the MCRs in is made up of twelve conventional moves with 21 steps. Second, the Vietnamese MCRs are longer because of the amount of the information presented in the reports. Third, the lexical items used in the Vietnamese MCRs are clearer and more concise but not as diversified as those in the English MCRs due to a repetitive use of the same expressions in the reports. Finally, more reporting verbs are used in the English MCRs because teaching critical thinking in Vietnamese schools and universities has not as emphasized as in English settings.

The study acknowledges some limitations such as a conclusion section as well as the order of the moves is still neglected. In addition, there is a lack of the MCRs written in English by Vietnamese authors. Despite these limitations, the study is hoped to provide some pedagogical implications for teaching writing in Vietnamese settings to encourage student to be aware of the moves when writing a MCR.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Pages**

## CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Rationale for the study

Medical case reports (MCRs) serve as "primers" leading to discoveries of new diseases or disease pathophysiology as well as development of new preventive and therapeutic measures.

In Vietnam, the limited amount of research about MCRs has lead to a limited understanding in describing this structured writing that prevents medical staff frompublishing their research into international journals.In the world, much research on medical language has been reported.Nevertheless, so far, no reported research has been devoted to the contrastive analysis aboutthe genre of MCRs in English and Vietnamese. The issue thus has been an uncultivated land within Vietnamese applied linguistics.

To fulfill the gap, the author of this paper, thus, desires to carry out a study titled *"Medical Case Reports in English and Vietnamese: a Genre-based Analysis"*. In the light of Swale's genre analysis (1990 & 2004), I developed genre analysis by using **moves** to identify rhetorical patterns in English and Vietnamese MCRs.

## 1.2. Scope of the study

This study investigates the complete MCRs with four main sections including *Abstract, Introduction, Case presentation* and *Discussion*. The *Conclusion* section is not put under investigation because it is optional (Helán, 2011 and Adel, 2015).The moves are analyzed in terms oftheir frequency, length and steps while the lexical signals are analyzedconcerning the lexical items and reporting verbs.

## 1.3. Aims, objectives and research questions

*1. How do the moves work in English and Vietnamese medical case reports?*

> 1.1. *What are the frequency and length of the moves in English and Vietnamese medical case reports?*
>
> 1.2. *How do the steps of the moves operate in English and Vietnamese medical case reports?*
>
> 1.3. *How do the lexical signals of the moves operate in English and Vietnamese medical case reports?*

> 2. *What are the similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese medical case reports regarding the identified items?*

## 1.4. Research methods

The study is designed as a Mixed Method Research Design. The quantitative data reveals different frequencies of moves and lexical signals used in MCRs while the closer qualitative analysis of discourse data shows how the moves and lexical signals are used by English and Vietnamese writers to achieve the goals.

## 1.5. Significance of the study

The studyhelps the lecturers develop pedagogical strategies for writing course with the evidence of cross-linguistic influence and differences in discourse. More importantly, it makes contribution to promoting and popularizing the medical achievements of training, scientific research and treatment of Vietnamese medicine.

## 1.6. Research data

This study uses two specific corpora:MCRs written in English containing 132,473 tokens and MCRs written in Vietnamese language consisting of 141,167 tokens. Each corpus contains 80 texts published

within 2010 and 2015. The criteria for collecting the data follow principles suggested by Nwogu (1997: 121) including *Reputation Representativity and Accessibility.*

## 1.7. Structure of the thesis

This study includessix chapters. After CHAPTER I - Introduction, the research is continued with the following chapters:CHAPTER II – Literature Review, CHAPTER III- Methodology, CHAPTER IV– Deployment of moves in English and Vietnamese MCRs, CHAPTER V – Similarities and differences between move deployment in English and Vietnamese MCRs and finally, CHAPTER VI -Conclusions of the study are drawn.

## CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

## 2.1. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The following key terms are asserted clearly: genre, move, medical case report and reporting verb. Particularly, the definition of "*genre*" by John Swales (1990) and"*move*" by Nwogu (1997) are used in the current study. In addition, the term "*medical case report*" can be understood as a medical recount of a rare pathological condition in a single patient and a "*reporting verb*" is known as one of the explicit ways for writers to establish the credibility of the reported claims and can be used to report the speech of others.

## 2.2. APPROACHES TO GENRE ANALYSIS

## 2.2.1. The Systemic Functional Sydney School approach to genre

The Systemic Functional Sydney School approach to genre (known as Systemic-Functional Linguistics approach) was founded by a British-born scholar M. A. K. Halliday with the focus on the relationship between language and its functions in society. Instead of viewing texts in relation to communities like Swales (1990, 2004), the SFL approach analyzed three meta-functions of meaning-making known as the ideational, interpersonal, and textual.

## 2.2.2. North American New Rhetoric tradition approach to genre

The principle for this approach is originated from the essay "*Genre as Social Action*" by (Mille & Miller, 1994) who examines genre as typified social action, as ways of acting based on recurrent social

situations. Although this new approach to genre constitutes a particularly powerful and promising approach to writing as social process, some linguists have been concerned about the pedagogical implications that this approach may bring to education.

### 2.2.3. The ESP Approach to Genre

In ESP genre analysis, "move" and "step" are the central recognition that has been given different meanings. Moves served the function and purpose of a segment of text at a more general level and step provided a more detailed rhetorical means of realizing the function of a move.The ESP approach is associated predominantly with the names of Swales (1990) with three central terms: *discourse community, genre and language learning task.*According to him, there were two different types of community:

### 2.3. MEDICAL CASE REPORTS AS A GENRE

The layout (superstructure) of a medical case report may differ widely according to policies of Journals. According to Rison (2013), individual sections of an actual case report in a sequence that matches the requirements of the journals with the following sections: Abstract Introduction (background) Case presentation Discussion Conclusion. This study bases on general format of MCRs suggested by Rison, but the discussion section is not put under investigation based on the view of Helán (2012) and Adel &Moghadam (2015) who claims conclusion section can be considered as optional.

### 2.4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS OF THE STUDY

### 2.4.1. Theoretical framework for move analysis:

The current study uses another aspect of the Swales's framework (1990) to analyze this kind of genre known as move analysis. Swales' move analysis not only looked at the moves through steps but also studied the lexical signals of moves.

### 2.4.2. Theoretical framework for reporting verb analysis

The verbs are tallied, recorded, and then classified based on Hyland (2002) classification since this framework provides the comprehensive categories of RVs in terms of their activity and evaluation. Hyland (2002) classified RVs into three categories,

including Research Acts, Cognition Acts and Discourse Acts. Each process type of the RV is divided into evaluation categories.

### 2.4.3. Contrastive rhetoric framework

The current study is constructed around the comparative paradigm of discourse analysis of the MCRs in English and Vietnamese. The terminology used to indicate the relationship between the related texts is the notion of "*comparative corpora*" to find out differences between the two languages texts in terms of frequency of occurrence, length, steps, lexical items and reporting verbs. The reasons for the similarities and differences between the two languages are explained from cultural point of view using the contrastive rhetoric framework.

## CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

### 3.1. THE DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA

### 3.1.1. The description of the chosen MCRs

This study uses two specific corpora:MCRs written in English and MCRs written in Vietnamese language. The former contains 132,473 tokens while the later consists of 141,167 tokens. Each corpus contains 80 texts

### 3.1.2. The description of sources

The sources of the corpora in this case mean the institutions or agencies publishing the MCRs considered in this study. There are five main sources, one of which is the journal in English and four sources are from the journals in Vietnam.

### 3.1.3. Criteria for collecting the data

The data collection process in this study follows principles suggested by Nwogu (1997: 121) including: (i) **Reputation (**the esteem, which members of an assumed readership hold for a particular publication or group of publication), (ii)**Representativity** (authentic discourse of that professional community) and (iii)**Accessibility (**the ease with which samples can be obtained).

### 3.2. DATA ANALYTICAL TOOLS

This study proposes a genre-based analysis. For most analyses, the corpus investigation package WordSmith Tools 7 (Scott, 2007).**Wordlist** is used to calculate the number of tokens and sentences

occurring in the texts while a **concord tool** is used to make a concordance, to calculate the frequency of lemmata and to interact reviewing collocates and co-text.

## 3.3. DATA ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The modified model of move analysis for MCRs applied in this study is the combination of Nwogu (1997), Hyland (2000), and Méndez-Cendón's (2009) models to match with the macro-structure of the MCRs that contains fifteen distinct moves based on the particular section of a MCR including Abstract, Introduction, Case presentation and Discussion.

## 3.4.THE ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

### 3.4.1. Move analysis

- Step 1: The analysis of *length, frequency* and *steps* of the movesare identified and described based on the modified analytical model (combination of Hyland, Nwogu and Mendez-Cedon).
- Step 2: The analysis of lexical signals concerning the *lexical items* and *reporting verbs*

### 3.4.2. Comparison between English and Vietnamese MCRs

The identified items are compared to find out the similarities and differences. English is considered as the base language and Vietnamese as a comparative language. The reasons for the similarities and differences between the English and Vietnamese MCRs are discussed based on contrastive rhetoric.

## CHAPTER IV.DEPLOYMENT OF MOVES IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE MCRs

## 4.1. DEPLOYMENT OF MOVES IN ENGLISH MCRs

### 4.1.1. Deployment of moves in English MCR abstracts

#### *4.1.1.1. The study on moves*

**(a)The frequency:** 80 MCRs English texts (100%) includetheir abstracts. M1 approximately doubles that of M4 and is about 20% more than that of M2, M3 and M5, 87.5% compared with 47.5%, 68.75%, 67.5% and 65%, respectively.

**(b) The length :**M1 and M3 are the longest with 3.738 and 3.787tokens (29.05% and 29.40%), respectively. In contrast, M2 isthe shortest with

1.682 tokens written in 62 sentences (10.08%). M4 is about 17% lower than that of M1 and M3, 12.92% compared to 29.05% and 29.40%, respectively. The last move (M5) has 1.998 tokens

**(c) The move steps:** M1occures in three fourths of the English abstracts with the emphasis on steps 1, 2 and 4. M2 is presentedwith the purposive form ("*the aim*" or "*the goal*").The presentation of M3 is predominant with steps 1-2 or 2-3. The discourse function of M4 in English MCR abstracts isabout the treatment results and sometimes the arguments about the results. M5is seen in seventeen instances(32.69%).

### 4.1.1.2. The study on the lexical signals

**(a) The lexical items**

- M1: "*is the most common*", "*is the leading cause*", "*is one of the common complications*" to argue topic prominence and *"..... are rare/uncommon", "only a few cases have been reported", etc.*
- M2: *"We present a case…", "We report a case ...", "We review (a) rare case/cases ...",etc.*
- M3: "*A ...-year-old male/female/man/woman/ patient presented with*", "*a patient was admitted to the hospital/clinic/emergency room for ...*", "*... findings/examinations showed, etc.*
- M4:*"after treatment, the patient ...", "At/during her/his + time follow up, the patient ..."* in their abstracts.
- M5:*"This is the first/second case of ...", "Only a few cases have been reported in ...",etc.*

**(b) Reporting verbs**

The reporting verbs reflect mainly two acts: *Research Acts and Discourse Acts.* Research Acts factive verbs allow writers to acknowledge their acceptance of the author's results. The Discourse Acts verbs are seen in many instances to either take responsibility for the writers' interpretation of the information by conveying their uncertainty or assurance of the correctness of the claims reported or attribute a qualification to the author to report the authors' position neutrally.

### 4.1.2. Deployment of moves in English MCR introductions
### 4.1.2.1. The study on the moves

**(a) The frequency:** The occurrence of M6 is approximately double that of M7 and about 10% more than that of M8, 97.5% compared with 53.75% and 82.5%, respectively.

**(b)The length:** M6 is observed as the longest moves in the English introductions with 6.758 (47.22%) written in 333 sentences. M7 is over twice longer than that of M8 regarding their average number of tokens, 5493 compared to 2059 accounted for 38.39% and 14.39%, respectively. M8 is the shortest one in this section with 2059 (14.39%).

**(c) The move steps:** Almost all the English M6 contain both steps with 70 instances (89.74%). Only twenty-oneM7 instances are found with the two steps (48.83%). More than a half of M8 instances contain a single step 1 with thirty-four instances (51.51%).

*4.1.2.2. The study on the lexical signals*

**(a) The lexical items**

- **M6:** To give the background knowledge of the research, the lexical items such as "*... is one of the most ancient diseases"*, *"is a common cause of ...",etc.* are predominant. Meanwhile, the lexical items such as *"... is rare", ".... is an uncommon", ".... is rarely seen",* are seen to express the rarity of the case.
- **M7:**"*literature indicates...*" "*Most literature suggests that ...*" " *... reported/ described/ presented* " were used to present step 1 while "*no case report exists ....",* are used to write step 2.
- **M8:***"We report an unusual presentation of ...", "wereportthecaseof ...",etc.*

**(b) Reporting verbs**

Only two categories (*Discourse and Research Acts*) are presented in English introductions. More Discourse Acts verbs are used than the Research Acts verbs.English writers either take responsibility for their interpretation of the information by conveying their uncertainty or assurance of the correctness of the claims reported or attribute a qualification to the author.

**4.1.3. Deployment of moves in English MCR case presentations**

*4.1.3.1. The study on the moves*

**(a) The frequency**

M9 is approximately the same as that of M12, 100% compared with 97.5%, respectively. 60 instances are found to present M10 (75%). M11 is scattered in 70 English MCRs. The proportion is about 12% higher than that of M10, but is nearly 13% lower than that of M9, 87.5% compared to 75% and 100%, respectively.

**(b) The length**
- M9: Out of 35.813 tokens, the average proportion of this item in this move is 21.47%.
- M10 is the shortest move among the others in the section with 4.175 tokens (11.66%).
- M11: The runner-up longest move with  10.897 tokens (30.43%) presented in 236 sentences
- M12 is the longest one among the others in the section with 13.051 tokens (36.44%)

**(c) The move steps**
- M9: Four fifths (82.5%) of the articles include etwo steps while 17.5% of the presentation is for step 1
- M10:The information is varied depending on a specific case or the kind of disease the patient is having.
- M11: 42 instances (60%)are with the two steps andanother 40% include either a single step 1/step 2.
- M12: 56 instances (71.79%) include both steps. 18 examples (23.08%) are with a single step 2.

### 4.1.3.2. The study on the lexical signals
**(a) The lexical items**
- M9: "*a ...-year-old male/female/patient was admitted with/for + symptoms*"
- M10: "*On physical/general examination, (the patient) showed ...*",etc.
- M11: "*laboratory tests revealed ...*", "*Blood investigation revealed ...*",etc.
- M12: "*the patient was treated with ...*", "*The patient underwent ...*" *for* describing the treatments. For writing the diagnosis of the disease, the lexical items such as "*The patient was diagnosed as ...*", "*A diagnosis of ... was made/established*"are presented.

**(b) Reporting verbs**
The proportion of the RVs belonging to *Research Acts* is overwhelmed over the section with 455 times of use (89.22%). The

factive verbs have the advantage over the non-factive ones to show the writers' acceptance of the authors' results or conclusions. In *Discourse Acts*category, Insurance verbs are preferred. The Counter RVs are totally ignored in the section by the English writers to portray the authors' judgments as false or incorrect.

### 4.1.4. Deployment of moves in English MCR Discussions

*4.1.4.1. The study on the moves*

**(a) The frequency and length**

The two first moves have the same frequency of occurrence in English MCR discussion section, 77 out of 80 instances accounted for 96.25%. Meanwhile, M15 is made up nearly one thirds that of the previous moves, 37.50% compared to 96.25%, respectively. In terms of the length, the average number of tokens of M13 is nearly double that of M15, 4847 tokens compared to 2301 ones(11.28% and 5.36%, respectively). M14 can be considered as the longest one among the others with 35.813 tokens (83.36%).

**(b) The move steps**

- M13**:** eighteen instances (23.38%) are written to talk about the main findings and the supplemental findings. Meanwhile, 53 instances (68.83%) are presented for describing only the main findings.
- M14 mainly focuses on the two steps.
- M15: 28 instances (90.32%) are written with a single step 1.

*4.1.4.2. The study on the lexical signals*

**(a) The lexical items**

- M13: "*name of the rare disease + was/were/has been/reported/, etc.*
- M14:"*In our case/in our patient(s), (a disease) + was described/recognized*", etc.
- M15: "*in conclusion/ in summary*", "*We believe that ....*", "*The doctors must/ should be aware of ....*"

**(b) Reporting verbs**

Discourse Acts verbs have the highest percentage of occurrence (61.43%). Among which, Assurance verbs are written non-factively to report the authors' position neutrally and the Doubt verbs are used with tentative attitude toward the reported information. Research Actsversb are seen most in M14 and the writers are more familiar with the non-

factive verbs than factive sub-categoryto report the research procedures neutrally without evaluation on procedural aspects of the author's investigation.Cognition Acts verbs hold the least proportion to show positive attitude towards the reported information as a way of accepting the information as correct.

## 4.2. DEPLOYMENT OF THE MOVES IN VIETNAMESE MCRs
### 4.2.1. Deployment of the moves in Vietnamese MCR abstracts
#### 4.2.1.1. The study on the moves
**(a) The frequency**

M1 is scattered in 45 texts (56.25%). M2 is observed in fifty-one abstracts (63.75%). The proportion of M3 is nearly 14% more than that of M4 and nearly doubles that of M5.

**(b) The length**

M3 is the longest move with 5.030 (37.08%). M1 in Vietnamese MCR is the follow-up longest move with 3.085 (22.74%) presented in 113 sentences (23.74%). M2 contain 1962 tokens (14.46%). The percentage of M4 is nearly the same as those of M2 with 1903 tokens (14.03%). M5 can be considered as the shortest move.

**(c) The move steps**
- M1: Seven abstracts include three steps.
- M2: Almost all Vietnamese writers use the second form stated by Al-Khasawneh (2017) to present M2
- M3: 57.14% contain two steps.
- M4: The number of instances containing both the results and arguments is observed in 10 abstracts (22.22%) while the rest of the abstracts concentrating on the results occur in 35 abstracts (77.78%).
- M5: Nine instances (17.31 %)are found with step 1 and 3. Meanwhile, the single step 1, 2 or 3 is found in two, six and fourteen abstracts accounted for 3.85%, 11.54% and 26.92%, respectively.

#### 4.2.1.2. The lexical signals
**(a) The lexical items**
- M1: "… *làcănbệnhphổbiến/thườnggặp*", " …… *ítđượcđềcậpđếntrong y văn", etc.*
- M2: "*mụctiêu*" *(aim/purpose)*

- M3: "*Chúng tôi báo cáo một ca bệnh nam/nữ được chẩn đoán*", "*Chúng tôi giới thiệu ...*", *etc.*
- M4: "*Bệnh tiến triển ... ngày sau đó*", "*Sau mổ .....*", "*Sau .... Ngày điều trị ....*". The phrase "**Kếtquả**:" in bold with colon as a subtitle to emphasize the results is used.
- M5:The phrase "**Kếtluận**" *(in conclusion)* is used.

**(b) Reporting verbs**

    *Research Acts and Discourse Acts* verbs are used most. In Research Acts, the verbs are used both factively and non-factively to show that they accepted or agreed with what the authors' reporting. The writer portrays the speaker as presenting true information or a correct opinion. In the Discourse Acts, all these verbs are introduced for assurance non-factively with both active voice and passive voice.

**4.2.2. Deployment of moves in Vietnamese MCR introductions**

*4.2.2.1. The study on the moves*

**(a) The frequency**

    M6 scatter in seventy-five texts (93.75%). M7 is the least frequent move with forty-one instances (51.25%). The percentage of M8 is nearly 20% more than that of M7, but nearly the same percentage is lower than that of M6, 75% compared to 51.25% and 93.25%, respectively.

**(b) The length**

    M6 is the longest with 7.444 tokens (50.53%)presented in 181 sentences. M7 is the follow-up longest move with 5.027 (34.12%) that are presented in 197 sentences. M8 is the shortest with 2.261 tokens (15.35%).

**(c) The move steps**

- M6: Almost all the M6 include two suggested steps with sixty-nine instances (89.61%). A single step 1 or step 2 is seen only in eight instances (10.39%).
- M7: 25 instances contain both steps (60.98%) while the rest of the instances have a single step 1 (39.02%)
- M8: A single step 1 is used in thirty-two moves (53.33%), two steps areused in twelve instances (20%) and combining two steps together in one sentence is observed in fourteen instances (23.33%).

### 4.2.2.2. The study on the lexical signals

**(a) The lexical items**

- M6:*".... Là bệnh thường gặp, tuy nhiên ...", "... là bệnh lý phổ biến, tuy nhiên…"."…. Là một bệnh hiếm gặp", "Đây là một loại bệnh lý rất/khá hiếm gặp", etc.*

- M7: *"Năm ...., ..... phát hiện ...", ".... được mô tả/ miêu tả/ghi nhận/nghiên cứu/báo cáo/", etc.*

- M8: *"Chúng tôi thong báo/ báo cáo/ giới thiệu/ mô tả/ miêu tả/ ghi nhận/", etc.*

**(b) Reporting verbs**

Overall, RVs written in this Vietnamese section occur in only two categories: *Research Acts* and *Discourse Acts*. Research Acts verbs used non-factivelyaremuch more popular than factively. Discourse Acts verbs are seen in only Insurance sub-category with non-factive meaning.

### 4.2.3. Deployment of moves in Vietnamese MCR case presentations

### 4.2.3.1. The study on the moves

**(a) The frequency**

M9 is the most frequent.M10 has the least frequency of occurrence. M11 hasnearly the same proportion as that of M12, 96.25% compared to 93.75%, respectively.

**(b) The length**

- M9 includes 16.667 tokens written in 756 sentences (30.17%).

- M10 is the shortest move with 5328 tokens (7.26%) presented in 227 sentences.

- M11 has 13.436 tokens accounted for 19.22%.

- M12: The average number of tokens in this move is nearly double that of M9, 34.476 (49.32%) compared to 16.667 (23.84%), respectively.

**(c) The move steps**

- M9: About two thirds of the papers are introduced with both steps (72.5%). In addition, some writers contain a single step 1 in this move. The evidence is seen in 20 articles (25%).

- M10: Focuses on describing the problems of the parts of the body with a disease.

- M11: More than two thirds of the papers include two steps (70.6%):
10 instances present step 2 before step 1, 11 instances include a single
step 1 and the rest contain a single step 2.
- M12: 43 papers include two steps (55.84%) while those with a single
step 2 occur in 34 reports(44.16%) focusing more on the treatment
procedures they apply to the patients.

### 4.2.3.2. The study on the lexical signals

### (a) The lexical items

- M9: "*Lý do vào viện*" (reasons for being admitted to hospital); "*Tiền
sử*" or "*Bệnh sử/Tiền căn*" (medical history) to express the medical
history of the patient are described.
- M10. "*Khám khi vào viện (thấy): …*", "*Vào viện: …*", "*Khám toàn
trạng (ghi nhận/phát hiện): …*"
- M11:"*Chụp dạ dày:*", "*Chụp MRI:*", "*CT scan:*"or "*Siêu
âm:*","*Xét nghiệm:*"
- M12:"*Chẩn đoán*","*Điều trị*"

### (b) Reporting verbs

*Research Acts* category is mostly predominant over the three sub-
categories: factive, non-factive and counter-factive. The use of RVs in
non-factive subcategory is more popular to portray the authors'
judgments as false or incorrect.The Discourse Actsverb is used non-
factively to report the author's position neutrally.

### 4.2.4. Deployment of moves in Vietnamese MCR Discussions

### 4.2.4.1. The study on the moves

### (a) The frequency and length

- M14 is the most frequent with 78 articles (97.50%). In contrast, M15
is seen in only 12 articles (15%).
- The average number of tokens of M13 is nearly one sevenths that of
M14, 14.949 tokens compared to 49.291 ones (20.61% and 70.94%),
respectively. M14 isthe longest with 49.291 tokens (70.94%)
presented in 1.607 sentences. In contrast, M15 is the shortest with
5.872 tokens written in 178 sentences.

**(b) The move steps**

- M13: 54 out of 74 articles (72.97%) givesthe main findings while those with the second findings occur in 13 instances (17.56%), and the rest is for presenting both main and second findings.
- M14: 34 articles (43.04%) contain three steps, 25 papers (31.63%) use both steps. The use of step 4 is obeyed in every paper; both step 1 and step 2 areused in more than a half of the papers. That is why when writing a MCR, step 1, step 2 and step 4 should be presented.
- M15: M15 is observed in only 12 articles: three papers are presented with both steps while a single step 1 is seen in the rest of the articles.

### 4.2.4.2. The study on the lexical signals

**(a) The lexical items**

- M13: *".... Là bệnh/ bệnh lý rất hiếm gặp." "..... tương đối hiếm gặp""... là trường hợp đầu tiên ..."*
- M14: To present step 1 and step 2, the lexical signals are seen as "*Qua trường hợp trên/vừa trình bày, chúng tôi thấy rằng ...*", "*Ca bệnh này cho thấy ...*",etc. Meanwhile, when presenting step 4, Vietnamese writers used the signals like: "*Y văn ghi nhận ...*", "*Báo cáo của ... cho thấy ...*", etc.
- M15: No lexical items are found in M15

**(b) Reporting verbs**

Research Acts RVs are used more than Discourse Acts while Cognition Acts verbs are not seen.Research Acts verbs hold the most frequency of occurrence with 449 times of use (83.77%): non-factiveverbs are seen329 times (61.38%) followed by factive verbs with 116 times. Compared to the Research Acts category, the frequency of occurrence of Discourse Acts verbs is far lower.

### 4.3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- M1, M2, M3, M5, M6, M8, M9, M10, M11, M12, M13 and M14 can be considered as the conventional moves since they occur in more than 60% of the papers in both English and Vietnamese.
- RVs are used in both Research Acts (aiming at indicating tested activities performed in the real worls) and Discourse Acts categories (granting the writers the ability to take responsibility for how the

16

information is understood by expressing their tentativeness about the reliability of the conclusions from the report).

## CHAPTER V. SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MOVE DEPLOYMENT
## IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE MCRs

## 5.1. COMPARISONS OF MOVE DEPLOYMENT BETWEEN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE MCRs
### 5.1.1. Comparisons of move deployment between English and Vietnamese MCR abstracts
#### 5.1.1.1. The moves
**(a) The frequency**
- **Similarities:**M2 and M3 have nearly the same frequency of occurrence. Both English and Vietnamese authors do not follow the conventional structure of the abstracts.
- **Differences**: English authors tend to write more moves in the section (M1, M2 &M5)

**(b) The length**
- English M1 is longer than that of the Vietnamese M1, 3.738 tokens compared to 3.085, respectively.
- Vietnamese abstract M2 is longer than the English M2.
- M3 is calculated as the longest move in the both corpora. However, the length of the Vietnamese M3 is much longer than that of English M3.
- English M4 abstracts is longer than the Vietnamese M4.

**(c) The move steps**
- M1: Almost all the English MCRs contain three steps (1, 2 and 4) while in Vietnamese corpus, twenty-nine M1 include at least two steps (1 - 2 and 2 - 4).
- M2:Almost all the writers both in English and Vietnamese sources send the messages in which the purposes of the study with some expressions like "the aim" or "the goal" are given.
- M3:Almost all the writers in both English and Vietnamese use two steps to present M3. Among which, Vietnamese writers prefer using step 1-3 while English writers use steps 2 – 3 more.

- Move 4: Almost all the writers in both languages focus on describing the treatment results without arguments. In addition, to emphasize the results after treatment, Vietnamese writers prefer including the phrase "**Kếtquả:**" in bold with a colon while that in the English writers is rarely seen.
- M5: The structure of M5 of English and Vietnamese MCRs can be the combination of step 1 and step 2 and even the presentation of a single step 1 or 2 is acceptable.

### 5.1.1.2. The lexical signals

**(a) The lexical items**

- M1:To make topic generation they use the superlative form of the adjective "*common*" while the adjective "*rare*" is frequently used when they want to fulfill the gap in the field.
- M2: While English writers give the tacit message to identify the purpose, Vietnamese ones state the aims of their study directly by putting the word "*mục tiêu*" (*aim/purpose*) in bold at the beginning of the move.
- M3: Although '*admit for*' or "*present with*" in English or "*vào viện do …*" in Vietnamese with equivalent meaning are very typical, many other lexical items are reused in the Vietnamese abstracts.
- M4: "*after*" in English or "*Sau khi*" in Vietnamese is mainly used to show the treatment results. However, Vietnamese abstracts experience the word "**kết quả**" in bold many times.
- M5: The concise way is also deployed in the last move (Conclusion) in the Vietnamese set with the use of the bold word "*Kết luận*" (*in conclusion*).

**(b) Reporting verbs**

**- <u>Similarities:</u>** Both English and Vietnamese writers give priority to the use of non-factiveRVs in Discourse Acts category. (the RVs are used to report the authors position neutrally). Both English and Vietnamese use the verbs with equivalent meanings such as *the most common (phổ biến nhất), rare* (*hiếm gặp*), etc.

**- <u>Differences:</u>** English abstracts witness more types of RVs than Vietnamese abstracts, more RVs are seen in English abstracts (19 compared to 12, respectively)

***5.1.1.3. Concluding remarks:*** The way to interpret the information in the moves by Vietnamese writers is more concise and clearer than that of English ones. English abstracts experience more types of RVs than Vietnamese abstracts.

## 5.1.2. Comparisons of move deployment between English and Vietnamese MCRs introductions

### *5.1.2.1. The study on the moves*

**(a) The frequency**

- **<u>Similarities</u>:** M6 is the most frequent followed by M8. M7 occures the least in both corpora
- **<u>Differences</u>**: No significant differences between the two sources regarding their frequency of occurrence

**(b) The length**

- **<u>Similarities</u>:** M6 is the longest while M8 is the shortest
- **<u>Differences</u>**: Vietnamese MCR introductions are a bit longer than English MCR introductions. However, English writers tend to use more sentences.

**(c) The move steps**

- **<u>Similarities</u>:** Almost all English & Vietnamese M6 are seen with two steps. Both English & Vietnamese M7 do not present both steps. Both English and Vietnamese M8 present a single step 1.
- **<u>Differences</u>:** M7: English writers present either single step 1 or step 2 while Vietnamese introduce only a step 1. M8: Sometimes English writers merge step 1 with step 2, while Vietnamese writers do not.

### *5.1.2.2. The lexical signals*

**(a) The lexical items**

- **<u>Similarities:</u>**
    + M6: Goes from popularity of a specific case in general to a unique and rare aspect of the case: "*The most common/ relatively frequent (thường gặp/phổ biến)……. uncommon/ rarely seen/ no reported cases (hiếm gặp/ ghi nhận lẻ tẻ)*"
    + M8: the use of personal pronoun *"we" (chúngtôi) + reported/ described/ presented (báocáo/ môtả/ trìnhbày)*" to give the purpose of the study is presented.

- **Differences:**

English writers give clearer explicit lexical items to refer to the limitations of the previous research that motivated them to do their current study

**(b) Reporting verbs**

- **Similarities:** Both English and Vietnamese spend most RVs on the Research and Discourse Acts. Discourse Acts (Insurance) verbs are used non-factively to report the information neutrally without giving any evaluative comments or personal opinions on the reported information.

- **Differences:** Vietnamese Research Acts RVs are repeated much more frequently than English RVs (142 times compared to 26 times, respectively). English Discourse Acts RVs are more than three times higher than those of Vietnamese RVs (133 times compared to 36 times, respectively). Doubt sub-category verbs occur tentatively in English corpus while no verbs are seen in Vietnamese corpus.

**5.1.3. Comparisons of move deployment in English and Vietnamese MCR case presentations**

*5.1.3.1. The study on the moves*

**(a) The frequency**

- **Similarities:** M9, M10 and M12 in English and Vietnamese respectively have nearly the same frequency of occurrence

- **Differences**: M11 is seen a bit more in Vietnamese papers than in English papers.

**(b) The length**

**- Similarities:** M12 is calculated as the longest while M10 is the shortest among the others

- **Differences**: Vietnamese moves are longer than English moves. Accordingly, Vietnamese case presentations are longer than English case presentations.

**(c) The move steps**

- **Similarities:** Both steps are seen in many English and Vietnamese casepresentations are

- **Differences:** Vietnamese writers more focus on treatment procedures

### 5.1.3.2. The lexical signals

**(a) The lexical items**

- **<u>Similarities</u>:** Many verbs with equivalent meanings are written in English and Vietnamese case presentations such as *confirm – ghi nhận/ show (cho thấy)/ find (phát hiện), etc.*
- **<u>Differences</u>:** The presentation of the steps in the Vietnamese case presentations is clearer and more concise than that in the English ones

**(b) Reporting verbs**

- **<u>Similarities:</u>** Research Acts verbs are used more than Discourse Acts verbs and Cognition Acts verbs are nearly ignored in both corpora.
- **<u>Differences</u>:** More reporting verbs are seen in English case presentations

### 5.1.4. Comparisons of the move analysis results between English and Vietnamese Discussions

### 5.1.4.1. The moves

**(a) The frequency**

More than 90% of the articles in the two corpora are written with the two first moves. M15 is not given prominence in both languages.

**(b) The length**

- **<u>Similarities</u>:** M14 is the longest and M15 is the shortest
- **<u>Differences</u>:** Vietnamese discussion moves remain longer than English discussion moves. Accordingly, Vietnamese discussion section is longer than English discussion sections

**(c) The move steps and lexical items**

- **<u>Similarities</u>:** M14: step 1 and step 4 are written in both languages. Some lexical signals with equivalent meanings are seen in the two corpora: *"our patient/case suggested/presented"* (in English) and *Cabệnhnàychothấy ...* (in Vietnamese). "*According to ....*" (Theo tácgiả ....,),etc.
- **<u>Differences</u>:** No significant differences are found.

### 5.1.4.2. The reporting verbs

- **<u>Similarities</u>:** Both English and Vietnamese writers spend most reporting verbs on the Research than on Discourse Acts and Cognition Acts.

- **Differences:** The total number of reporting verbs are seen more in English corpus than in Vietnamese corpus. The reporting verbs are used more often in English corpus than in Vietnamese corpus.

## 5.1.5. Comparisons of move deployment in whole English and Vietnamese MCRs

### 5.1.5.1. The move distribution

**(a) The frequency:**

- **Similarities:** Conventional generic structure of English and Vietnamese medical case reports is obeyed quite strictly with almost all the sections (except for Vietnamese Abstract section)
- **Differences**: Conventional generic structure of English medical case reports is obeyed more strictly with almost all the sections.

**(b) The length:** English MCRs are shorter than Vietnamese MCRs regarding both written number of tokens and sentences in the two corpora.

**(c) The move steps**

- **Similarities:** The patterns of both languages are not completely conformed to the proposed model: A single step is introduced in some moves both in English and Vietnamese MCRs (M5, M7 and M8) although at least two steps are suggested.
- **Differences**: In some moves (M3, M9, M12), English writers introduce more steps than Vietnamese writers do.

### 5.1.5.2. The lexical signals

**(a) The lexical items**

- **Similarities:** The use of "*common*" = *phổ biến nhất*; "*rare*" = *hiếm gặp,* "*admit for*" = *vào viện do,* "*after treatment*" = *Sau khi điều trị and* the personal pronoun *"we" (chúng tôi)* is seen.
- **Differences:** The lexical items used in some moves by Vietnamese writers are clearer and more concise but English lexical items are more diversified.

**(b) The reporting verbs**

- **Similarities:**Many English and Vietnamese RVs with equivalent meaning are seen: *(confirm, show, observe, report, present, describe, find,* etc.). The RVs are seen frequently in M2, M3, M6, M7, M11 & M14. The verbs are used with active voice more than passive voice.

The RVs occur frequently in two categories: *Research Acts & Discourse Acts*

- **<u>Differences:</u>**More RVs are seen in English papers than in Vietnamese ones. The RVs in English are used much more frequently than those in Vietnamese. Vietnamese writers totally are not familiar with the Doubt tentative verbs (tentative attitude toward the reported information)

### *5.1.5.3. Concluding remarks*

- The genetic structure of a MCR both in English and Vietnamese consists of four main sections including Abstract, Introduction, Case presentation and Discussion.
- English writers ensure the number of the sections in their papers more stably than Vietnamese writers do. In addition, the moves written in English MCRs are seen with greater number.
- The length of English MCRs is much shorter than Vietnamese MCRs
- The lexical items observed in the moves in English are not as clear as those in Vietnamese are, but more diversified.
- The number of RVs is seen more in English MCRs than in Vietnamese MCRs.

## 5.2. REASONS FOR SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE MCRs

The reasons for the similarities and differences between the two corpora thus focus on the three issues: The effect of English as a global language, the contrastive rhetoric points of view and the teaching writing in Vietnamese settings. Concerning with the first issue, this study finds that the power of English as a global language has a big influence on of Vietnamese writers' styles on research article writing. However, the way to present the information in Vietnamese MCRs in some ways contrasts with Kaplan's theory of contrastive rhetoric. Most importantly, the disregard of teaching writing in Vietnam leads to some differences in writing products (structure, the use of lexical items, and the use of RVs) compared to native- English speaking writers.

## CHAPTER VI.CONCLUSIONS

This chapter comprises of four main parts. The first part provides concluding remarks of the study and discusses the findings of the two

research questions. The second parts deals with the pedagogical implications withdrew from the findings. The next part shows the limitations of the study and the last part suggests some ways for further studies.

## 6.1. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

In this paper, I have been concerned with the issues of the studies on the moves and lexical signals found in English and Vietnamese MCRs.The research methods and techniques I use to address the research questions are quantitative, qualitative and comparative. The results obtained from this study lend weight to the following general conclusions:

Firstly, according to the analysis, it is obvious that there are some significant structural and lexical features by which the genre of medical case reports can be identified. Based on the modified model, the structural progression of medical case reports can be described in terms of 15 distinct rhetorical moves, each of which is realized by a series of 1–5 "constituent elements" or steps (33 in total) that fulfill its particular purpose. However, it is found out that the structure of both English and Vietnamese MCRs is not always made up of all these fifteen moves. For instance, M4, M7 and M15 do not occur very often in both English and Vietnamese MCRs. The frequency of the three moves falls below 60%, they thus can be marked as optional (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). The rest moves (M1, M2, M3, M5, M6, M8, M9, M10, M11, M12, M13 and M14) are recognized as conventional moves as they occur in at least 60% of the appropriate sections in the two copora (Kanoksilapatham, 2005). In addition, in the current study, not all the suggested steps are written while introducing the moves of MCRs. This tendency is in line with Samraj (2009) in the point of view that one or more steps can realize each rhetorical move, but not all moves comprise constituent steps. In other words, the rhetorical moves in the genre of MCRs are not fixed as Hyland (2000), Nwogu (1997) and Mendez-Cedons (2009) have suggested.

Secondly, regarding the length of MCRs, it is found that Vietnamese MCRs is longer than English ones. However, the reasons for this is not due to the Oriental (Asian) organizational thought pattern

(non-linear) as Kaplan concluded, but because of the more information presented in the Vietnamese corpus. In other words, Vietnamese writers may include more than one case at the same time in a MCR.

Thirdly, the conclusion is concerned with the lexical features. The results show that each move contains lexical features that are influenced by the purpose of individual moves and sometimes by their concrete explicit lexical items. For example, according to the analysis, the main purpose of Move 2 is used to state the purpose of the study directly. The writers may take this chance to present or report the case while the others want to describe or to review it. Therefore, the lexical items identified in Move 2 are "*We present a case ...", "We report a case ....", "This article describes ...."* and the RVs, accordingly are just the verbs used with the lexical items. However, the lexical items used in the Vietnamese MCRs are clearer and more concise but not as diversified as those in the English MCRs because there has been a repetitive use of the same expressions in Vietnamese papers. This finding is against the results of Kaplan's research because the organizational thought pattern of Asian writing writers is not always non-linear.

Finally, the findings of the research reveal that more reporting verbs are used in English MCRs than in Vietnamese ones. While twenty-four RVs are observed in English corpus, seventeen are seen in the Vietnamese one. The explanation for this can be based on the critical thinking teaching in Vietnamese schools and universities. However, the use of the reporting verbs with active voice is preferable in both corpora. This is the most straightforward way to present the writer's ideas since it creates a clear image in the reader's mind of who is doing what.

To sum up, the genre of medical case reports has its typical structure, which is made up of twelve conventional moves with 21 steps. Each of them fulfills a particular purpose and has its characteristic grammatical features.

In addition, the effect of English as a global language, the contrastive rhetoric points of view and the teaching writing in Vietnamese settings are the explanations for the similarities and differences between the two languages.

## 6.2. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The current study contributes the understandings of moves and lexical signals and the major factors that construct the move deployment in a genre of MCR. An investigation into the moves of medical research articles is not new, especially in Western countries. However, in Vietnam the study of this kind of genre has not been reported yet. Therefore, the current study is hoped to provide some pedagogical implications for teaching writing in Vietnamese settings to encourage students to be aware of the role of motivation and critical thinking.

## 6.3. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- A conclusion is not put under investigation in the current study (based on the theory of Helán, 2011 and Adel, 2015).
- In the current study, the moves are examined regarding the frequency, length and steps. However, the order of the moves is still neglected.
- The triangle comparison of the MCRs including the papers written in English by native-English speakers, in English by Vietnamese authors and in Vietnamese language can be known as the ideal way to reach the purpose of the current study

## 6.4. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This section considers a number of areas for future research into the genre of MCRs that could contribute to the field of genre studies. The further research is suggested based not only on the shortcomings of the studies discussed above but also on the ways to explore writing quality of medical texts among Vietnamese writers.

## REFERENCES

1. Adel, S.M.R. &Moghadam, R.G. (2015), "A Comparison of Moves in Conclusion Sections of Research Articles in Psychology, Persian Literature and Applied Linguistics", *Teaching English Language* (9) No. 2, Fall &Winter 2015, pp. 167-191.
2. Coe, R., & Freedman, A. (1998), *Genre Theory: Australian and North American Approaches. From Theorizing Composition, a Critical Source Book of Theory and Scholarship in Contemporary Composition Studies,* GreenWood: ED. M.L. Kennedy.

3. Figueiredo, D. (2010), "Context, register and genre: Implications for Language education", *RevistaSignos 2010 / 43 Número Especial Monográfico*(1), pp. 119-141.

4. Halliday, M. (1994), *Introduction to Functional Grammar,* London: Oxford University Press.

5. Helán R. (2012), "Helping Medical Students Write: Genre Analysis of Medical Case Reports", *In: Kaščáková, E., and M. Zvirinský. FORLANG Cudziejazyky v akademickomprostredi. Košice: Technickáuniverzita v Košiciach*, pp. 75-85.

6. Hyland, K. (2000), *Disciplinary discourses: social interactions in academic writing,* Harlow: Pearson Education..

7. Hyland, K. (2002), "Activity and evaluation: Reporting practices in academic writing. Academic discourse", pp. 115-130.

8. Kanoksilapatham/ Biber, D. et.al (2007), *Discourse on the Move. Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure. Chapter 2: Introduction to move analysis,* John Benjamins Publishing Co. Amsterdam - The Netherlands.

9. Kaplan, R. (1966:12), "Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education",*Language Learning* (16) , pp. 1-22.

10. Méndez-Cendón, B. (2009), "Combinatorial Patterns in MCRs: An English-Spanish Contrastive Analysi*", The Journal of Specialised Translation*, Issue 11.

11. Mille, C., & Miller, C. (1994), "Genre as Social Action"*,Quarterly Journal of Speech*, Vol. 70 , pp.151-167.

12. Nwogu, K. N. (1997), "Structure of Science Popularisations: A Genre-analysis Approach to the Schema of Popularised Medical Texts*", English for Specific Purposes* (10), pp. 111-123.

13. Rison, R. A. (2013), "A Guide to Writing Case Reports for the Journal of Medical Case Reports and BioMed Central Research Notes*", Journal of Medical Case Reports* (7) , 239.

14. Scott, M. (2007), *Wordsmith Tools 4,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

15. Samraj, B. (2009), *Move structure*, Manuscript submitted for publication.

# THESIS RELATED PUBLICATION

1. The role of discourse analysis in translations. Educational and Social Journal, Special number, 11-2015.

2. Application of model of discourse analysis to translation of medical texts. Journal of Lexicography & Encyclopedia – Vietnam Institute of Lexicography & Encyclopedia. No. 5 (49), 2017.

3. Collocations in English and Vietnamese medical case reports. Journal of Lexicography & Encyclopedia – Vietnam Institute of Lexicography & Encyclopedia. No. 4 (54), 2018.

4. Move analysis of the case presentation section of English and Vietnamese medical case reports. Journal of Language and Life (Linguistic Society of Vietnam), No. 6 (273), 2018.