A MOVE ANALYSIS OF HIGHLY CITED MEDICAL RESEARCH ARTICLES ON COVID 19

No. Abstract: ABS-ICOLLITE-24044

Sheren Agustin, Prof. Eri Kurniawan, M.A., Ph.D., Dr. Ruswan Dallyono, M.Pd.

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

Publishing research articles is a vital aspect of academic life, yet many novice writers struggle with organizing their articles effectively. While extensive research has been conducted on the move structures of medical research articles, there has been limited focus the structural organization across the abstract, introduction, results and discussion sections. There is also a lack of research analyzing highly cited medical research articles. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the move structures employed in highly-cited medical research articles on COVID-19 and to evaluate the applicability of the collaborative frameworks to medical research articles.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Move analysis identifies communicative roles in text segments, where a move is a coherent discourse unit with a specific purpose, such as indicating a research gap (Swales, 2004). Moves can be further broken down into smaller units called steps (Jirapanakorn et al., 2014).

Previous studies on medical research articles:

• Core moves and their development (Nwogu, 1997; Li & Ge, 2009).

• Detailed analysis of structural elements and linguistic aspects (Fryer, 2012; Huang, 2014).

• Comparative studies of introductions (Jirapanakorn et al., 2014; Meng, 2021).

• Analysis of abstracts section (Abdollahpour & Gholami, 2019).

• Analysis of IMRD section (Davis, 2020).

METHOD

Design: Descriptive qualitative

Data source: Scopus database

Data collection:

Source Criteria Type:

- Journals (Articles only),

- Language: English

- Relevance Keywords

Selection Process:

- Initial Filter: Based on selection criteria

- Citation Count: Top 50 articles selected

- Final Relevance: Sorted by specific medical field interest

- Final Corpus: 30 article

The selected articles are analyzed by utilizing the collaborative framework proposed by Hyland (2000) for Abstract, Swales (2004) for Introduction, Cotos et al. (2017) for Method, and Moreno & Swales (2018) for Results and Discussion.

Data analysis:
- Segmentation
- Linking
- Frequency Calculation

The analysis categorized moves and steps into conventional (>60%) and optional (<60%) types based on Kanoksilapatham's (2005) theory.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

- Move structure in the abstract section

Move/Step	Occurrence (N=30)	Percentage	Status
Move 1 Introduction	29	96.67%	Conventional
Move 2 Purpose	11	36.67%	Optional
Move 3 Method	30	100%	Conventional
Move 4 Product	30	100%	Conventional
Move 5 Conclusion	30	100%	Conventional

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

- Move structure in the introduction section

Move/Step	Occurrence (N=30)	Percentage	Status
Move 1: Establishing a territory	**30**	**100%**	**Conventional**
Move 2: Establishing a niche	**28**	**90%**	**Conventional**
Step 1A: Indicating a gap	27	90%	Conventional
Step 1B: Adding to what is known	1	3.33%	Optional
Step 2: Presenting positive justification	6	20%	Optional
Move 3: Presenting the present work	**29**	**96.67%**	**Conventional**
Step 1: Announcing present research descriptively and/or purposively	29	96.67%	Conventional
Step 2: Presenting RQs or hypotheses	0	0%	-
Step 3: Definitional clarifications	2	6.67%	Optional
Step 4: Summarizing methods	0	0%	-
Step 5: Announcing principal outcomes	0	0%	-
Step 6: Stating the value of the present research	2	6.67%	Optional
Step 7: Outlining the structure of the paper	0	0	-

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

- Move structure in the method section

Move/Step	Occurrence (N=30)	Percentage	Status
Move 1: Contextualizing study methods	**28**	**93.33%**	**Conventional**
Step 1: Referencing previous works	6	20%	Optional
Step 2: Providing general information	0	0%	-
Step 3: Identifying the methodological approach	20	66.67%	Conventional
Step 4: Describing the setting	9	30%	Optional
Step 5: Introducing the subjects/participants	26	86.67%	Conventional
Step 6: Rationalizing pre-experiment decisions	1	3.33%	Optional
Move 2: Describing the study	**30**	**100%**	**Conventional**
Step 1: Acquiring the data	22	73.33%	Conventional
Step 2: Describing the data	11	36.67%	Optional
Step 3: Describing experimental/study procedures	29	96.67%	Conventional
Step 4: Describing tools	4	13.33%	Optional
Step 5: Identifying variables	6	20%	Optional
Step 6: Rationalizing experiment decisions	5	16.67%	Optional
Step 7: Reporting incrementals	0	0%	-
Move 3: Establishing credibility	**30**	**100%**	**Conventional**
Step 1: Preparing the data	1	3.33%	Optional
Step 2: Describing data analysis	30	100%	Conventional
Step 3: Rationalizing data processing/analysis	3	10%	-

- Move structure in the results and discussion section

Move/Step	Occurrence (N=30)	Percentage	Status
Move 1 (AF): Announcing (function)	**29**	**96.67%**	**Conventional**
Step 1 (SEC): Announcing (sub) sections	29	96.67%	Conventional
Step 2 (EXT): Announcing or referring the reader to external sources	0	0%	-
Step 3 (MSP): Announcing moves, steps or propositional meaning	0	0%	-
Move 2 (BGI): Background information	**18**	**60%**	**Conventional**
Step 1 (KFS): Restating key features of the current study	8	26.67%	Optional
Step 2 (RWC): Reporting background information with citations procedures	10	33.33%	Optional
Step 3 (POC): Providing background information without citations	4	13.33%	Optional
Move 3 (SUM): Summarizing or restating key result	**30**	**100%**	**Conventional**
Step 1 (RES): Presenting results neutrally	30	100%	Conventional
Step 2 (CRES): Contrasting with other results in the study	19	63.33%	Conventional
Step 3 (HRES): Highlighting results	30	100%	Conventional
Move 4 (COMM): Commenting on key results or other features	**30**	**100%**	**Conventional**
Step 1 (MEAN): Establishing the meaning of results	26	86.67%	Conventional
Step 2 (COMP): Comparing with previous research	25	83.33%	Conventional
Step 3 (EXPL): Explaining results or discussing effects	28	93.33%	Conventional
Step 4 (PRED): Making predictions	2	6.67%	Optional
Step 5 (REACT): Reacting to results or other features	0	0%	-
Move 5 (EV): Evaluating the current study or other research or practice	**26**	**86.67%**	**Conventional**
Step 1 (LIM): Pointing out negative features or limitations of the current study	25	83.33%	Conventional
Step 2 (STATE): Evaluating the state of knowledge or practice in broad terms	3	10%	Optional
Step 3 (CONTR): Stating the contribution of the current study	7	26.67%	Optional
Step 4 (POS): Pointing out positive features of the current or proposed study	5	16.67%	Optional
Step 5 (GAD): Noting sprecific gaps in knowledge or deficiencies in other research or practice	0	0%	-
Move 6 (IMP): Drawing implications	**22**	**73.33%**	**Conventional**
Step 1 (REC): Making recommendations for future research or practice	22	73.33%	Conventional
Step 2 (APP): Suggesting the applicability of results or usability of outcomes	5	16.67%	Optional
Step 3 (HYP): Hypothesizing for future research	3	10%	Optional
Move 7 (ELF): Elaborating (function)	**0**	**0%**	**-**
Step 1 (JUST): Justifying what is stated in a neighbouring proposition	0	0%	-
Step 2 (EXEM): Exemplifying what has been stated in a previous proposition	0	0%	-
Step 3 (CLAR): Clarifying what has been stated in a previous proposition	0	0%	-

CONCLUSION

- The findings align with the research objectives, which involve analyzing the move structures utilized in highly-cited medical research articles on COVID-19 and evaluating the applicability of collaborative frameworks to such articles.

- The findings contribute to provide a framework for future researchers, specifically in the medical discipline.

REFERENCES

- Abdollahpour, Z., & Gholami, J. (2019). Rhetorical structure of the abstracts of medical sciences research articles. *Prensa Medica Argentina, 105*(1). https://doi.org/10.47275/0032-745x-114

- Cotos, E., Huffman, S., & Link, S. (2017). A move/step model for methods sections: Demonstrating Rigour and Credibility. *English for Specific Purposes, 46.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2017.01.001

- Davis, R. H. (2020). Moves and Steps in the IMRD Sections of Medical Research Articles. *Taiwan International ESP Journal, 11*(1), 23–39. https://doi.org/10.6706/TIESPJ.202008_11(1).0002

- Fryer, D. L. (2012). Analysis of the generic discourse features of the English-language medical research article. *Functions of Language, 19*(1), 5–37. https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.19.1.01fry

- Huang, D. (2014). *Genre Analysis of Moves in Medical Research Articles.*

- Hyland, K. (2000). Disciplinary Discourses. Social Interactions in Academic Writing. In Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. The University of Michigan Press.

- Jirapanakorn, N., Trakulkasemsuk, W., & Keyuravong, S. (2014). Move Analysis of English Research Article Introductions in Thai and International Medical Journals. *REFLections, 17*, 23–40. https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v17i0.114201

- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes, 24*(3), 269–292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.08.003

- Li, L. J., & Ge, G. C. (2009). Genre analysis: Structural and linguistic evolution of the English-medium medical research article (1985-2004). *English for Specific Purposes, 28*(2), 93–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2008.12.004

- Meng, Y. (2021). Move-Step Structure of the Introduction Section of English Medical Science Research Articles Written by Chinese Researchers Published in International Journals. *Review of Educational Theory, 4*(2), 36. https://doi.org/10.30564/ret.v4i2.3111

- Moreno, A. I., & Swales, J. M. (2018). Strengthening move analysis methodology towards bridging the function-form gap. English for Specific Purposes, 50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2017.11.006

- Nwogu, K. N. (1997). The Medical Research Paper: Structure and Functions. In *English for Specific Purposes* (Vol. 16, Issue 2).

- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press.

THANK YOU!