

*In the Name of  
God*



*Ferdowsi University of Mashhad*

**Genre-based Analysis of English Patient Information Leaflets  
(PILs) and Examining the Reading Strategies Used by Skilled and  
Novice Readers in Reading PILs**

**By:**

**Rahil Sheibani**

**Supervisor: Dr. Behzad Ghonsooly**

**Advisor: Dr. Khalil Ghazizade**

*A thesis submitted to the English Department of the Faculty of  
Letters and Humanities, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the M.A. Degree in Teaching  
English as a Foreign Language*

**Mashhad, Iran**

**March 2011**

## *Acknowledgement*

*Without support of God, this thesis would be impossible.*

*I would like to thank all who have helped me in the accomplishment of this thesis. I feel indebted to them all as they had a strong influence on my task.*

*First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my dear supervisor, Dr. Ghonsooly, whose comment and recommendations helped me improve the quality of this thesis. This thesis could not have been possible without his continuous support. I feel really indebted to him.*

*I also owe my thanks to my dear advisor, Dr. Ghazizade, whose help and encouragement was present all through accomplishing this thesis. I'm really thankful to him.*

*I am also grateful to the dear readers of this thesis, Dr. Hosseini and Dr. Ghapanchi, whose comments will help me improve the quality of this thesis.*

*I also thank all participants of this study who assist me in acquiring my data.*

*Last but certainly not least, I would like to thank my family, especially my father and mother, for their support and encouragement. Words are unable to express how deeply I am indebted to them.*

*to my dear  
mother and father*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Subject                                       | Page |
|---|------|
| Title Page                                    | i    |
| Acknowledgements                              | iii  |
| Dedication                                    | iv   |
| Table of Contents                             | v    |
| List of Tables & Figures                      | x    |
| Abstract                                      | xi   |
| <br>  |      |
| <b><u>Chapter 1: Introduction</u></b>         |      |
| 1.1. Background                               | 2    |
| 1.2. Statement of the Problem                 | 7    |
| 1.3. Significance of the Study                | 7    |
| 1.4. Purposes of the Present Research         | 8    |
| 1.4.1. Research Questions                     | 8    |
| 1.5. Definitions                              | 9    |
| 1.6. Delimitation                             | 11   |
| <br>  |      |
| <b><u>Chapter 2: Review of Literature</u></b> |      |
| 2.1. Introduction                             | 14   |
| 2.2. Language Analysis for ESP                | 14   |
| 2.2.1. Register Analysis                      | 14   |
| 2.2.2. Rhetorical Analysis                    | 15   |
| 2.2.3. Genre Analysis                         | 16   |
| 2.2.3.1. Approaches to Genre Analysis         | 18   |
| 2.2.3.1.1. English for Specific Purposes      | 18   |
| 2.2.3.1.2. New Rhetoric                       | 19   |
| 2.2.3.1.3. The SFL Approach                   | 19   |
| 2.2.3.2. Key Concepts in Genre Analysis       | 20   |
| 2.2.3.2.1. Discourse Community                | 20   |

---

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 2.2.3.2.2. Genre                                | 21 |
| 2.2.3.3. Definition of Genre                    | 22 |
| 2.3. Empirical Studies of Genre                 | 24 |
| 2.3.1. Studies in Research Articles             | 24 |
| 2.3.1.1. RA Abstract                            | 24 |
| 2.3.1.2. RA Introduction                        | 25 |
| 2.3.1.3. RA Method                              | 29 |
| 2.3.1.4. RA Results                             | 30 |
| 2.3.1.5. RA Discussion                          | 32 |
| 2.3.1.6. RA Conclusion                          | 34 |
| 2.3.2. Studies in Medical Genre                 | 35 |
| 2.3.2.1. PILs Rhetorical Structure              | 35 |
| 2.3.2.2. PILs Readability and Comprehensibility | 37 |
| 2.3.2.3. PIL Translatability                    | 41 |
| 2.4. Reading                                    | 42 |
| 2.4.1. Hypertext Reading                        | 43 |
| 2.4.2. Reading Comprehension Strategies         | 44 |
| 2.4.3. Skilled and Novice Readers               | 48 |
| 2.4.4. Eliciting Reading Information Technique  | 48 |
| 2.3.4.1. Think-aloud Protocol Analysis          | 49 |
| 2.5. Empirical Researches on Reading            | 53 |
| 2.5.1. Empirical Studies on Hypertext Reading   | 56 |

### **Chapter 3: Methodology**

|                              |    |
|------------------------------|----|
| 3.1. Introduction            | 60 |
| 3.2. Phase 1: Genre Analysis | 60 |
| 3.2.1. Corpus                | 60 |
| 3.2.2. Analytical Framework  | 61 |
| 3.2.2.1. Macrostructure      | 62 |
| 3.2.2.2. Move                | 62 |
| 3.2.2.3. Step                | 62 |
| 3.2.3. Data Analysis         | 63 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 3.2.3.1. Analysis of Macrostructure       | 63 |
| 3.2.3.2. Analysis of Move-Step Structure  | 64 |
| 3.3. Phase 2: Examining Reading Strategy  | 64 |
| 3.3.1. Participants                       | 65 |
| 3.3.2. Subject Selection                  | 68 |
| 3.3.3 Instruments                         | 69 |
| 3.3.3.1. TOEFL                            | 70 |
| 3.3.4. Procedure                          | 71 |
| 3.3.4.1. Using L1 for Verbal Reports      | 71 |
| 3.3.4.2. Choosing Text                    | 72 |
| 3.3.4.3. Organizing Think-aloud Session   | 74 |
| 3.3.4.4. Pre-Think-aloud Training         | 74 |
| 3.3.4.5. The Main Task                    | 74 |
| 3.3.4.6. Probing                          | 75 |
| 3.3.4.7. Response Classification Scheme   | 75 |
| 3.3.5. Data Analysis                      | 75 |
| 3.3.5.1. Segmentation                     | 76 |
| 3.3.5.2. Simple vs. Complex Strategy      | 78 |
| 3.3.5.3. Strategy vs. Response            | 82 |
| 3.3.5.4. Cognitive vs. Affective Response | 82 |
| 3.4. Summary                              | 82 |

#### **Chapter 4: Discussion of Results**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 4.1. Introduction  | 84 |
| 4.2. Phase1: Genre Analysis                              | 84 |
| 4.2.1. Macrostructure Analysis                           | 84 |
| 4.2.2. Microstructure Analysis                           | 86 |
| 4.2.2.1. Composition                                     | 87 |
| 4.2.2.2. Pharmacodynamics and Pharmacokinetic Properties | 88 |
| 4.2.2.3. Indications                                     | 90 |
| 4.2.2.4. Dosage and Administration                       | 91 |
| 4.2.2.5. Contraindications                               | 93 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4.2.2.6. Special Warnings and Precautions for Use | 94  |
| 4.2.2.7. Interactions                             | 95  |
| 4.2.2.8. Side Effects                             | 96  |
| 4.2.2.9. Pregnancy and Lactation                  | 98  |
| 4.2.2.10. Drivers and Machine Users               | 99  |
| 4.2.2.11. Overdose                                | 100 |
| 4.2.2.12 Storage Condition and Shelf Life         | 100 |
| 4.3. Phase two: Reading Strategies                | 104 |
| 4.3.1. Proportion of Reading Strategies           | 104 |
| 4.3.2. Analysis of the Protocols                  | 107 |
| 4.3.2.1. Higher-level Processing Strategies       | 107 |
| 4.3.2.1.1. Using Prior Knowledge                  | 108 |
| 4.3.2.1.1.1. Using Background Knowledge           | 108 |
| 4.3.2.1.2. Metacognition                          | 108 |
| 4.3.2.1.2.1. Paraphrasing                         | 108 |
| 4.3.2.1.2.2. Identifying Problems                 | 110 |
| 4.3.2.1.2.3. Adjusting Rate                       | 110 |
| 4.3.2.1.2.4. Skipping Difficult Sections          | 111 |
| 4.3.2.1.2.5. Skipping Trivial Sections            | 112 |
| 4.3.2.1.3. Inferencing                            | 112 |
| 4.3.2.1.3.1. Reprocessing at Sentence Level       | 112 |
| 4.3.2.1.3.2. Reprocessing at Phrase Level         | 113 |
| 4.3.2.1.3.3. Guessing                             | 113 |
| 4.3.2.1.3.4. Watchers                             | 114 |
| 4.3.2.1.3.5. Finding the Key Words                | 115 |
| 4.3.2.2. Lower-level Processing Strategies        | 115 |
| 4.3.2.2.1. Word Recognition                       | 115 |
| 4.3.2.2.1.1. Decoding                             | 115 |
| 4.3.2.2.1.2. Using Dictionary                     | 116 |
| 4.3.2.2.1.3. Repeating Words                      | 116 |
| 4.3.2.2.1.4. Correcting Pronunciation             | 117 |
| 4.3.2.2.1.5. L1 Equivalent Search                 | 118 |



|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 4.3.2.2.1.6. Word for Word Translations                        | 118 |
| 4.3.2.2.2. Syntactical Processing                              | 119 |
| 4.3.2.2.2.1. Morphological Analysis                            | 119 |
| 4.3.2.2.2.2. Syntactical Analysis                              | 119 |
| 4.3.2.3. Cognitive/Affective Responses                         | 120 |
| 4.3.2.3.1. Cognitive Responses                                 | 120 |
| 4.3.2.3.1.1. Self-Directed Questioning                         | 120 |
| 4.3.2.3.1.2. Commenting on Process                             | 120 |
| 4.3.2.3.2. Affective Responses                                 | 121 |
| 4.3.2.3.2.1. Emotive Responses                                 | 121 |
| 4.4. Strategies in each section                                | 122 |
| 4.5. Summary   | 124 |
| <b><u>Chapter 5: Conclusion</u></b>                            |     |
| 5.1. Introduction  | 126 |
| 5.2. Summary   | 126 |
| 5.3. Pedagogical Implication                                   | 128 |
| 5.4. Suggestions for Further Research                          | 130 |
| References   | 133 |
| Appendices   |     |
| Appendix A: Reading Paper of Sample TOEFL Used in the Study    | 143 |
| Appendix B: Subjects' Raw Data                                 | 153 |
| Appendix C: Transcriptions of Verbal Reports (Skilled Readers) | 154 |
| Appendix D: Transcriptions of Verbal Reports (Novice Readers)  | 158 |

## **List of Tables:**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Tab. 2.1. Swales' 1981 Model for the Structure of RA Introduction                 | 26  |
| Tab. 2.2. Swales' 1990 CARS Model of RA Introduction                              | 27  |
| Tab. 2.3. Nwogu's 1997 Model for Structure of RA Method                           | 30  |
| Tab. 2.4. Williams' 1999 Model for Result   | 31  |
| Tab. 2.5. Hopkins and Dudley-Evans' 1988 Model for RA Discussion                  | 32  |
| Tab. 2.6. Swales' 1990 Model for RA Discussion                                    | 32  |
| Tab. 3.1. Subjects' Demographic Makeup  | 66  |
| Tab. 3.2. Classification of Processing Strategies                                 | 79  |
| Tab. 4.1. The Percentage and Sequence of PILs Section                             | 85  |
| Tab. 4.2. Microstructure of Composition Section                                   | 88  |
| Tab. 4.3. Microstructure of Pharmacodynamics & Pharmacokinetic Properties Section | 89  |
| Tab. 4.4. Microstructure of Indications Section                                   | 90  |
| Tab. 4.5. Microstructure of Dosage and Administration Section                     | 91  |
| Tab. 4.6. Microstructure of Contraindications Section                             | 93  |
| Tab. 4.7. Microstructure of Warnings and Precautions for Use Section              | 94  |
| Tab. 4.8. Microstructure of interactions Section                                  | 95  |
| Tab. 4.9. Microstructure of Side Effects Section                                  | 96  |
| Tab. 4.10. Microstructure of Pregnancy and Lactation Section                      | 98  |
| Tab. 4.11. Microstructure of Driver and Machine Users Section                     | 99  |
| Tab. 4.12. Microstructure of Overdose Section                                     | 100 |
| Tab. 4.13. Microstructure of Storage Condition and Shelf Life Section             | 101 |
| Tab. 4.14. Micro-Structure of PILs  | 102 |
| Tab. 4.15. Frequency of Reading Strategies Used by the Skilled Readers            | 104 |
| Tab. 4.16. Frequency of Reading Strategies Used by the Novice Readers             | 106 |

## **List of Figures:**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Fig. 3.1. Ratio of Gender and University Levels   | 66  |
| Fig. 4.1. The Percentage of PILs Sections   | 85  |
| Fig. 4.2. Percentage of Reading Strategies Utilized by the Skilled and the Novice Readers | 106 |
| Fig. 4.3. The Proportion of Categories of Reading Strategies Used by the Skilled Readers  | 123 |
| Fig. 4.4. The Proportion of Categories of Reading Strategies Used by the Novice Readers   | 124 |

## ABSTRACT

This study sought to identify the rhetorical structures of Patient Information Leaflets (PILs), and also explore the reading strategies utilized by skilled and novice readers in reading this kind of text. The majority of researches on genre analysis only have explored text rhetorical structures without examining them in tasks such as reading. This study was conducted in two phases; the first is genre analysis of English PILs and the second comprises case studies by means of think-aloud protocol analysis. The genre analysis phase aimed at identifying the macro- and micro-structure of PILs; the microstructure analysis was done at two levels of move and step. In this phase, 30 English PILs were analyzed. The second phase tried to explore reading strategies used by readers possessing different reading abilities. A reading TOEFL test was administered to two groups of undergraduate and graduate EFL learners of Ferdowsi University of Mashhad and think-aloud procedure was used to study the use of different reading strategies. The verbal reports of 6 selected informants were analyzed and the results were categorized. The results of the first phase indicated that PILs are composed of 17 sections, and each section has its own particular move-step framework. The second phase showed that skilled readers used more reading strategies than the novice. The highest utilized category of strategies among both groups was word processing strategy. Moreover, the skilled group paid more attention to higher-level processing strategies (using prior knowledge, metacognition, inferencing) than the novice group. In addition to this, they paid attention to word and sentence level meaning simultaneously.

*Keyword: genre, move, step, reading strategies, think-aloud procedure*

# **Chapter one**

## **Introduction**

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

### **1.1. Background**

English is currently the most widespread language in the world, most of written texts and more especially the scientific data and research articles are presented in English. In order to yield this information, reading is the most beneficial tool. Yalcin and Sengul (2004) mentioned that students should catch up with the changing world, so they are supposed to be lifelong learners. As most of the learning processes occur in terms of reading, students should possess meaningful and critical reading abilities. Without supportive skills of reading comprehension, ideal level of learning may not be reached. A large amount of research in the field of reading confirms the reading skill importance. It has got the central attention in language research and language instruction. Many scholars have tried to shed light on different aspects of this skill. Reading is an active and complex process; it is a ‘cognitive process’ both in L1 and L2. This skill is an interaction among the reader, the text and the context in which the reading takes place (Flavel, 1979). The readers try to decode symbols in order to derive or construct the meaning. Reading is not a linear process; in reading readers constantly form hypotheses, test predictions, and use world knowledge and language knowledge to construct meaning (Goodman, 1967, 1985; Smith, 1979).

A large body of research indicated that there are many factors that affect reading comprehension. Paris and Jacobs (1984) who differentiated between skilled and novice readers, pointed that skilled readers often are engaged in deliberate activities, which need planful thinking, flexible strategies and periodic self-monitoring, while novice readers seem to be inattentive to these effective strategies. Moreover, proficient L2 readers can compensate for the lack of English proficiency by increasing awareness and usage of reading strategies to reinforce their understanding (Carrell, 1991).

Baker and Brown (1984) and Klatzien (1991) also have distinguished between skilled and poor readers; according to them, poor readers are generally deficient in reading skills and using strategies, while the skilled readers are able to reflect and monitor their own cognitive processes in reading. Skilled readers are not only aware of which strategies to use, but also tend to be better at regulating the use of strategies while reading. In other words, the skilled learners know which strategy to use and when to use them in order to increase their reading comprehension. It should be noted that the awareness of reading strategies does not mean knowing how to use them.

Some researchers have tried to categorize the identified reading strategies (Akyel & Erçetin, 2009; Pilten, 2010; Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001). They listed some useful reading strategies such as ‘setting purpose for reading’, ‘previewing text before reading’, ‘checking the text content purpose’, ‘noting text characteristics’, ‘determining what to read’, and ‘rereading for better understanding’.

Moore, et al. (2003) counted following strategies as particularly important ones:

- Connecting knowledge to prior experience
- Previewing and predicting to improve comprehension
- Organizing information and applying meaningful frameworks and categories
- Self-monitoring of understanding
- Evaluating the text critically

In order to collect data about the process of reading comprehension, different methods could be used. One of these methods is think-aloud procedure. This verbal report of thinking is different from earlier introspective methods because the central assumption of this method is that subjects can verbalize their thought while no change takes place in their thought sequences; it should be done at the time of performing the task. Being able to think about one’s own thinking is a crucial component of learning, since it enables learners to assess their comprehension and adjust their strategies, which leads to greater success (Ericsson, 2002).

It seems necessary to assert that reading strategies are not inherently effective, but need to be valued by the reader while accomplishing the reading task. Selecting an effective strategy is specified by different factors including the nature of the task, learners' individual characteristics, learners' learning aptitude, prior experience, and background knowledge (Williams & Burden, 1997).

Readers' awareness of the text genre may accelerate their reading comprehension. Genre analysis has attracted so much attention since the early 1980. Genre, which has traditionally been a literary concept, has recently become a popular framework for analyzing the form and rhetorical function of non-literary discourse (Candlin, 1993). Linguistics and language teachers have tried to apply genre-centered-approaches to the analysis of written and spoken discourse in order to provide satisfactory models and descriptions for academic and scientific text and also help non-native speaker students to enhance their ability of understanding and proper production of text (Dudley- Evans, 1986).

The first scholar who introduced the concept of genre in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) was Swales (1990); he defined the term genre as "conventionalized communication event whose form and linguistic features are determined by practices and conventions of discourse community to which the text is addressed" (p. 58). The definition implies that when linguistic features of communication event are analyzed, the specific social context where it is used should be taken into consideration. Genre analysis essentially is based on two central assumptions. First, the feature of a similar group of text depends on the social context of their creation and use. Second, those features can be described in a way that relates a text to other texts like it.

Biber (1988) made a distinction between genre and text type in this way genre is based on external and non-linguistic features, while text type is defined by internal and linguistic characteristics of a text. A genre can be viewed as a category assigned on the basis of external criteria like intended audience, purpose and activity type which refers to a conventional and culturally recognized grouping of text based on

properties other than (linguistic) criteria forming the basis of text type categories. External criteria which determine genre categories are assigned based on use rather than form.

Swales (1990) introduced two other concepts, move and step, in the field of genre analysis. According to him, move is a seminal unit relevant to the writer's purpose. Many linguistic features made up a text segment like lexical meaning, prepositional meaning, illocutionary force, etc. These features give the segment a uniform orientation and signal the concepts of discourse in it. A move can be realized by one step or the combination of steps. It captures the function and purpose of a segment of a text at a more general level; however, steps spell out more specifically the rhetorical means of realizing the function of move, the set of steps for a move is the set of rhetorical choices.

Swales' model has been used by different scholars in the field of applied linguistics and English for specific and academic purposes. The reason for conducting the analysis of rhetorical structure of academic papers by different scholars (Cheng, 2006; Martin, 2003) is the role that genre can play in text classification, which may contribute to comprehension and production of text. The role of genre in reading comprehension seems to have roots in the idea that there may be underlying recurrent features which are prototypically present in particular group of texts.

Swales' (1990) model has attracted the attention of the researchers working on medical genre (Nwogu, 1997; Samarj, 2000). But except medical research articles the other types of medical text have been ignored. Conducting ample of researches (Nwogu, 1997; Rezaei & Sayfour, 2009; Samarj, 2000; Williams, 1999) on medical research articles is an obvious evidence for the importance of these kinds of texts; other medical texts like medical brochures, patient information leaflets (PILs), drug labels, and medical postures get less attention. These texts are anticipated for public. therefore, the scope of their intended audience is broader than academic papers. It seems that no standard international structure has been identified and proposed for



designing PILs, so the present study aims at analyzing the rhetorical structure of PILs to fill this gap.

Medicine leaflets should comply with some legislation (e.g. European commission); they ought to be understood by general population who possess different needs and abilities. Some studies were conducted to evaluate the quality of leaflets by means of readability formulae, but they were limited in their scope for improving the quality of the information in leaflets. Information should be designed in a way that attracts, motivates and promotes the readers' understanding (Twomey, 2001).

It is well known that patients forget or misunderstand much of the consultation content. A study conducted by Savage (1992) showed that on average, patients forget half of what the doctor had told them within 5 minutes of leaving the consultation. In general, people may only retain about 20% of what they hear, also the average adult forgets half of what he or she is told within a few minutes, but this may be decreased if there is additional visual or written input. So, it seems to be crucial to back up verbal advice with written material. As patients are unreliable witnesses to the consultation, leaflets should be used to compensate these inadequacies, and to bring patients' knowledge in line with the correct medical information (as cited in Dixon-Wood, 2001). PIL audiences prefer information that is easy to understand with sufficient detail to fulfill their needs. The essential steps in the advancement of health education material are evaluating them by the target groups, providing pictures and visual aids to increase their comprehension, representing needs of various ages, genders, and different levels of literacy (Elliot & Shenker, 2009). As Dixon-Wood (2001) supposed, a crucial condition for success of information is that the message is reached and comprehended, interpreted, and understood by the reader as intended by the writer.

Another important characteristic of the PILs that makes them appropriate to be selected as the material for analysis in this study is their authenticity. Widdowson (1979) argues that authenticity is achieved when the readers interpret the intention of

writer and respond correctly to it. Some teachers prefer authentic texts in which nothing has been changed, but the others favor simulated authentic materials in which some changes have been done to assist learner. Materials are classified into 3 types; “authentic” not written for language learners, but for natives, “pedagogic” specially written for the learners of language (these texts have a pedagogic goal), and “adopted” simulated authentic texts according to learner’s level and need. According to this definition, PILs can be categorized as authentic materials.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

Because of their large number of intended audience and the importance of their content, PILs are considered to be one of the most important text types in the field of medicine. It is surprising that this kind of text genre has got no attention up to now. The present study is a genre-based analysis of PILs which focuses on the identification of their rhetorical structure.

On the other hand, as mentioned in the previous section, the role of genre in reading comprehension is not deniable. Identifying the reading strategies EFL learners with different levels of proficiency utilize to read PILs would shed light on the relation of reading strategies and the genre of PILs.

## **1.3. Significance of the Study**

The results of the genre analysis of the present study can contribute to devising ESP courses, especially for students of medicine. It can make them aware of the generic structure of the medical informative materials.

ESP teachers can enhance their students’ ability in writing, reading and comprehending this genre by informing them of the rationale behind these analyses. The proposed model of the study can be used as a descriptive template in developing PILs.

The findings of the think-aloud experiment would give insight to instructors for assigning remedial tasks according to learners' abilities. In addition, identifying the strategies used by skilled readers in comprehending reading texts and equipping novice ones with those strategies could compensate for their reading weaknesses.

## **1.4. Purposes of the Present Research**

The present study aims at: a) Analyzing the rhetorical structure of English PILs in order to find the comprising moves and steps of each section of the PILs based on Swales' model at two-level; b) Discovering the reading strategies used by the skilled and novice EFL learners in comprehending PILs; c) Comparing the utilized reading strategies based on the rhetorical structure with respect to proficiency levels of these learners.

The present study has two major components; the first one is genre analysis of 30 English PILs. The overall macro- and micro-structure of PILs are recognized. The second phase tries to identify the reading strategies utilized by the skilled and novice readers in reading these informative and authentic texts. A reading paper of a sample of TOEFL test<sup>1</sup> is used to select these participants. The test scores indicate the proficiency level of the participants. These subjects, who have different reading abilities, read the selected PIL and their reading strategies are identified by means of think-aloud protocol analysis. The identified strategies are classified, compared and contrasted.

### **1.4.1. Research Questions**

This study is based on and guided by the following research questions:

- What is the dominant macrostructure of English PILs?
- What are the moves and steps comprising the rhetorical structure of different sections of English PILs?

---

<sup>1</sup> More detailed information of this instrument and the way of its administration is provided in Methodology section of the study.

---

- What are the reading strategies used by the skilled EFL readers in understanding of these moves and steps?
- What are the reading strategies used by the novice EFL readers in understanding of these moves and steps?
- What are the differences between reading strategies used by skilled and novice EFL learners?

## **1.5. Definitions**

The key terms that are present in this study are listed below together with their definitions. Some of these terms have been stated few times, while the others are appeared more frequently. All these key terms are defined in this section regardless of their frequency of occurrences in the present study.

### **1.5.1. Genre**

Swales (1990) has defined genre as “a conventionalized communication event whose form and linguistic features are determined by practices and conventions of the discourse community to which the text is addressed.” (P. 58)

### **1.5.2. Move**

Move is a seminal unit relevant to writer purpose, many linguistic features made up a text segment like lexical meaning, prepositional meaning, illocutionary force, etc. These features give the segment a uniform orientation and signal the content of discourse in it. Moves can vary in size, but contain at least one proposition (Swales, 1990).

### **1.5.3. Step**

Step spells out more specifically the rhetorical means of realizing the function of move. The set of steps for a move is the set of rhetorical choices (Swales, 1990).