Māori and English textbooks designed for language learners at intermediate level: A comparison in terms of the occurrence and use of insights gained from research on discourse analysis

Anthea Fester
Department of General and Applied Linguistics
Te Kura Kete Aronui (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences)
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato (University of Waikato)
Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand
[amfester@waikato.ac.nz]
Hēmi Whaanga
Te Pua Wānanga ki te Ao (School of Māori and Pacific Development)
*Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato (*University of Waikato)
Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand
[hemi@waikato.ac.nz]

Abstract
Over the past two decades, research in the area of discourse analysis has expanded rapidly and has yielded insights that could usefully inform the teaching and learning of languages. In this paper, we report on the results of a comparative study of a number of commercially available textbooks designed for learners of English and learners of *te reo Māori* at intermediate level in terms of the extent to which they can be shown to have been influenced by specific aspects of discourse analysis research. In the textbooks designed for learners of English, there is some evidence that the writers are aware of, and have been influenced by some aspects of discourse analysis research, particularly in the teaching of writing skills. In the textbooks designed for learners of *te reo Māori*, however, there is almost no sign of influence of research of this type. In view of the importance of the teaching and learning of *te reo Māori* in relation to the maintenance of the language, and in view of the fact that many young people in New Zealand now learn a range of academic subjects through the medium of *te reo Māori*, this raises issues that we believe need to be addressed.

Keywords: coherence, cohesion, discourse relations, genre, macro-patterning, teaching English as an additional language, teaching *te reo Māori*, textbooks, text types, writing skills

Introduction

In the last two decades, research in the area of discourse analysis has increased rapidly. Commenting on one area of this research alone, Whaanga (2006, p. 197) makes the following observation:

> Forty years ago, the study of discourse relations was confined to a few linguists, most of whom were working within the context of a particular functionally-based theory of language (tagmemic theory). Now, it would be almost impossible for any linguist of any persuasion, or, indeed, anyone whose discipline impacts in any way on information processing (natural or artificial), to avoid engaging in one way or another with issues associated with discourse relations.

Some aspects of research in the area of discourse analysis have clearly had an influence on the teaching of English to primary school students since the early 1990s, something that is evident in the success of books such as *Exploring how texts work* by

Fester, A. & Whaanga, H. (2007). Māori and English textbooks designed for language learners at intermediate level: A comparison in terms of the occurrence and use of insights gained from research on discourse analysis. *He Puna Kōrero: Journal of Māori and Pacific Development.* 8(1), 20–35. https://doi.org/10.15663/K10.14132

Derewianka (1990 [1994]) and *Context, text, grammar: Teaching the genres and grammar of school writing in infants and primary classrooms* by Knapp and Watkins (1994). Our particular interest is in the extent to which research on discourse analysis has influenced the teaching and learning of English and *te reo Māori*. With this in mind, we analysed a number of commercially available textbooks designed for learners of English and learners of *te reo Māori* at intermediate level, paying particular attention to the following areas of discourse analysis research: coherence, cohesion, discourse macro-patterning, discourse relations, genre and text-type.

Literature review

Discourse macro-patterning

In the early 1980s, linguists began to take an interest in the overall or global structuring or patterning of discourses. In some cases, the focus was on the type of discourse macro-patterning that is not specific to any particular genre or text-type (see, for example, van Dijk (1982) and Hoey (1983)); in others, the focus was on the relationship between overall discourse structure and genre or text-type (see, for example, Van Dijk (1982)).

Non-genre specific macro-patterning is approached in very different ways by van Dijk (1982) and Hoey (1983). Hoey's approach is to identify and label sections of text in terms of the overall function they perform in the discourse as a whole. Van Dijk aims to find precise ways of summarizing sections of a discourse that can be labelled in terms of their overall functioning in a discourse (van Dijk, 1982, p. 180).

Hoey refers to the functioning of text segments in relation to the discourse as a whole as the 'rhetorical organisation' of a text and focuses on rhetorical organisation that is not specific to particular genres or text-types. Thus, for example, he argues that *situation-problem-solution-evaluation* is a pattern that is found in a whole range of texts belonging to quite different genres. He identifies three overall rhetorical patterns that have been summarized by Houia-Roberts (2003, p. 80) as follows:

Table 1: **Rhetorical patterns identified by Hoey (1983)**

Label	Rhetorical Segments	Nuclear (obligatory) segments	Optional segments	Prototypical pattern	Note
PSn (Problem-Solution)	**S** (Situation) **P** (Problem: aspect of *situation* requiring a response) **Sn** (Solution/ Response to Situation) **Ev** (Evaluation of response)	**P** **Sn**	**S** **Ev**	**S-P-Sn-Ev**	All elements can appear more than once and the pattern can be varied by reordering, addition and conflation of segments.
Matching: (Matching compatibility OR Matching contrast)	**S** (segment) **CompS** (compatible segment); **S** (segment) **ContS** (contrasting segment)	**S** **CompS;** **S** **ContS**		**S-CompS;** **S-ContS**	
General-Particular (Generalization-example OR Preview-details)	**G** (generalization) **Ex** (example) OR **T** (topic) **R** (restriction) **I** (illustration) OR **P** (preview) **D** (details)	**G-Ex;** **T-R** OR **T-I;** **P-D**	**I** OR **R**		

Hoey examines a range of texts in terms of whether their rhetorical organisation is *linear* or *cyclic* and whether they involve *multilayering* (Hoey, 1983, pp. 82-96). A text is said to be *linear* where there is a straightforward progression from one discourse segment to the next and *cyclic* where earlier discourse segments are revisited or restated or further developed later in the text. Thus, for example, the *problem* section of a text may be repeated, restated or revisited at a later point in the text. A text is said to be *multilayered* when one or more text segments involves several parts. *Multilayering* can be *progressive* (involving, for example, a series of partial solutions or responses to a problem) or *spiral* (involving, for example, *repeated* attempts to respond to the same problem). Crombie and Houia (2001) and Houia-Roberts (2003, 2004a) have explored the relevance of Hoey's approach to the rhetorical organisation of texts written in te reo Māori.

With reference to discourse macro-patterning, Van Dijk distinguishes between *conventional superstructures* and *semantic macrostructure. Conventional superstructures* are defined as "conventionalized schemata, which provide the global 'form' for the macrostructural 'content' of a text" (van Dijk 1980, p. 127). These conventional superstructures "belong to our general knowledge of language and culture" and are "shared with other members of a community" (van Dijk 1977, p. 17). *Semantic macrostructures* are "semantic structures of discourse whose meaning and reference is defined in terms of their constituents' meanings" (van Dijk 1980, Preface). Thus, the conventional superstructure of a discourse (like Hoey's rhetorical structure) is its overall patterning, each discourse segment being labelled in a way that identifies its overall function in the discourse (e.g., *problem; solution*) whereas the *semantic macrostructure* is an outline of the core meaning of a discourse in summary form (that is, in the form of macro-propositions, each of which summarises one segment of the discourse). Van Dijk links the conventional superstructure of a discourse to its semantic macrostructure so that each part of the conventional superstructure is associated with one or more macro-propositions (parts of the summary). He also indicates that although particular discourse macro-patterns may be associated with particular types of text (such as, for example, scientific articles), others, such as, for example, *Introduction-Problem-Solution-Evaluation/Conclusion,* appear to have more general applicability.

As early as the 1960s, Longacre (1968) identified a range of genres associated with discourses in a number of Philippine languages. These included a *narrative genre* (recounting some sort of story) and a *procedural genre* (prescribing the steps of an activity or activity complex). He not only outlined their overall structuring or macro-patterning, but also defined them with reference to a range of functions and linguistic indicators. Thus, for example, he noted that the procedural genre involved chronological sequence in projected time and could be 1st, 2nd or 3rd person oriented. Although Longacre's focus was on discourses in a number of Philippine languages, he observed later (Longacre, 1972) that there were similarities between one of the patterns typical of a certain type of narrative discourse in the Philippines and a similar type found in Mexico and New Guinea and in some narratives written by English speakers. The pattern he identified is very similar to one of the macro-patterns that Van Dijk identified as being likely to have cross-cultural applicability: *Setting; Complication; Evaluation; Resolution; Moral; Coda*.

Research on discourse macro-patterning has a great deal to offer in relation to the teaching of languages, particularly, perhaps, in relation to the teaching of writing.

Discourse relations

Discourse relations (also referred to in the research literature as 'clause relations', 'deep structure relations', 'semantic relations', 'semantico-pragmatic relations', 'clause relations' and 'inter-propositional relations') are relationships of meaning that hold between propositions or groups of propositions. They are generally regarded as being universal or near universal, that is, as applying to all languages. However, there is, as yet, no overall agreement among researchers about the way in which these relations should be categorised. Thus, for example, Longacre (1972) proposed a model including ten 'deep structure relations' along with a number of varieties of each, but later (Longacre, 1996) revised the model to include twelve relations. Beekman and Callow (1974) proposed a model that included four relations involving propositional addition (*Chronological Sequence*; *Simultaneity*; *Alternation*; *Conversational Exchange*; *Matched Support*) and eighteen involving propositional support (*Manner*; *Comparison*; *Contrast*; *Equivalence*; *Generic-Specific*; *Amplification-Contraction/ Summary*; *Reason-Result*; *Means-Result*; *Means-Purpose*; *Condition-Consequence*; *Concession-Contraexpectation*; *Grounds-Conclusion*; *Time*; *Location*; *Circumstance*; *Identification*; *Comment*; *Content*). There are also differences in terms of the ways in which these relations are classified into types. Thus, for example, Hollenbach (1975) posits five relational category types (*Temporal*, *Causal*, *Logical*, *Equivalence* and *N-ary*) whereas both Crombie (1985a & b and 1987) and Kehler (2002) classify relations into three types (comparison and contrast, cause and effect and temporal/ spatial) based on types of cognitive process. A recent classification of discourse relations proposed by Whaanga (2006, pp. 206-207), which is based on a study that includes texts in te reo Māori, is outlined in *Table 2* below.

Table 2: **Classification of discourse relations by Whaanga (2006, pp. 207-208)**

Relational Types	Further categorisation of relational type	Relational varieties	Definitions	Examples
Temporal	Temporal	*Temporal Sequence*	Involves chronologically sequenced event propositions.	*He tidied up and then left the building site.*
		Temporal Overlap	Involves temporarily overlapping event propositions.	*As he was measuring the site, he slipped on the wet grass.*
Additive	Bonding	*Bonding* (including *Rhetorical Coupling*)	Involves non-comparative, non-contrastive, non-elective, non-causative propositional addition.	*He was wearing a rain cape and carrying a torch.*
Associative	Matching Compatibility	*Paraphrase*	Involves equivalence of propositional content.	*He began combat; he started to fight.*
		Statement-Affirmation	Involves affirmation of the truth or validity of the content of a proposition.	*He said that the explosion caused the collapse and I agree.*
		Simple Comparison	Involves comparison in respect of similarity.	*The leaders were afraid and so were their followers.*
		Exemplification	Involves an example of a general statement.	*Economic superiority does not guarantee victory. The defeat of the USA in the Vietnam war is just one example.*

Table 2 (continued): **Classification of discourse relations by Whaanga (2006, pp. 207-208)**

Relational Types	Further categorisation of relational type	Relational varieties	Definitions	Examples
Associative	Matching Contrast	*Simple Contrast*	Involves comparison in respect of difference.	*One structure was weak; the other was strong.*
		Statement-Denial	Involves denial of the truth or validity of a proposition.	*He said that the explosion caused the collapse but I disagree.*
		Denial-Correction	Involves the correction of some aspect of propositional content.	*It wasn't the heat that caused the cracks; it was the constant pressure of water.*
		Exception	Involves a general statement and an exception.	*All of the buildings leak except the one built by my company.*
		General-Particular	Involves content specification of a generic semantic predicator.	*Someone was responsible. It was the project manager.*
	Alternation	*Supplementary Alternation*	Involves a choice among non-contrasting alternatives.	*Nobody ordered the bricks or bought the roofing felt.*
		Contrastive Alternation	Involves a choice between/among contrasting alternatives.	*It will either survive the storm or it won't.*
Causal	Causality	*Reason-Result*	Involves the reason for a particular outcome.	*She built a new fence because the old one was damaged.*
		Grounds-Conclusion	Involves an outcome based on inference rather than observation.	*He was in charge of the project so he must have been the one who made the final decision.*
		Means-Result	Involves the means of achieving a particular outcome.	*By nailing the letter box to the fence, she was able to make it more secure.*
		Means-Purpose	Involves an action and its intended outcome.	*He added concrete to the mix in order to make it stronger.*
	Conditionality	*Realisable Condition*	Involves an outcome that is contingent on a realisable condition.	*If he leaves now, he'll get there in time for the meeting.*
		Unrealisable Condition	Involves an outcome that is contingent on an unrealisable condition.	*If it had been built differently, it wouldn't have collapsed.*
	Concession	*Concession-Contraexpectation*	Involves an actual effect which is contingent on the blockage or denial of a usually anticipated effect.	*Although both the design and the building were excellent, the client complained.*

Discourse relations can be encoded in languages in a range of different ways. Thus, the relation of Reason-Result can be signalled in English by, for example, subordinating conjunctions (e.g., *because, as, since, seeing (that)*), prepositions (e.g., *because of, due to, in view of, thanks to*), verbs (e.g., *cause, bring about, effect*) and nouns (e.g., *result, reason, consequence*), and in te reo Māori by, for example, subordinating conjunctions (e.g., *nō te mea; nā te mea; i te mea, inā*), sentence conjuncts (e.g., *nā reira; nō reira; nā wai*), prepositions (e.g., *nā, i, mō, mō runga, i runga, nā runga*) and nouns (e.g., *take*).

Discourse relations can play an important role in text construction (including paragraphing) and comprehension.

Coherence and cohesion

In order to understand the difference between coherence and cohesion, it is useful to make a distinction between *text* and *discourse*. We refer here to a *text* as a piece of spoken or written language that is bounded in some way. Thus, for example, a novel may be bounded by a book cover. The word 'text', as used here, includes only words that are actually spoken or written. The word 'discourse', as used here, refers to the interpretation of a text. In order to make sense of a text as coherent discourse, that is, in order to interpret it, we need to make a range of assumptions on the basis of

background knowledge and understanding, including, for example, our understanding of the context in which it is or was spoken or written and our knowledge or understanding of the topic or topics covered. In doing this, we make a range of inferences. For this reason, although we share the same text, we do not necessarily share the same discourse, that is, people may interpret texts in different ways. One of the things that helps us to gain a measure of shared understanding of texts is what we refer to as textual *cohesion*.

A text is *coherent* to the extent that it makes sense to us. A text is *cohesive* to the extent that it includes *cohesive devices*, that is, words, phrases, etc. that function to link its various parts together.

In interpreting a text, that is, in attempting to make sense of it as a piece of coherent discourse, we make use of our general understanding of the ways in which things and events in the world can be linked, something that is reflected in discourse relations (see above) and in the clues to making links between text segments that are included in the text itself. These clues include *cohesive devices*, that is words and phrases that tell us about the types of connection between different parts of a text that the speaker or writer intended. Cohesive devices include things like anaphoric pronouns, ellipsis, substitution and repetition (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). A text may be coherent (that is, it may make sense to us) even when it does not include cohesive devices. However, the presence of cohesive devices can help us to interpret a text. Thus, (1) below will be interpreted as coherent by most readers because they will assume that the two clauses are related in a Reason-Result relationship; (2) below will also be interpreted as being coherent. This time, however, readers are provided with a signal that confirms their interpretation in the form of the word 'because', a cohesive device (subordinating conjunction) that signals the fact that the content of the second clause should be interpreted as a reason for the content of the first.

(1) She left work early. Her father was ill.
(2) She left work early because her father was ill.

Coherence and cohesion have been studied extensively (see, for example, Crombie (1985a & b), Winter (1971, 1974, 1977, 1979, 1982, 1992, 1994), Halliday and Hasan (1976)), including a number of works that make specific reference to te reo Māori and to the relevance of research in this area to the teaching of language (Houia, 2001a & b), Houia-Roberts (2003, 2004a & b), Whaanga (2006)).

Genre and text-type

The term 'genre' is used here in the sense in which it is often used in the systemic-functional research tradition, that is, to refer to the primary communicative purpose of a written text, such as, *to instruct, to explain, to argue, to describe/classify, to recount*. The term 'text-type' is used here to refer to the ways in which texts are classified into types in particular societies. Thus, in common with, for example, Houia-Roberts (2003), we define genre here in terms of cognitive processes (e.g., *arguing* and *explaining*), and *text-types* in terms of social constructs (e.g. *information reports; whaikōrero*). Different genres are marked by the salience of particular types of cognitive process and discourse relations. For example, in the *recount genre*, the salient cognitive process is *temporal* and the salient discourse relations are *temporal sequence* and *temporal overlap*; in the *instruction genre*, the interaction of *temporal and causative cognitive processes* is salient and the salient discourse relations are *reason-result, means-purpose* and *temporal sequence*. It is important to note,

however, that a number of writers (see, for example, Biber (1989)), use these terms in the opposite sense. This is also common in the North American tradition where, in line with traditional usage (particularly in literary contexts), a number of academic researchers use the word 'genre' to refer to what is referred to here as 'text-type' and 'text-type' to refer to what are referred to here as 'genre'. In a recent article, Bruce 2005) attempts to resolve this problem by referring to 'cognitive genres' (e.g., *explanation* and *argument*) and 'social genres' (e.g., *novels* and *academic articles*) rather than to genre and text-type.

Drawing upon the work of Halliday (1985), Martin (1985), Martin & Rothery (1986), Christie (1989), Painter (1985), Kress (1982; 1985) and others, and also upon the expertise of experienced teachers, Derewianka (1994) provides an account of how the teaching of writing in primary schools can be related to an approach to the description of genres. In doing so, she examines the ways in which language functions to enable us to make sense of the world and fulfil real purposes such as arguing and sharing information (Derewianka, 1994, pp. 3-4). She also presents a methodology associated with a four-part curriculum cycle as follows: *preparation* (background information); *modelling* (presentation of a model text); *joint construction* (joint creation of a text); *independent construction* of a text (pp. 13-14). Derewianka outlines six genres (*recount, instruction, exposition/argument, narrative, report* and *explanation*), associating each with structural elements and typical linguistic features. In summarising Derewianka's approach to *recount* (see *Table 3*), Houia-Roberts (2004, p. 69) notes that "some of the language features to which reference is made appear to be consequences of an overall orientation towards *chronological sequence* and *temporal overlap* (i.e., action verbs and linking items to do with time), whereas others (e.g., use of simple past tense) appear to be consequences of the relationship between the temporal positioning of the narrator in relation to that of the events",. She also notes that "certain types of propositional relationship (e.g., *chronological sequence*) . . . have implications in terms of linguistic choice or, more specifically, in terms of a specific linguistic range from which choices may be made" (p. 70).

Table 3: **A summary of recount genre according to Derewianka (1994, p. 15)**[1]

RECOUNT GENRE		
Recount genre: unfolding a sequence of events over time		
Purpose: to tell what happened		
TEXT ORGANIZATION		
Orientation: background information (generally at the beginning): *who*, *where*, *when* **Series of Events** ordered in chronological sequence **In addition** there may be personal comment at various stages		
LANGUAGE FEATURE CHARACTERISTICS		
Participants: specific (e.g. 'our dog') **Tense:** simple past tense **Verbs:** action **Linking items:** temporal ('then', 'at the same time' etc.)		
TYPES OF RECOUNT AND CHARACTERISTIC LANGUAGE USE		
PERSONAL: retelling an activity the writer was personally involved in **1st person pronouns**	**FACTUAL:** recording the particulars of an incident (e.g. news report) **3rd person pronouns** **Passive voice**	**IMAGINATIVE:** taking on an imaginary role and giving details of events **Usually in 1st person**

Another approach to teaching writing in relation to genre that has been influential in schools is that of Knapp and Watkins (1994) who propose, drawing on the social semiotics of Kress (1988) and Martin and Rothery (1986), a model based on social

aspects of literacy in which genre is seen as a process and text-type as a product and in which there is explicit recognition of the multi-generic nature of texts.

Houia-Roberts (2004a, p. 62) notes that "[the] mastery of genre . . . and corresponding text-types . . . is important for academic success" and that "[such] mastery is an important aspect of discourse competence and extends language learning beyond sentence boundaries".

The textbooks analysed and the analytical framework

Textbooks at intermediate level relating to the teaching of English and te reo Māori were analysed in terms of the extent to which they could be shown to have been influenced by specific aspects of discourse analysis research. Although each of the four textbooks analysed was published in a different year, all of them first appeared at a point when there was already a considerable body of research on all of the aspects of discourse analysis that are taken into account in the textbook analysis.

The English textbooks analysed were from the *Headway* series (Soars & Soars, 1998) and the *Landmark* series (Haines & Stewart, 2000). The *Headway* series has five levels (from beginner to advanced); the *Landmark* series has two levels (intermediate and upper-intermediate). In each case, the intermediate level textbook was the one analysed.[2]

The *te reo Māori* textbooks analysed are from the *Te Whanake* (The Upward Growth) series (Moorfield, 2001a & b; 2003; 2004) and the *Te Ia reo* (The Current of Language) series (Cormack & Cormack, 1995b; 1996; 1998). In the case of *Te Whanake*, the textbook analysed, *Te Pihinga* (The Seedling) (2001b) is the second of five in the series.[3] In the case of *Te la reo,* the textbook analysed is *Te Pūkaki* (The Stream) (1996b), the second of four in the series.[3, 4] The writers of neither *Te Whanake* nor *Te Ia reo* link any of the books in the series specifically to intermediate level. However, since discourse analysis research might be expected to have an influence at every level, this is not a major problem.

Each of the textbooks was analysed in terms of the extent to which there was evidence that account had been taken of the relevance to the teaching and learning of language of each of the following:

- *Discourse macropatterning* (i.e., the overall rhetorical structuring of texts in terms of the functions performed in relation to the text as a whole by different sections of the text (e.g., *situation- problem – solution- evaluation*);
- *Genre and text-type* (that is, the range of different genres (e.g., (*recount, instruction, exposition/argument, narrative, report and explanation*) and the language characteristically associated with each, as well as characteristic features of text-types such as *personal letters, advertisements, menus,* etc.)
- *Discourse relations* (i.e., the internal patterning of texts in terms of relationships (such as *Reason-Result*) between text segments);
- *Coherence and cohesion* (i.e., the ways in which discourse relations contribute to the construction and interpretation of coherent texts, and the ways in which discourse relations can be signalled by the presence of cohesive devices, including, for example, conjunctions such as 'because' or 'nō te mea'.

Findings

Discourse maropatterning

None of the four textbooks analysed includes any indication that their authors have taken advantage of the potential of research on discourse macropatterning in relation to the teaching of text construction and comprehension. There is, however, in *Headway Intermediate* (*Chapter 9*), an exercise that includes reorganising information so as to produce a complete paragraph. This indicates an awareness of the fact that the organisation of text at a higher level than that of the sentence is important, particularly as the exercise necessarily involves students in taking account of cohesive devices. Even so, neither cohesion, nor the discourse relations that underlie it, is introduced. Another exercise in the same book (*Chapter 10*), in which learners are asked to consider appropriate beginnings and endings of letters, indicates an awareness of the importance of the structuring of different types of text. However, with these two exceptions (which cannot be said to do more than signal that there is some awareness of the value of taking account of supra-sentential organisation), there is nothing that relates to the overall patterning of discourse in this book. *Landmark Intermediate Student's book* is equally absent of any clear approach to discourse macropatterning. There is (*Chapter 7*) an exercise in which students are asked to identify complete and incomplete short stories and to organise information to create a short story. However, this is not accompanied by an introduction to the organisational and linguistic characteristics of the recount genre, let alone by any indication of typical macropatterning. Neither of the *te reo Māori* textbooks includes any indication that textual organization (macropatterning) has been taken into account.

Genre

None of the textbooks introduces a range of genres. In *Headway Intermediate*, the texts and text segments introduced in ten of the twelve units involve *personal recount*. In *Landmark Intermediate*, personal recounts appear in more than half of the units. The recounts involve (in terms of text-types), short stories and letters. However, neither the discourse relations that characterise recount are discussed, nor are the characteristic linguistic features of recount. Both also include some references to *description* (which, along with classification) is discussed under the heading of *Information report* by Derewianka (1994, p. 52). However, once again, the characteristic features of *description* are not discussed, the focus being on aspects of the grammar of comparison and contrast only. In one section in *Landmark Intermediate* (*Unit 2*), the *instruction* genre appears in the form of a recipe where students have to fill in gaps in a text. This requires them to use imperatives such as *bake, stir,* and *fry*. However, this is an isolated exercise. Students are not required to engage in exercises or activities relating to the instruction genre at any point later in the unit. Overall, although two different genres appear in *Headway Intermediate* and four in *Landmark Intermediate*, there is little evidence in the English textbooks of an awareness of the characteristic features of these genres (in terms, for example, of discourse relations) or of the potential relevance of these characteristic features to the teaching and learning of English.

Both of the *te reo Māori* textbooks examined contain examples of texts that focus on the genre of *personal recount*. Also, in both cases, there are texts focusing on *description*. However, although the texts that occur in these textbooks include this genre, there is little reference in either of the books to characteristic features of the genre. Thus, for example, in *Unit 2* of *Te Pihinga,* which includes sample texts that

involve description, there is, apart from a long list of adjectives, nothing that makes specific reference to the genre. Furthermore, although it is presented within the context of a section apparently dealing with *description*, one of the texts is a *recount* (which includes some description). Thus, although recount and description characterise some of the texts that occur in this textbook, there is no focus on either mono-generic texts *as such* or bi-generic or multi-generic (blended) text *as such*. In *Te Pūkaki*, *personal recount* and *description* are largely embedded in artificial dialogues that include a context setting introduction. As in the case of *Te Pihinga*, there is no guidance on what characterises different genres.

Text types

The English textbooks focus on a very restricted range of text-types. In fact, personal letters and short stories are the main text-type focus in both. There are no examples of menus, advertisements, catalogues, entertainment guides, film reviews, flyers, etc. Furthermore, the potential of reading texts to provide models for students' writing remains largely unexploited for two reasons. First, there is no clear indication of what features are characteristic of the text-types that are included (typical organisational patterns, for example). Secondly, reading and writing tasks within the same unit may involve different text-types. Thus, for example, in *Unit 6* of *Landmark Intermediate*, the text for reading is a story, but the students are asked to write a letter to a friend. Thus, the opportunity to help students to identify and use characteristic features of recount is not exploited. In *Headway Intermediate*, there is a reading task involving an interview in *Unit 5*. However, the writing task in that unit involves form filling. Although *Landmark Intermediate* is more consistent in maintaining a link between the text-types in reading sections and in writing sections of the same unit (e.g., both the reading and writing sections of *Unit 2* involve a recipe), the potential of the model texts introduced in reading sections for providing guidance on the construction of written texts is nowhere fully exploited.

Very few texts exhibiting written text-types are included in *Te Pūkaki.* All of the texts are dialogues (available in spoken form on CD and in written form in the textbook). These dialogues generally begin with a context setting introduction and include personal recount. Overall, they lack authenticity as dialogue, often including long segments by a single speaker that have little communicative function in terms of the dialogue as a whole. They appear, in fact, to be little more than vehicles for grammatical constructions and vocabulary that become the focus for later decontextualized exercises. In *Te Pihinga,* there are also many examples of dialogues. Once again, their primary function appears to be the introduction of grammatical structures (often several different ones). There are also examples of letters, postcards, information brochures and story telling. The focus, however, is simply on comprehension (relating to a series of comprehension questions) rather than on the *characteristic* organisational structures of these text-types or their *characteristic* linguistic usages. For example, in *Chapter Five* a series of letters is provided and students are invited to write a letter of their own, using them as models. However, except for the instruction that they should use the letters as models, the students are given no guidance about letter writing. Furthermore, each of the letters is different in terms of the occurrence of different genres.

Coherence, cohesion and discourse relations

In neither *Headway Intermediate* nor *Landmark Intermediate* is there any genuine focus on discourse coherence. The exercises in these textbooks generally focus on discrete grammar points, with the students often being expected to fill in gaps in lists of unrelated sentences that may not even bear any relation to the unit topic. Thus, for example, although students may be asked to fill in gaps in sentences in which conditions or reasons appear in subordinate clauses by inserting an appropriate subordinating conjunction (*if/ because*), the significance of the fact that these sentences involve binary values (i.e., condition *and* consequence; reason *and* result) is never the focus of attention, nor is students' attention ever directed towards the fact that sentences that are very different syntactically may be alike in terms of discourse relations. Thus, for example, *because* (subordinating conjunction) and *because of* (preposition) are cohesive devices that signal the presence of the same relation (*Reason-Result*): *He left because it was raining/ He left because of the rain*. Of course, this relation can also be signalled by many other cohesive devices, including the nouns *reason* and *result*: *The reason he left was that it rained*; *It rained. The result was that he left.* This is equally true of other discourse relations. However, neither of the English textbooks examined makes any reference to this, maintaining a focus that is primarily grammatical in orientation. A discourse focus would necessarily give equal weight to the role that grammar and lexis play in highlighting discourse relations and, therefore, in guiding interpretation and aiding text construction. Even so, both English textbooks deal with *temporal sequence*, *temporal overlap* and *contrast* and *comparison* in several units. However, these are generally dealt with in relation to text segments rather than in relation to complete texts, and the focus remains largely (as in traditional grammars) on grammatical signals. Thus, for example, as in the case of Haines and Stewart (2000, p. 10), comparative adjectives are far more likely to be given attention than other ways of expressing relations involving *Simple Comparison or Simple Contrast*. Furthermore, exercises that clearly involve discourse relations sometimes appear to occur randomly, bearing no obvious connection with the remainder of the topic content. Thus, for example, in *Headway Intermediate* (p.8), students are asked to correct sentences. One of them involves *Statement-Denial* and *Denial-Correction*. However, this particular relational combination occurs nowhere else in the unit and is not reinforced in any way.

In both *Te Pihinga* and *Te Pūkaki*, text and discourse construction and comprehension are treated, as in the case of the English textbooks, largely from a grammatical perspective. Thus, for example, there are numerous sections in *Te Pihanga* (see *Chapters 4, 6* and *7*) in which markers of temporal and causative relations are introduced largely from a grammatical perspective. Thus, for example, Moorfield (2001b, pp. 123 – 124) notes that "words formed by adding the derived noun ending [nominalisations] are used with **nō** to form a sentence pattern which translates as 'when' in English", adding that "[this] sentence pattern is used for past time". He then provides the following four examples with translations (p. 124) [underlining in the original]:

<u>Nō te tīmatanga</u> ki te ua, <u>ka</u> hoki rātou ki roto.	When it began to rain, they went back inside
<u>Nō te matenga</u> o te kuia, ka whakatūria he tēneti.	When the elderly lady died, a tent was erected.

Nō te haerenga o Te Hira ki te tūranga hou, ka whakatūria a Wiki hei tumuaki.	When te Hira went to the new position, Wiki was promoted to be the head.
Nō tōna putanga mai, ka kihia ia e ōna whnaunga.	When she appeared, she was kissed by her relations.

He then provides two examples where "the **nō** at the start of the sentence may be replaced by **ī** without altering the meaning" [bold in original] (p. 124) and two different examples where "this pattern is used without the derived noun ending being added" (p. 124). As the two examples below demonstrate, we no longer simply involve *Temporal Sequence*. Both of these examples include Reason-Result, something to which reference is not made in the explanation:

I te whakatakariri o te koroua, ka oma ngā tamariki whakatoi.	Because the elderly man was angry, the cheeky children ran off.
I te koretake o Mere ki te pūkana, ka tonoa ia ki muri.	Because Mary was so hopeless at doing the **pūkana** she was sent to the back.

Conclusion

There is very little evidence in any of the four textbooks analysed here of any real awareness of the importance of introducing language learners to aspects of discourse construction and comprehension other than those that involve sentence grammar. None of the textbooks introduces learners to discourse macropatterning. The range of genres in the textbooks is extremely limited, with over half of the texts in the English textbooks involving recount and with most of the texts in the Māori textbooks being in the form of dialogues in which description and recount sometimes occur. At no point in any of the four textbooks is there a genuine focus on characteristic discourse features of different genres. The range of text-types in all four textbooks is also limited, with the English textbooks focusing on personal letters and short stories and the Māori textbooks focusing on dialogues whose primary function appears to be to act as vehicles for the introduction of new vocabulary and new grammatical constructions. Coherence and discourse relations are largely neglected in all of the textbooks although each of them does focus from time to time on one aspect of cohesion, that is, the grammatical signalling of relations. However, the relations themselves are not introduced, the result being that these signals are treated simply at the clause level, as signals of, for example, various types of subordinate clause. On the basis of these findings, it seems reasonable to speculate that it may be some time before insights gained from research in the area of discourse analysis are adequately reflected in textbooks designed for language learners.

Endnotes

1. *Table 3* is reprinted from Houia-Roberts (2004a, p. 69).

2. *Headway Intermediate* consists of a student's book (12 units, each with a different topic), a teacher's book, a workbook and supplementary resources, including cassette tapes or CDs (to accompany the student's book and the workbook), a pronunciation course with cassette or CD, a video with an activity book and online interactive exercises. It is part of a general English course that is described by the authors as being suitable for adults, including young adults. The first unit (organized in a similar way to the other units) includes a range of language points. At the end of the twelve units, there is a language commentary section (including explanation of the language points covered in each unit), tapescripts (relating to the content of the audiotapes accompanying each unit) and the answers to the exercises. The Landmark Intermediate student's book is also composed of 12 units with each unit having a different thematic focus. In addition to this, there is also a teacher's book, a workbook and two cassettes with the audiotapes for each of the units. The Landmark series has two levels only; namely; an Intermediate and Upper- Intermediate. The authors recommend the books for adults and young adults. Typically, one unit covers a number of different discrete grammar points. For example, in Unit 1, there are three points being focused on, and they are 'frequency expressions with the present simple', the 'present perfect simple' and 'adverbs'.

3. *Te Whanake* ('The Growth') is designed primarily for teenagers and adults. The first three levels consist of a textbook, a workbook and a teachers' book; the fourth level has a textbook only. Supplementary resources include audiotapes/CDs, videotapes. A Māori-English, English-Māori dictionary and index (Moorfield, 2005) are available. *Te Pihinga* is intended for lower intermediate-level students (Moorfield, 2001b, 2003; Moorfield & University of Waikato, 2003). It "develops language to describe objects, animals, people, sounds, illnesses, feelings, the weather, places, colours and the landscape", and includes "giving directions, letter writing, travel, going to the beach, native birds, expressing feelings and computers" (Moorfield, 2006a). It has nine chapters, each of which "focuses on one main area of language" Moorfield (2006b), each of which includes dialogues or texts, explanation (with examples) of new grammar and usage in the dialogues/ texts, additional vocabulary, listening and speaking exercises (using audio- and videotapes and CDs) and writing, reading and speaking activities (Moorfield, 2006b).

3. The final book in the series has not yet been published.

4. *Te Ia Reo* is primarily designed for secondary school students in Years 9 – 13 (aged around 9 – 13). However, the authors note that it could also be used with senior primary school students and with adults in tertiary institutions. At each level, there is a textbook, a workbook and a teachers' book. Supplementary resources include audiotapes, photocopy masters, readers and videotapes. *Te Pūkaki* has five main chapters (*Ngā Tākaro* (Games); *Ngā Kai* (Foods), *Ngā mahi i te Kāinga* (Jobs at Home), *Te Tūtaki Tangata* (Meeting People); and *Ngā Haere Whakangahau* (Trips)). It also has two additional chapters which "revise all the structures and most of the vocabulary of the [pervious] chapters" (Cormack & Cormack, 1995a, p. 5). In each of the first five chapters, new structures are introduced and are followed by "basic exercises for working through the teaching point" (pp. 5-6). Each chapter has an introductory passage *(He Kōrero Tīmatanga*) which is said to contain "most of the *anga* (structures) and *kupu* (vocabulary) that are used in the chapter" (p. 15).

References

Beekman, J., & Callow, J. (1974). *Translating the word of God: With scripture and topical indexes*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.

Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruce , I. (2005). Syllabus design for general EAP courses: A cognitive approach. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *4*(3), 239-256.

Christie, F. (1989). Genres in writing. In *Writing in schools: Study guide* (pp. 3-49). Victoria (Australia): Deakin University Press.

Cormack, I., & Cormack, S. (1995a). *Te mātāpuna: He aratohu whakaako*. Tāmaki-makau-rau: New House.

Cormack, I., & Cormack, S. (1995b). *Te mātāpuna: He pukapuka mahi*. Tāmaki-makau-rau: New House.

Cormack, I., & Cormack, S. (1996). *Te pūkaki: He pukapuka mahi*. Tāmaki-makau-rau: New House.

Cormack, I., & Cormack, S. (1998). *Te awa rere: He pukapuka mahi*. Tāmaki-makau-rau: New House.

Crombie, W. (1985a). *Discourse and language learning: A relational approach to syllabus design.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crombie, W. (1985b). *Process and relation in discourse and language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crombie, W. (1987). *Free verse and prose style*. London & New York: Croom Helm.

Crombie, W., & Houia, W. (2001). The rhetorical organization of Māori discourse: An illustration. *Journal of Maori and Pacific Development, 2*(1), 32-49.

Derewianka, B. (1990/[1994]). *Exploring how texts work.* Victoria, (Australia): Australian Print Group.

Haines,S., & Stewart, B. (2000). *Landmark intermediate student's book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *Spoken and written language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoey, M. (1983). *On the surface of discourse.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Hollenbach, B. (1975). Discourse structure, interpropositional relations, and translation. *Notes on Translation, 1*(56), 2-21.

Houia, W. (2001a). *Inter-propositional semantic relations and semantic relational encoding in written discourse in Māori: an investigation.* Unpublished M.Phil., The University of Waikato, Hamilton.

Houia, W. (2001b). Looking at relationships between propositions in Māori language. *Journal of Maori and Pacific Development, 2*(2), 39-56.

Houia-Roberts, N. (2003). Genre and authentic written discourse in Māori and their relevance to the education of students in upper secondary and tertiary Māori-medium educational settings. *Journal of Maori and Pacific Development, 4*(2), 65-99.

Houia-Roberts, N. (2004a). An analysis of the rhetorical organisation of selected authentic Māori texts belonging to the text-types *argument* and *information report*. *Journal of Maori and Pacific Development, 5*(1), 2-34.

Houia-Roberts, N. (2004b). *An examination of genres and text-types in written Māori discourse: Analysis and pedagogic implications.* Unpublished Ph.D. (Applied linguistics), University of Waikato, Hamilton.

Kehler, A. (2002). *Coherence, reference and the theory of grammar.* Stanford, U.S.: Centre for the Study of Language and Information.

Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (1994). *Context, text, grammar: Teaching the genres and grammar of school writing in infants and primary classrooms.* Sydney: Text Productions.

Kress, G. (1982). *Learning to write.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Kress, G. (1985). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice*. Geelong: Deakin University.

Kress, G. (1988). Towards a social theory of genre. *Southern Review, 21*, 215-243.

Longacre, R. E. (1968). *Discourse, paragraph, and sentence structure in selected Philippine Languages: Volume 1: Discourse and paragraph structure* (No. Final Report: Contract No. 0-8-062838-0391). Santa Ana, California: The Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Longacre, R. E. (1972). *Hierarchy and universality in discourse constituents in New Guinea languages: Discussion*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Longacre, R. E. (1996). *The grammar of discourse* (2nd. ed.). New York: Plenum Press.

Martin, J. R. (1985). *Factual writing: Exploring and challenging social reality.* Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Martin, J. R., & Rothery, J. (1986). What a functional approach to the writing task can show about 'good writing'. In B. Couture (Ed.), *Functional approaches to writing* (pp. 241-262). Norwood: N.J. Ablex.

Moorfield, J. C. (2001a). *Te kākano* (2nd ed.). Auckland: Longman/Pearson Education New Zealand.

Moorfield, J. C. (2001b). *Te pihinga* (2nd ed.). Auckland, N.Z.: Longman/Pearson Education New Zealand.

Moorfield, J. C. (2003). *Te māhuri* (2nd ed.). Auckland: Longman/Pearson Education New Zealand.

Moorfield, J. C. (2004). *Te kōhure* (2nd ed.). Auckland, N.Z.: Longman/Pearson Education New Zealand.

Moorfield, J. C. (2005). *Te aka: Maori-English, English-Maori dictionary and index*. Auckland, N.Z.: Longman/Pearson Education New Zealand.

Moorfield, J. C. (2006a). Te pihinga. Retrieved 1 December, 2006, from http://www.tewhanake.maori.nz/textbooks/tepihinga.cfm

Moorfield, J. C. (2006b). Textbooks. Retrieved 1 December, 2006, from http://www.tewhanake.maori.nz/textbooks/

Moorfield, J. C., & University of Waikato. (2003). *Te pihinga: Pukapuka ārahi i te kaiwhakaako* (2nd ed.). Kirikiriroa, Aotearoa: Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato.

Painter, C. (1985). *Learning the mother tongue.* Victoria, (Australia): Deakin University Press.

Soars, L., & Soars, J. (1998). *Headway intermediate student's book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Dijk, T. A. (1977). Semantic Macro-structures and knowledge frames in discourse comprehension. In M. A. Just & P. A. Carpenter (Eds.), *Cognitive Processes in Comprehension* (pp. 3 – 32). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures, discourse interaction and cognition.* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

van Dijk, T. A. (1982). *Some aspects of text grammars: A study in theoretical poetics and linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton.

Whaanga, J. P. (2006). *Case roles/ relations and discourse relations: A Māori language-based perspective.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of Waikato, Hamilton.

Winter, E. O. (1971). Connection in science material: A proposition about semantics of clause relations. In *Centre for Information on Language Teaching papers and*

reports (Vol. 7, pp. 41-52). London: Centre for Information and Research for British Association for Applied Linguistics.

Winter, E. O. (1974). *Replacement as a function of repetition: A study of its principal features in the clause relations of contemporary English.* Unpublished Ph.D., University of London, London.

Winter, E. O. (1977). A clause-relational approach to English texts: A study of some predictive lexical items in written discourse. *Instructional Science, 6*(1), 1-92.

Winter, E. O. (1979). Replacement as a fundamental function of the sentence in context. *Forum Linguisticum, 4*(2), 93-133.

Winter, E. O. (1982). *Towards a contexual grammar of English.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Winter, E. O. (1992). The notion of unspecific verses specific as a way of analysing the information of a fund-raising letter. In W. C. Mann & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Discourse description: Diverse linguistic analyses of a fund-raising text* (pp. 131-170). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Winter, E. O. (1994). Clause relations as information structure: two basic text structures in English. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in written text analysis* (pp. 46-68). London; New York: Routledge.