Genre and authentic written discourse in Māori and their relevance to the education of students in upper secondary and tertiary Māori -medium educational settings

Ngaere Houia-Roberts

Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato (University of Waikato)

[nroberts@waikato.ac.nz]

Abstract

I report here on part of a research project whose primary aim was to investigate a range of authentic Māori texts in terms of the search for commonly occurring organisational and cognitive patterns, and to consider the pedagogic implications of this investigation in terms of the teaching of writing skills in Māori-medium educational settings. An examination of a range of text segments written by educated and highly proficient users of Māori suggests that, in terms of textual relationships, there are characteristic patterns of organisation that characterise the three genres that appear to be most commonly required of student writers in Māori-medium upper secondary and tertiary educational contexts, that is, the genres of *arguing, explaining* and *describing*. Another part of the project – an examination of whole texts in terms of overall, structuring – is reported in the next issue of this journal.

Introduction

Academic discourse involves "peculiar ways of knowing, selecting, evaluating, reporting, concluding, and arguing" (Bartholomae, 1986, p. 4), and instruction in academic discourse is intended to prepare students to "gradually enter the community of 'knowers' while retaining their own voice in the process" (Spellmeyer, 1989, p. 274). Coming to terms with the technical aspects of writing is only one aspect of the process of learning to write. Also involved is learning to structure information and ideas in ways that reflect the differing demands of different social and cultural contexts. Learning to write in educational contexts is, therefore, part of the process of socialisation into academic and work practices, part of what is required for subject understanding:

> Writing structures our relations with others and organises our perceptions of the world. By studying texts within their contexts, we study as well the dynamics of context building (Bazerman & Paradis, 1991, p. 3).

Students who are learning Māori and learning through the medium of Māori in secondary and tertiary educational contexts need to be able to create and interpret texts in Māori in a wide range of academic contexts. It is generally accepted that this involves coming to terms with technical aspects of the language. What appears to be less widely understood is the fact that it also involves coming to terms with universal processes, as well as with culturally and linguistically specific aspects of text construction and comprehension. If we are to assist learners, we need a clear understanding of the nature of the tasks required of them and what is required in order to perform these tasks.

In order that students should learn to function as effective writers in Māori-medium academic contexts, they need to understand how the requirements that operate in these contexts relate to the world of writing beyond the academy. If our students are to

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. *He Puna Kōrero: Journal of Māori and Pacific Development.* 4(2), 65–99.
https://doi.org/10.15663/K10.14064

have models, these models should be based not on English, but on authentic texts written by educated Māori writers who are highly proficient in the use of the language. Appropriate models – models that are embedded in the target culture - are important because, as Kress (1985, p. 49) reminds us: "Every text contracts . . . relations of INTER-TEXTUALITY with a vast network of other texts". Appropriate models can be liberating in that they provide an authentic cultural resource as a starting point for the exploration of new possibilities and individual creativity. In this way, students and teachers can be empowered "to transform the academy" (Sommers, 1992, p. 30). Thus, although Cope and Kalantzis (1993, p. 245) argue that "learning [should not be] a matter of duplication of a standard form, but mastery of a tool which encourages development and change", a good *starting-point* is to examine authentic models of good writing.

The concepts of 'genre' and 'text-type' are fundamental to the research reported here. Therefore, my first task was to critically review international research literature on genre and text-type with a view to determining its relevance to the analysis of written discourse in *te reo Māori*. The second task was to examine the type of writing tasks typically required of students in Māori-medium settings at upper secondary and tertiary levels. The third task was to establish a model for the analysis of authentic texts exhibiting these genres and text-types and to apply that model to the analysis of texts and text-segments written by educated and highly competent users of the language. The aim of this part of the research was to determine how educated native speakers of Māori approach writing tasks that are similar in nature to those undertaken by students in the upper years of schooling and in tertiary education settings. The final task was to determine how, in the context of Māori-medium education settings, we make use of the knowledge and understanding gained from the analysis of the writings of educated native speakers of Māori.

The use of the terms 'genre' and 'text-type'

There is considerable disagreement in the research literature in relation to how the terms 'genre' and 'text-type' should be used. For Biber (1989), for example, the term 'genre' can most appropriately be used to characterise whole texts on the basis of external criteria, such as, for example, audience and context. From this perspective, research reports and lectures would be examples of different genres. The term 'text-type', on the other hand, would be defined in terms of overall rhetorical function and internal structure. Thus, for example, arguments and expositions would represent different text-types, differences which could be characterised by differences in internal patterning. Here, however, the terms 'genre' and 'text-type' are used differently. *Genres*, which are the focus of attention in this paper, are defined here in terms of cognitive processes (e.g. *arguing* and *explaining*), and *text-types,* which are the focus of a paper which will appear in the next issue of this journal, are defined in terms of social constructs (e.g. *information reports*).

A critical review of some landmark publications on genre

The concept of 'genre' has been studied in many different ways and within the context of a wide range of academic disciplines. It is a concept that can be traced back at least as far as the work of Aristotle (384-322 B.C.). In most early studies, the term 'genre' was used with reference to classifications of texts into categories such as speeches, poems or biographies, categories that were generally defined in terms of socio-cultural factors and/or linguistic/structural ones. More recently, however, the term 'genre' has often been restricted to classifications that could be said to be based

largely on overall discourse function (e.g. *narration, exposition*), with the term 'text-type' being reserved for classifications that could be said to be based largely on overall socio-cultural function (e.g. *novel, poem*).

In order to appreciate the ways in which approaches to genre and text-type have changed and developed over time, it can be useful, as, for example, Paltridge (1997) has done, to attempt to classify them in relation to theoretical positioning and/or discipline orientation. Inevitably, however, there are many works that can be categorised in a range of different ways.

The first two sections, below, focus on approaches to genre that relate to literary works and folklore. The next section examines approaches that focus on every-day conversational interaction. The emphasis then moves to works that are concerned primarily with rhetoric and effective debate, and 'new rhetoric' and composition studies. The next section examines works that focus on the teaching of English for specific purposes. Reference is then made to work that can be related – directly or indirectly – to the systemic-functional approach to language analysis. Finally, in preparation for the outline of the analytical model used here, there is a consideration of cross-generic approaches to discourse patterning.

In general, there is a detectable movement in the twentieth century from research that seeks to describe genre in terms of rules of various kinds to research that emphasises the importance of context and allows for considerable variation, variation that is, nevertheless, constrained by a range of social and cultural factors. This movement reflects a general movement in intellectual endeavour in the twentieth century: a movement from structuralism (with its emphasis on rules) towards post-structuralist thinking (which emphasises procedures and choices). However, the relative weight given to one or the other (rule-governed behaviour versus culturally and socially constrained behaviour) seems to depend not just on the era when research was conducted, but also on the overall purpose and setting of the investigation. Thus, an emphasis on pedagogic applications of studies of genre is likely to lead researchers to search for regularities that can be described in ways that are susceptible to imitation. This may mean that realisations that are regarded as stereotypical are highlighted.

Genre, text-type and literary theory

Approaches to genre within literary theory have changed significantly over the years. What is most evident prior to the twentieth century is a circular movement where genres have at times been seen as fixed or relatively fixed, at other times as relatively free.

Influenced by the work of Aristotle, many literary analysts initially classified literary works into socio-culturally determined categories (often referred to as 'genres' in English), seeking to determine whether works belonging to each of these categories shared features relating to content, structure and/or language which, in combination, could be related to a concept of stylistic appropriateness (Dubrow, 1982, p. 48).[1] With the Renaissance, however, came considerable questioning in England of the notion that there were a fixed number of genres that obeyed strict rules. This was followed by the neo-classical period in which there was a return to the notion that there were fixed norms which determined appropriate writing within specified genres. The Romantic era once again saw a reversal. Not only was there a rejection of the notion that genres were fixed, but there was also questioning of whether the concept

of genre was a useful one at all. The Victorian era saw a return to the notion of genre as essentially rule-governed, although Arnold's influential work, *On the Classical Tradition* (1960), gives some indication that a moderate degree of flexibility was regarded as acceptable.

In the twentieth century, influenced by structuralism within linguistics and anthropology, literary approaches to genre were initially characterised by the search for rules and regularities. Here, the influence of Levi-Strauss ([1966]/1983) and Propp ([1928]/1969) seems to have been particularly significant. With the development within literary studies of 'new criticism' or 'practical criticism', where the focus was on language and the structural analysis of literary works, there was a return to approaches to genre in which socio-culturally determined categories (e.g. *the novel; the poem*) rather than categories defined in terms of overall communicative purposes (e.g. *narration; exposition*) were the centre of attention. The emphasis at this point was on attempting to identify characteristic linguistic features of literary text-types such as poems rather than characteristic features of discourse processes such as narration.

The 'structural era' involved a search for general laws and rules. Gradually, however, there came the realisation that there was a great deal of difference and divergence in works that appeared to belong to the same general type. By the 1960s, critics such as Croce (1968) were arguing that every genre 'breaks generic laws' (Dubrow, 1982, p. 4).[2] Indeed, poststructuralists such as Derrida (1980) argued that genres merge into one another. As the twentieth century progressed, literary approaches to genre began to reflect a general intellectual movement that emphasised procedures and choices and that was more accommodating to difference and flexibility. Here, relationships began to be sought between genres and constructs such as gender, literacy and power. In this area, the works of Barthes ([1966]/1977) and Derrida ([1967]/1978) were particularly influential. Out of these developments have emerged critical approaches to discourse that explore the construction and reflection in text of a range of ideological positions (e.g. Kress, 1990; van Dijk, 1993; Fairclough, 1995).

Related to research that explores the relationship between genre and ideology are reader-oriented approaches, including the reception theory of Jauss ([1974]/1982), in which the contribution made by the reader in interpreting text is regarded as central. Important works in this area are those of Iser (1978), who makes a distinction between the 'implied reader' and the 'actual reader' of a text.

What is central to much of the recent work on genre within literary theory is the view that texts are not "self-contained units whose meaning could be established independently of context" (Lechte, 1994, pp. 10-11). Within this framework, the work of the Russian theorist Lotman is particularly significant. Lotman (1977) draws attention to the way in which texts communicate culture and link the past with the present. Genres, therefore, are defined not only in terms of structural features, but also in terms of social and cultural expectations. In all of this work, the concept of 'intertextuality' is central, that is, the notion that a text is not read as an object in its own right, but is interpreted in relation to our expectations and our experience of other texts.

Overall, the approach to genre within literary studies now seems to be one which rejects any notion of rigid and fixed boundaries and which stresses that viewing

genres too deterministically leads to an over-simplification of reader and listener responses to them. Fowler, for example, in line with the work of Wittgenstein (1953), argues that genres may be regarded as similar to family members in that although they have a lot in common, there is no one single feature that will identify them as belonging to a particular family (Fowler, 1982, p. 41). As Fishelov observes, generic conventions may be regarded "as a challenge, or a horizon, against which the writer and . . . readers have to define themselves" (Fishelov, 1993, p. 82). Thus writers may stretch the boundaries and may blend conventions.

Approaches to genre through folklore

In research that centres on folklore, patterns of content were originally considered to be of most significance. This is evident in the work of the brothers Grimm at the end of the nineteenth century on myths, legends and folk tales (Grimm & Grimm, 1891).

One very important early twentieth century work in the general area of folktale analysis is that of Olrik (1921) who looked at the unity of the plot, the opening and closing sections of tales, the number and type of characters, and episodic repetition. A particular focus of attention was what types of event (e.g. life-threatening events or the giving of advice) occurred, when, and how often. This type of approach is developed in the work of the Russian Formalist, Propp (1928), where there is a search for what is referred to as the grammar of the folktale. Propp identified 31 'action developing events' (which he called 'functions'). He found that although any individual folktale might contain any number of these, when they did occur, they occurred in the same order. His belief, and that of other Russian Formalists, was that it was not the individual features of a text which accounted for its meaning, but the interaction among all the various components.

Gradually, work on folklore began to incorporate factors such as function and belief as well as overall content structure (Dundes, 1964, p. 110). This reflected the work of linguists of the Prague school who were interested in the relationship between form, function and context. Linguistic factors were also gradually accommodated (Scott, 1965, p. 74) so that eventually, in the work of Ben-Amos (1976, p. 225), we see genre within folklore defined in terms of a combination of formal features, thematic domains and potential social usages in particular contexts.

Although much of the early work on folktales was formulaic in orientation, suggesting that genres could be defined in terms of strict adherence to certain regularities, the work of Rohrich ([1979]/1991, p.55) is interesting in that it suggests that "genre is not a rigid, timeless, universally valid entity", but something that changes over time. He also argued that there are 'hybrid genres' and that so-called rules could be broken "thus disappointing those who find pleasure in constructing an abstract system of classification" (Rohrich, [1979]/1991, p. 56). The concept of 'rule breaking' combined with the concept of 'reception' in such a way as to introduce far greater flexibility into folklore-centred approaches. Thus, for example, Elliot Oring (1986) argues that myths, tales and legends are defined not simply in terms of formal properties, but also in terms of the ways in which they are received by a particular discourse community.

Work on genre and folktales has included research in the area of linguistic anthropology and the ethnography of communication. Within linguistic anthropology, there has been considerable interest in American Indian languages and cultures since

the late nineteenth century. The work of Malinowski (1923; 1935) is particularly important here. Malinowski was interested not only in the events recounted in texts and the relationship between these events, but also in the relationship between the narrative itself and the context in which the narrative is recounted, and in the 'performance style' (the way in which the tale is told).

An important aspect of those studies that centre on actual performance as being partly definitional of genres is the concept of intertextuality. That is, it has been argued that interpretation of a text belonging to a particular genre depends not on that text alone (or a specific performance or reading of that text), but also on the understanding that is brought to bear on it as a result of our knowledge of similar texts and other performances or readings**.** This relates to the work of Bakhtin ([1935]/1981) and, later, to that of Kristevan (1980) and Lemke (1992). Within this tradition, genres are not seen in terms of mechanical reproduction. Neither are they seen as being essentially definable in terms of linguistic structure. Rather, they are seen as historically specific conventions and ideals. Authors are regarded as composing in relation to these ideals, and audiences as retrieving in relation to them also. Thus, genres are treated as consisting of orienting frameworks, interpretative procedures and sets of expectations, none of which should be regarded as requiring rigid adherence (Hanks, 1987, p. 689).

Work in the area of the ethnography of communication relates genre studies to the relationship between communicative behaviour and ethnic typology, the assumption being that there are significant differences in patterns of language use across cultures (Gumperez, 1982). Here, the focus is on language in its social setting. In this area, the work of Hymes (1962; 1964; 1967) is particularly well known. Communicative events are examined in terms of the type of event, the topic, the purpose of the communication, the settings and participants, the form and content of the message and the order of speech acts, including turn taking and speaker overlap. The belief here is that an adequate approach to genre requires an examination not only of texts, but also of the social and cultural factors that impinge on texts. Both Hymes (1962; 1964; 1967) and Saville-Troike (1989) agree that a genre is made up of a number of salient components such as the participants involved, the setting, the function of the event, the form of the event and the channel and code of communication. This work differs from the systemic-functional based work discussed later, work that is also socially oriented, in that there is typically less emphasis on internal linguistic selection than there typically is in much of the work within the systemic-functional approach to genre. It also differs in that it does not separate 'context of culture' from 'context of situation'.

Thus, within folklore studies, there has been, as there has been in literary theory, a gradual movement away from a focus on form as definitional of genre towards a more general focus in which other factors are considered to be at least equally important.

Approaches to genre through everyday interactions

Within the area of investigation known as conversation analysis, the emphasis is on oral genres in the context of conversation (Levinson, 1983, p. 284). Among the interactions that have received attention here are doctor-patient consultations, legal hearings, news interviews, psychiatric interviews and calls to emergency services (Drew & Heritage, 1992). There has also been work on courtroom hearings (Atkinson & Drew, 1979) and classroom interaction (McHoul, 1978). The belief here is that

there is a tendency towards stereotypical interaction patterns, and so there is a search for regular and systematic patterns. Here, particular attention has been paid to 'preference organization' (preferences for particular combinations of utterances), including 'adjacency pairs' (typical pairings of utterances), turn taking, topic initiation and development, feedback, repairs and conversational openings and closings (Schegloff, 1968; Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). There is here (unlike the work on ethnography of speaking) no emphasis on interviews with participants, speaker views or field notes, the focus being on the language interaction itself rather than what participants believe about the interaction. What is important here is the emphasis on details of the whole interaction rather than just the language component of the interaction.

Approaches to genre that relate to the rhetoric of persuasion and effective debate

The study of rhetoric began as the study of the art of persuasion. From there, it developed into the wider field of effective engagement in debate and, more recently, into studies of what is involved in presenting a case logically and effectively in either speech or writing.

Although nineteenth and twentieth century rhetorical studies can be seen to relate in some ways to the Aristotelian tradition, they differ in so far as they generally emphasise communicative purposes (e.g. *narration, exposition*) rather than, or as well as, text-types (e.g. *the poem*) although both may be taken into consideration. Thus, whereas approaches to genre within the tradition of literary studies have tended to emphasise text-types (e.g. *the novel, the poem),* approaches to genre within the rhetorical tradition have tended to emphasise communicative purposes. They can, therefore, be regarded as a continuation of the approach that we find in, for example, the work of Bain (1867), whose focus was on communicative purposes such as *narration, exposition, description, argumentation*, and *persuasion.*

A development of this approach can be seen in the work of Labov (1972) where, for example, narrative structure is conceptualised as being composed of *abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, result or resolution* and *coda.* It can also be detected in Longacre's work on Philippine languages (1968) in which narrative structure is outlined in terms of *aperture, episode, denouement, anti-denouement, closure* and *finis.*

Within the rhetorical tradition, a distinction, then, tends to be made between communicative purposes (e.g. *narrative*), which are seen as definitional of genre, and text-types (e.g. *the novel*), in which a range of genres may occur. Within this tradition, there are, however, also works in which genre is defined not in terms of communicative purposes (e.g. *narration*), but in terms of 'orientations'. Thus, for example, Kinneavy (1971, p. 84) outlines the following orientations (described in relation to characteristic patterns of organisation and stylistic features), which he conceives of as different genres:

- a work is 'expressive' if the focus is on the sender;
- a work is 'discursive' if the focus is on the receiver;
- a work is 'literary' if the focus is on the linguistic form of the text;
- a work is 'referential' if it refers to some 'world reality'.

Although the emphasis within the rhetorical tradition has often been on communicative purposes (e.g. *narrative, exposition*) as being definitional of different types of genre, this has sometimes been refined to allow for a definition of genre in terms of a range of different category combinations. Thus, for example, in defining a genre, all of the following may be taken into account:

- the *topic* of the text;
- the *mode* of the text (e.g. 'narrative' or 'satire');
- the *form of argumentation* (e.g. expository, descriptive, legal);
- the *style* of the text (Threadgold, 1994).

New rhetoric and the teaching of composition

The concept of genre has received considerable attention in a specific development of the rhetorical tradition - 'new rhetoric' - an approach which concerns itself with composition studies in North American educational institutions (Freedman & Medway, 1994; Connor, 1996). Typical of this work is the research of Carolyn Miller (1984) which looks at formal aspects of texts as well as at socio-contextual factors and at the types of action a particular genre aims to accomplish. Within this movement, Bazerman (1988), for example, examines the way in which scientific writing changes and develops in response to changes in scientific understanding, and Bizzell (1996) examines the relationship between academic discourse and critical consciousness.

In overall terms, genres are generally defined within this tradition in relation to the social context to which they represent a response, that is, a genre emerges as a situationally appropriate response. A genre is thus seen as emerging from socially constructed reality (Miller, 1984) and texts are seen as constructing rather than merely reflecting that reality - as shaping social contexts, not just as responding to them. A major influence on work on genre within the 'new rhetoric' is Bakhtin ([1936]/1986), whose approach is consistent with the view that genres allow for creativity and are flexible and variable in terms of linguistic patterning.

Approaches such as these emphasise the social construction of genres and can readily be related to teaching contexts. Particularly interesting here are the proposals of Bergmann and Luckmann (1995) whose research links the study of genre to the notion of social constructivism within the sociology of knowledge. Here genres are seen as "socially constructed communicative models for the solution of communicative problems" (Luckmann, 1992, p. 226). In other words, genres provide ways of responding to recurrent communicative problems and act as guides to expectations about what is said and done. Genres can be conventionalised into routine patterns that enable the "transmission and traditionalization of intersubjective experiences" (Guenthner & Knoblauch, 1995, p. 5). They therefore contribute to the socialization of individuals. They are always, however, potentially open-ended.

From a teaching point of view, this is a very significant perspective. Even if it should be the case (which it does appear to be) that actual speech and writing often depart from prototypical categories, it may be helpful to present students with prototypical models to help in their socialisation into a particular perspective. When they have understood the norms, they will be in a position to judge when and how it may be appropriate to depart from these norms.

Genre studies relating to the teaching of English for specific purposes

A considerable amount of research on genre has related to the English used in academic and professional settings and much of this work has been conducted by Swales and his associates (Swales, 1981; 1990; Swales & Najjar, 1987), or influenced by their work (Cooper, 1985; Crookes, 1985; 1986; Gupta, 1985; Hopkins, 1985). This research, particularly in its emphasis on the changing nature of genres, can be readily related to the research of those working within the new rhetoric such as Miller (1994) who sees genre primarily in terms of social action. Also typical of work in this area is a focus on patterns of rhetorical organisation (in terms of moves and steps) that are considered to be specific to particular genres and are seen as "a means of achieving a communicative goal that has evolved in response to particular rhetorical needs" (Dudley-Evans, 1994, p. 220). Thus, for example, it has been argued that the use of the present perfect is typical of biology and biochemistry articles written in English (Gunawardena, 1989), that business news stories and academic journal articles are characterised by conjunctives (Morrow, 1989), and that business letters are marked by the occurrence of politeness strategies (Maier, 1992). It should be borne in mind, however, that corpus-based studies (see, for example, Biber, 1988) indicate that there is much more variety and complexity in actual linguistic choice than some of these studies might lead us to believe.

Within this approach, which draws on the ethnographic perspective and speech community orientation found in the work of Saville-Troike (1989), Gumperz (1962) and Hymes (1972), there is an emphasis on communicative purpose, and the influence of Council of Europe work on linguistic functions (e.g. Wilkins, 1977; Richterich & Chancerel, 1980) is often detectable.

What is, perhaps, most interesting from the perspective of this study is the fact that, in common with the approach associated with the new rhetoric, reference is made to genre in terms of prototypicality. Thus, a range of factors, including communicative purpose and audience expectation may influence form and structure so that a particular example may be seen as prototypical (Swales, 1990, p. 52). It is here, above all, that analysts working within this framework generally differ from a number of analysts working within the systemic-functional framework. Whereas many working within the systemic-functional framework believe that a text must behave in a particular way to be treated as belonging to a particular genre, analysts whose research is associated with the type of approach adopted by Swales have tended to believe that a text belongs to a genre by virtue of its purpose, but that a particular text may be a more or less effective, and more or less typical exemplar of a particular genre. The fact that a text is atypical does not mean that it can no longer be classified as belonging to a particular genre. An academic article that appears in an academic journal does not cease to be an academic article just because it is not typical of other academic articles. Thus Swales (1990, p. 58) defines genre as follows:

> [Genre is] a class of communicative events, . . . [sharing] some set of communicative purposes. . . . These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains choice of content and style . . . . In addition to purpose, exemplars of a genre exhibit various patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content and intended audience. If all high

> probability expectations are realized, the exemplar will be viewed as prototypical by a parent discourse community.

In labelling genres in terms of what social groups identify as particular social purposes (e.g. *personal letters, academic lectures*), this approach has more in common with the approach adopted by, for example, Longacre (1968) than it does with those influenced directly by the systemic-functional approach - such as Martin (1995) - for whom a more general communicative purpose (e.g. *telling someone what happened*) determines genre assignment (e.g. *recount*).

Researchers in this area have focused on a range of genres such as, for example, research articles and abstracts (e.g. Cooper, 1985; Graetz, 1985; Swales, 1990; Salager-Meyer, 1992; Gupta, 1995), dissertations (e.g. Dudley-Evans, 1986; 1989), medical and legal texts (e.g. Nwogu, 1991; Bhatia, 1993), job application and sales promotion letters (e.g. Bhatia, 1993), academic seminars and lectures (e.g. Weissberg, 1993; Thompson, 1994), and student writing in academic contexts (Samraj, 1995). Although overall discourse patterning is often seen as genre-related, genres are also seen as evolving and changing. Furthermore, texts may exhibit genre mixing and specific selections and combinations of language may vary widely within particular exponents of a genre.

In terms of approaches to overall organisation, research in this area often has a great deal in common with the work of Longacre (1968) and Labov (1972) who characterised narrative structure in similar ways and with reference to socio-cultural context:

> *aperture, episode, denouement, anti-denouement, closure* and *finis* (Longacre, 1968);
> *abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, result/resolution* and *coda* (Labov, 1972).

This approach, then, which has been influenced by the concept of genre as social action, focuses on the role of discourse communities in determining and responding to notions of what is appropriate. Because no distinction is made between 'genre' and 'register', the number of genres recognised is potentially very large. In this respect, this approach differs from approaches to genre studies that are conducted within the context of a systemic-functional approach. There, genres are generally identified in terms of overall communicative purpose (e.g. *argument, explanation, narration*) and texts that exemplify the same genre may differ in respect of register (field, mode and tenor).

From systemic-functional to process-oriented approaches

The systemic-functional approach to genre is characterised by an emphasis on function (how language enables us to do things such as argue and reflect etc. in order to achieve specific purposes) and on the language systems that play a role in the achievement of goals. In line with the earlier anthropological studies of Malinowski (1935), which strongly influenced the research of Halliday, *context of culture* and *context of situation* can be seen to impact on meaning and form, meaning itself being grounded in *purpose.*

For most of those working within this framework, what is referred to as 'genre' is seen in terms of 'context of culture', whereas what is referred to as 'register' is seen in

terms of 'context of situation'. A particular culture might, for example, distinguish between *recounts* (telling someone about what has happened) and *narratives* (telling a story for entertainment or aesthetic purposes) in terms of overall *function.* These overall cultural purposes or functions would be referred to as representing different genres. There would, therefore, be a *recount genre* and a *narrative genre.* We would not, however, refer to the novel as a genre. We might, however, say that a novel is an instance of a primarily narrative genre representing a particular register defined in terms of context of situation (i.e. field, mode and tenor of discourse). Another way of putting this might be to say that a novel is a text-type which can be examined in terms of field, mode and tenor. Novels are likely to exhibit the narrative genre, but may also exhibit other genres at different stages in their development.

Within systemic-functional approaches, then, register is seen in terms of context of situation, that is, in terms of a combination of field (the nature of the social activity, e.g. scientific discourse), tenor (the relationship between participants, e.g. degree of formality) and mode (the role of the language in the communication and the medium and channel of the communication, e.g. written to be read to an audience). Thus, for example, a particular text might be said to be an instance of the narrative genre which could be defined as belonging to a particular register by virtue of its field (e.g. detective fiction), its tenor (level of formality/ informality) and its mode (written to be read). What this means is that there will be a relatively small number of genres - defined in terms of overall primary cultural purposes. From this point of view, a *recount* that contained a considerable amount of *explanation* might still be classified as a *recount* (in terms of genre) in relation to its primary purpose. There is, however, a growing acceptance within the systemic-functional approach to genre that human purposes may be complex rather than unitary: the concept of *genre mixing* is becoming widely accepted.

Thus, within systemic-functional based approaches, our attention, in defining genre, is not just on texts, but on the overall cultural function that texts are intended to perform, such as, for example, providing entertainment and/or aesthetic satisfaction in narrative form. Whereas *context of culture* (general, overall cultural purpose) defines genres, *context of situation* (field/mode/tenor) is said to influence the actual patterns of language variation (structure of the text and lexico-grammatical patterns). So, it is not genre itself that is said to relate to actual language choice, but a combination of genre and register (field/mode/tenor). Thus, although within the systemic-functional framework it is generally believed that specific genres may have associated with them strong tendencies towards specific language forms, genre cannot be directly associated with these forms since they relate not only to context of culture, but also to context of situation. Although most of those who work within this overall context believe that there is a high probability link between genre, context of situation and language selection, there are those who argue that if you know in detail both the context of culture (overall cultural purpose) and the context of situation (field/mode/tenor), "you can predict what language will be used" (Eggins, 1994, p. 52). This is not, however, a view that is necessarily generally held. Biber, for example, has found a wide variety of linguistic variation within genres (Biber, 1989, p. 78) and his conclusion is that "different kinds of texts are complex in different ways . . . and . . . many earlier conclusions that have been reached about genre-specific language reflect our incomplete understanding of the linguistic characteristics of discourse complexity" (1992, p. 135).

A central feature of much research on genre within the systemic-functional context is the belief that the overall structure of a text is critical to the description and identification of a particular genre. In fact, the structure of a text is considered by some to be genre-defining (that is, a text with a particular overall pattern belongs, by definition, to the genre with which that overall pattern has come to be associated). Hasan, for example, has claimed that the one respect in which genres "cannot vary without consequence to their genre allocation is the obligatory [structural] elements [of a particular text]" (Hasan, 1989, p. 108). There are those who disagree. Thus Hanks (1996, p. 238) argues that this view represents a kind of closure based on the notion of rules, an approach which he believes to be "inappropriate for explaining the play between production and reproduction".

Studies of genre that are influenced by the systemic-functional approach to language began to be applied in classroom contexts as a result of dissatisfaction in the early 1980s with 'process' approaches to teaching writing in Australian primary schools and to what was seen as an over-emphasis on narrative writing (Cope & Kalantzis, 1993). For this reason, there has been considerable emphasis on 'factual' texts (e.g. *recounts* and *reports*). Here, a great deal of attention has been paid to the 'schematic structure' of texts, that is, to the way in which the beginnings and ends are structured and to the various ways in which the central section or sections may be organised. The *generic structure potential* of a text is the name given to what is said to be "the range of textual structures available within a genre".[3] For some, these comprise a combination of obligatory and optional textual elements; for others, the concept of 'obligatory' is inappropriate and might, therefore be replaced by 'preferred'.

Two works which have had a particularly marked influence in New Zealand schools are Derewianka (1994) and Knapp and Watkins (1994). Drawing upon the insights and expertise of experienced teachers, the work of Derewianka provides a systematic account of how the teaching of writing in primary schools can be related to an approach to the description of genres that draws upon the work of Halliday (1985), Martin (1985), Martin and Rothery (1986), Christie (1989; 1990), Painter (1986), Kress (1982; 1985) and others. Central to the work is an examination of how 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). Six types of genre are identified as indicated in *Table 1*:

Table 1: ***The six genres identified by Derewianka (1994)***

GENRES	FUNCTIONS
Recount	telling someone what happened
Instruction	telling someone how to do something (e.g. a recipe)
Exposition/ Argument	arguing a case (e.g. letter to a newspaper editor)
Narrative	providing entertainment in the context of a story
Report	providing information about things or classes of things
Explanation	explaining why something happens or how something works

For each of these types of genre, Derewianka identifies structural elements and typical linguistic features. A summary of her approach is provided in *Table 2* in relation to what she refers to as the 'recount genre'.

Table 2: ***A summary of the recount genre according to Derewianka (1994, p.15)***

RECOUNT GENRE: unfolding a sequence of events over time		
Purpose: to tell what happened		
TEXT ORGANISATION		
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; **Verbs:** action; **Linking items:** temporal ('then', 'at the same time etc.)		
TYPES OF RECOUNT AND CHARACTERISTIC LANGUAGE USE		
PERSONAL: retelling an activity writer was personally involved in – 1st. person orientation	**FACTUAL:** recalling 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

In addition to outlining a number of genres with associated features of textual organization and language, Derewianka (1994, pp. 13-14) 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.

The overall approach of Derewianka has proved to be both popular and useful. It is sometimes claimed, however, that the approach of Knapp and Watkins (1994) has the advantage of being more process-centred. This model is based on social aspects of literacy, stresses the multi-generic nature of texts, and does not strictly adhere to the systemic-functional theoretical literature. Here, genre is seen as the process that produces the end product or text-type. Knapp and Watkins identify five types of genre (social process) which they relate to five text-types: see *Table 3* following.

Table 3: ***The five genres (and associated processes) identified by Knapp and Watkins (1994)***

GENRES	**PROCESSES**
Instructing	through the *process* of logically sequencing actions or behaviours
Arguing	through the *process* of expanding a proposition to persuade readers to accept a point of view
Narrating	through the *process* of sequencing people and events in time and space
Explaining	through the *process* of sequencing phenomena in temporal and/or causal relationships
Describing	through the *process* of ordering things into technical or commonsense frameworks of meaning

The view of 'process' that Knapp and Watkins propose is based largely on sequencing and ordering. Thus, *instructing, narrating* and *explaining* all relate to sequencing. They would, at first sight, appear to be differentiated in terms of the *type of sequence* and *what is sequenced*. However, closer examination reveals some problems.

Looking first at *what is sequenced*, we see that in *instructing,* actions or behaviours are said to be sequenced; in *narrating*, people and events are said to be sequenced; in *explaining,* phenomena are said to be sequenced. One problem here is that

'phenomena' may be actions, behaviour or events. Thus, there is no clear-cut distinction in terms of *what* is sequenced.

Looking next at the *type of sequence*, we encounter similar problems**.** *Instructing* is related to logical sequence, *explaining* to temporal and/or causal relationships and *narrating* to sequencing in time and space. In fact, however, it is extremely difficult to determine how the authors distinguish between 'logical sequence' and the other two types of sequence (i.e. 'temporal and/or causal relationships' and 'sequencing in time and space').

Overall, then, the attempt by Knapp and Watkins to define genres in terms of processes and to discriminate among genres in terms of type and object of process appears to be unsatisfactory.

For each of the genres (processes) outlined, Knapp and Watkins propose structural and grammatical features (as illustrated with reference to the genre of arguing in *Table 4*)*:*

Table 4: ***An outline of the genre of arguing (adapted from Knapp & Watkins (1994, p. 118)***

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Genre: Arguing</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">The genre of arguing is a fundamental learning process. It is a central part of the process of learning and teaching and is, furthermore, an important element in effective social interaction and social participation of learners.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Purpose</td><td colspan="4">to reason, to evaluate, to persuade</td></tr>
<tr><td>Process</td><td colspan="4">In the process of arguing, writers give opinions and reasons for viewpoints, or may make propositions and elaborate</td></tr>
<tr><td>Products</td><td colspan="4">Arguments</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="2">Expositions:
writers put forward viewpoints and may elaborate by providing supporting evidence</td><td colspan="2">Discussions:
writers consider an issue from several perspectives and may argue for or against the issue</td></tr>
<tr><td>Grammar of arguing involves</td><td>Mental verbs
(processes)
(e.g. like, believe, think, appear)</td><td>Modality
(e.g. can, may, must, will, can perhaps)</td><td>Conjunctions
(e.g. first, second, however, therefore, also, such as)</td><td>Nominalisation
(e.g. 'grow' . . . 'growth')</td></tr>
</table>

Table 4 raises a number of issues. For example, although it is almost certainly true that sequential conjunctions (e.g. 'first', 'second'), additive conjunctions (e.g. 'also'), adversative conjunctions (e.g. 'however'), illustrative conjunctions (e.g. 'such as') and conclusive conjunctions (e.g. 'therefore') will commonly occur in the process of *arguing*, it seems equally likely that they will occur in the process of *explaining, narrating* and *instructing*. Indeed, most of them will also be characteristic of *describing*. This raises issues of considerable theoretical significance. In fact, when taken together with the point made earlier about sequencing, this suggests that different genres are not being distinguished in principled ways. In other words, an adequate account of both process and product is lacking. For this reason, the analysis conducted in this research project in relation to Māori texts and text-segments includes specific reference to perceptual processes.

In spite of the problems that have been noted, the approach adopted by Knapp and Watkins does attempt to move beyond the treatment of ordered structures and networks (a product-centred approach) to one in which a distinction is made between genres (sets of generic processes) and texts (products).

Cross-generic approaches to discourse patterning

Some of the categories that have been identified in the research to which reference has already been made may be seen as genre-specific realisations of more universally applicable organisational principles. Thus, for example, specific categories relating to specific genres in specific socio-cultural settings may be seen as particular representations of the more general, global categories of discourse organisation that have been outlined by van Dijk (1982) and Hoey (1983).

Global discourse structuring (discourse macropatterning) has been approached by van Dijk and Hoey in very different ways (which have been referred to by Crombie (1984) as the 'synoptic approach' (van Dijk, 1982) and the 'classificatory approach' (Hoey, 1983)). In adopting the synoptic approach, van Dijk aims not just to label chunks of discourse in terms of the overall function they perform, but to find precise ways of summarising sections of a discourse prior to overall function labelling (van Dijk, 1980, p. 180). The classificatory approach adopted by Hoey, on the other hand, directly classifies and labels sections of text in terms of the overall function they perform in the discourse as a whole.

In the synoptic approach, a distinction is made between *conventional superstructures* and *semantic macrostructures*. *Semantic macrostructures* outline the core meaning of a discourse in summary form (that is, in the form of macro-propositions, each of which summarizes one segment of the discourse); *conventional superstructures* outline the overall form of a discourse in terms of functional labels such as *Setting-Complication - Resolution*. The overall aim is to link the semantic macrostructure (the summary) and the conventional superstructure (the overall discourse segment labels) so that each conventional superstructure label is associated with one or more macro-propositions (parts of the summary). The synoptic approach makes provision for discourse patterning to be related to text-types (e.g. to the text as scientific article, informal letter etc.). Thus, within the synoptic approach, links can be made between text-types and conventional super-structures (overall patterns of discourse organisation). However, van Dijk argues that whereas certain super-structure schemata may offer valid indications of genre, a general genre typology cannot be based on super-structures alone. It is necessary, in defining genres, to make reference to a range of other factors.

Certain types of overall discourse structuring, van Dijk argues, are not genre-specific. Thus, in addition to proposing a range of super-structures for different genres, van Dijk argues that there are a number of functional categories which hold for discourse in general (as opposed to specific genres). These functional categories apply, he argues, to the sequencing of information in any discourse type. An example of these functional categories is:

Introduction-Problem-Solution-Evaluation/Conclusion

These functional categories are referred to by van Dijk as *metacategories* (van Dijk, 1980, pp. 110-111). He argues that these metacategories receive more specific nature

and function depending on the discourse genre in which they occur. Thus, for example, in the narrative genre, the *Introduction* may be more specifically defined as *Setting*. In this respect, the work of van Dijk on metacategories may be compared with Hoey's classificatory approach (Hoey, 1983) where a distinction is made between *discourse patterns*/*rhetorical organisation* (the patterning of discourse segments) and *discourse relations/discourse organisation* (the patterning of relationships between propositions). It is the first of these that invites comparison with van Dijk's non-genre-specific metacategories.

Hoey (1983) directly classifies and labels sections of text in terms of the overall function they perform in the discourse *as a whole*. He is explicit about the fact that this type of organisation is not intended to be seen as genre-specific. 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. From this point of view, it is clear that the classificatory approach of Hoey (which does not relate to genre) can be said to operate at the level that van Dijk refers to as the overall, meta-category level. Nevertheless, it *does* appear that these categories play a role in text-type determination. The rhetorical patterns discussed by Hoey are outlined in *Table 5*.

Table 5: ***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; 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**		

One aspect of the classification of texts in terms of rhetorical organisation is determining whether they exhibit *linear* or *cyclic development* and whether they

involve *multilayering*. Where a discourse develops in a *linear* fashion, there is a straightforward progression from one discourse segment to the next without any revisiting of earlier discourse segments. However, where a discourse is *cyclic,* there are points in the development of that discourse where earlier discourse segments are revisited or restated or further developed. For example, a *Problem* may be stated at the outset followed by a response to it. Following that, however, the problem may, in cyclic fashion, be restated. Another possibility is *multilayering*. *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).

Developing an analytical model

It was observed earlier that there are problems associated with the model proposed by Knapp and Watkins, one of these problems being the lack of a theoretical foundation for the processes that are said to be involved in different genres. The analysis of authentic Māori text segments conducted as part of the research project reported here sought to address this problem by applying a framework in which relationships between propositions are classified into three main types in relation to the cognitive processes involved (Crombie, 1987, pp. 102 - 110):

> associative (involving some aspect of contrast or comparison);
> logico-deductive (involving some aspect of cause and effect);
> tempero-contigual (involving relationships defined by temporal and spatial association).

These processes are said to "establish relations between propositions and propositional sequences" which, while being "essentially pragmatic", "may nevertheless be reflected in the semantic and lexico-grammatical structure of the language" (p. 2). A similar approach is also adopted by Kehler (2002) who argues for coherence as the basis of "our natural language understanding capacity" so that "just as we attempt to identify syntactic and semantic relationships when presented with a sequence of words in an utterance, we attempt to identify coherence relationships when presented with a sequence of utterances in a discourse" (p. 3). Kehler, apparently following Crombie, associates relationships with a "fundamental distinction . . . first articulated by the philosopher David Hume" in 1737 in *A Treatise of Human Nature*. He argues that "Hume's categories comprise a small set of basic types of cognitive principles" (pp.4 & 5), namely *resemblance*, *cause and effect* and *contiguity in time and place*.

Each of the three types of cognitive process has a number of relationships associated with it and each of these can be associated with a range of possible realisations. The inter-propositional relations that belong to each category as specified by Crombie are outlined in *Table 6.* The members of each relation may occur in the order indicated in the table or in reverse order.

It should be noted that although the relationships identified by Kehler are fewer in number, the two models can readily be compared (see *Table 7*). Assuming that *Paraphrase* is omitted from Kehler's model on the grounds that there is never exact parallelism of information and that *Bonding* is omitted on the grounds that there is no need for a base-line relationship, the only remaining areas of non-correspondence

relate to Kehler's omission of relationships that imply interaction or reported interaction (Statement-affirmation; Statement-denial; Denial-correction), antithetical or non-antithetical choice (Contrastive alternation; Supplementary alternation), and overlap in time (Temporal overlap).

Table 6: ***Cognitive processes and associated inter-propositional relations (adapted from Crombie 1987)***

Cognitive processes and inter-propositional relations			
Cognitive processes	**Associative (comparison/ contrast)**	**Logico-deductive (cause and effect)**	**Tempero-contigual (time and space)**
Inter-propositional relations	Simple contrast; Comparative similarity (Simple comparison); Statement– affirmation; Statement-exception; Statement-denial; Denial– correction; Concession-contraexpectation; Supplementary alternation; Contrastive alternation; Paraphrase; Amplification	Condition-consequence; Means-purpose; Reason-result; Means-result; Grounds-conclusion.	Chronological sequence; Temporal overlap; Bonding[4].

Table 7: ***A comparison of the relations proposed by Crombie (1987) and Kehler (2002)***

Kehler (2002)			**Crombie (1987)**
Category	**Relation**	**Description**	**Relation (for definitions see Table 3.7)**
Resemblance	**Parallel**	Focus on commonalities	**Comparative similarity**
	Contrast	Focus on points of departure	**Simple contrast**
	Exemplification	Focus on general statement followed by an example	**Statement - exemplification**
	Generalization	Focus on example followed by general statement	**Statement – exception**
	Exception	Introduces a negation within the constraints of Exemplification and Generalization	
	Elaboration	Generally refers to restatements but level of detail may be different.	**Amplification**
Cause-effect	**Result**	Propositions connected by presupposition	**Reason-Result; Grounds-Conclusion; Means-Purpose; Means-Result; Condition-Consequence**
	Explanation	Result with reversed clause ordering	
	Violated expectation	Contrasts actual with expected or desired effect	**Concession-contraexpectation**
	Denial or Preventer	Violated expectation with reverse clause ordering	
Contiguity	**Occasion**	Involves a sequence of events	**Chronological sequence**

Definitions and examples of relations are provided in *Table 8* which is adapted from Crombie (1985a and b; 1987).

Table 8: ***Definitions and examples of inter-propositional relations (derived from Crombie 1985 a & b and 1987)***

PROCESS	RELATION	DEFINITION	EXAMPLES
Associative	Simple Contrast	Involves the comparison of two things, events or abstractions in terms of some particular in respect of which they differ.	He was Tuhoe; she was Tainui.
	Comparative Similarity (Simple comparison)	Involves the comparison of two things, events or abstractions in terms of some particular in respect of which they are similar.	He was Tuhoe. She was Tuhoe too.
	Statement – Affirmation	The truth of a statement is affirmed.	**A**: He should leave. **B**: I agree.
	Statement-Exception	Involves a statement and an exception to that statement.	All of the warriors returned except for Rangi.
	Statement-Exemplification		All iwi, Ngāti Porou, for example, use symbolism in their songs.
	Statement-Denial	Involves the denial of the truth of a statement or validity of a proposition.	**A**: He won. **B**: Not so.
	Denial – Correction	Involves a corrective non-antonymic substitute for a denial.	She wasn't a teacher; she was a lawyer.
	Concession-Contraexpectation	Involves direct or indirect denial of the truth of an inference.	Although there was a good combination of rain and sun, the plants failed to flower.
	Supplementary Alternation	Involves two or more non-antithetical choices.	Nobody tended the plants or fed the animals.
	Contrastive Alternation	Involves a choice between antitheses.	Either he did it or he didn't.
	Paraphrase	Involves the same proposition expressed in different ways.	He began combat; he started to fight.
	Amplification	Involves implicit or explicit repetition of the propositional content of one member of the relation in the other, together with a non-contrastive addition to that propositional content.	He seized someone. It was Aroha.
Logico-deductive	Condition-Consequence	Involves a consequence which depends upon a realizable or unrealisable condition or hypothetical contingency.	Had he fought, they would have won.
	Means-Purpose	Involves a consequence which depends upon a realizable or unrealisable condition or hypothetical contingency.	He did it in order to win favour.
	Reason-Result	Involves an action that is/was/will be undertaken *with the intention of* achieving a particular result.	He left because there had been no powhiri.
	Means-Result	Involves the provision of a reason *why* a particular effect came about or will come about.	He angered her by refusing to speak.
	Grounds-Conclusion	Involves a deduction drawn on the basis of an observation.	He is wearing a medal so he must be one of the winners.
Tempero-contigual	Chronological Sequence	Involves a sequential (non-causative) link between propositions.	He tidied up and then left.
	Temporal Overlap	Involves a link between two events which overlap either wholly or partly in time.	As he fled, he looked over his shoulder.
	Bonding	The 'base line' relation. Involves a non-elective, non-sequential relation between juxtaposed propositions.	He wore a cape and carried a dagger.

Adopting an analytical approach based on the three cognitive processes identified by Crombie (1985a & b; 1987) and Kehler (2002) provides a basis for determining whether genres are, in fact, characterised by a preference for specific types of process and specific types of relationship associated with these processes. These cognitive processes and relationships therefore form part of the analytical model developed for the analysis of Māori texts and text segments. They are used here to analyse text segments belonging to the genres of *arguing, explaining* and *describing*. The other part of the model is derived from the rhetorical patterns identified by Hoey (1983). It is used in a forthcoming article (Houia-Roberts, 2004) to analyse the overall structuring of whole texts representing different text- types. The model is outlined in *Table 9*.

Table 9: ***Analysing Māori texts and text segments - The model***

Conceptual orientation	Associative Logico-deductive Tempero-contigual Mixed: any 2 of the above
Relational organisation	**Associative:** Simple Contrast Simple comparison Statement-affirmation Statement-exception Statement-exemplification Statement-denial Denial-correction Concession-contraexpectation Supplementary alternation Contrastive alternation Paraphrase Amplification **Logico-deductive:** Condition-consequence Means-Purpose Reason-Result Means-result Grounds-Conclusion **Tempero-contigual:** Chronological Sequence Temporal Overlap Bonding
Rhetorical organisation	PSn (Problem/ Solution) Matching (Compatibility/ Contrast) General-Particular (Linear; Cyclic (progressive or spiral multilayering))

Writing requirements in upper secondary and selected tertiary Māori-medium educational settings

One part of this research project involved analysing the writing requirements of students who are studying a range of academic subjects through the medium of Māori in Years 12 and 13 of schooling in New Zealand and in a Māori-medium tertiary educational faculty. Of the 175 writing tasks examined, the vast majority involved the genres of *arguing, explaining* and *describing*. These three genres were, therefore, selected for particular attention.

Genre and authentic Maori text segments: Analysis

In this part of the research project, eighteen *te reo Māori* text segments were categorized into three types of genre and analysed in terms of inter-propositional relations (discourse organisation)**.** Each of the eighteen text segments selected for analysis was drawn from an authentic text written for a specific purpose by one of two highly proficient users of *te reo Māori*. Nine of the text segments analysed were written in the first half of the twentieth century by Sir Apirana Ngata, a prominent Māori scholar and statesman of the time.[5] The other nine were written by Timoti Karetu (formerly professor of Māori at the University of Waikato) during his time as Commissioner of *Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori* (Māori Language Commission). All of the texts by Sir Apirana Ngata were written in the early to mid 1900s in order to keep his people informed of events and issues concerning Māori people. They are selected from a single source: *Apirana Turupa Ngata* (1996), edited by Wiremu Kaa and Te Ohorere Kaa. All of the texts written by Timoti Karetu were published in *He Muka,* a quarterly journal in Māori, between 1996 and 1999. They focus mainly on issues relating to the maintenance and revitalisation of te reo Māori. Each of the text segments is translated into English. The translations, which are intended to assist readers, are intentionally designed to be as close as possible to the originals. They may, therefore, sometimes appear clumsy.

The text segments were assigned to the following three genres: *arguing* (6 text segments, each of which involves arguing a case); *describing* (six text segments, each of which involves explaining why something happens/happened or how something works/worked); *explaining* (six text segments, each of which involves ordering information into categories). As indicated earlier, these three genres were found to be the most commonly occurring in the analysis of task requirements for students studying through the medium of Māori at upper secondary and tertiary levels. In distinguishing *describing* from *explaining*, a critical factor is whether the emphasis is on *what* or *why*. In either case, *how* (the means by which) may receive equal emphasis. In distinguishing *explaining* from *arguing*, a critical factor is the presence (*arguing*) or absence (*explaining*) of an emphasis on *opinions* and *conclusions*.

Only three analysed text segments are included here, one representing each of the three genres of *arguing, describing* and *explaining*. The analysed text segments are followed by a discussion of the findings overall.

Te Nūpepa o Te Aute nā Apirana Ngata

In this text segment, representing the genre of *arguing*, reference is made to the disappointment of many readers (*He nui to mātou pouri* . . .) with the quality of language contained in a letter printed in recent a edition of the Te Aute newspaper. Ngata argues that it is important to maintain a high quality of carefully chosen language in Māori newspapers (*Kaati kaore e tika nga korero weriweri kia perehiti* . . .) out of respect for the women and children who read them. He cautions against the use of unsavoury language (*Kia tūpato)* which, he argues, could result in prosecution, even imprisonment.

***Te Nūpepa o Te Aute* nā Apirana Ngata (Kaa & Kaa, 1996, 48)**			
Genre: Arguing			
Logico-deductive relations	**Text segment**	**Associative relations**	**Tempero-contigual relations**
Result-Reason	He nui to mātou pouri i to mātou kitenga i ētahi kupu kaore e tika kia perehitia i roto i tētahi o a tātou pepa Māori.		
	Ko āna kōrero kino, i roto i tētahi reta tuku mai, engari kaore pea i kitea e te etita.	Concession-Contraexpectation	
Grounds-Conclusion	E hoa mā, e kōrerotia ana o tātou pepa e te wāhine, e te tamariki, kaati kaore e tika nga kōrero weriweri kia perehitia.		
Grounds-Conclusion	He mea tēnei e taea te hāmene e te Kāwanatanga, a, e mau ai te tangata ki te whareherehere. Kia tūpato.		
Result-Reason	No nga kaitā te tino hē ki te perehi tonu i ērā kōrero tino kino atu (Te Punawai: Pīpīwharauroa 15 Mei 1899, whārangi 7-8).		

Translation: *The Te Aute Newspaper* by Apirana Ngata			
Genre: Arguing			
Logico-deductive relations	**Text segment**	**Associative relations**	**Tempero-contigual relations**
Result-Reason	We were very disappointed when we saw a type of language, that should not be printed, appeared in one of our Māori papers.		
	This offensive language appeared in a letter sent to the paper, but was evidently not seen by the editor.	Concession-Contraexpectation	
Grounds-Conclusion	Friends, our papers are being read by women and by children, so it is not right that offensive language, such as this, should be printed.		
Grounds-Conclusion	This is something that could incur a Government summons and could result in the imprisonment of those concerned. Be cautious.		
Result-Reason	The fault lies with the printers who continue to print this distasteful language.		

Nā Wai Kē Ia Te Reo Nei? nā Timoti Karetu

This text segment, representing the genre of *explaining*, outlines the decline in the number of fluent Māori speakers. The findings of the Benton survey of 1975-1978 are provided along with those of the Māori Language Survey undertaken in 1995 (Māori Language Year).

***Na Wai kē ia te Reo nei?* nā Timoti Karetu He Muka: Putanga 12 (2) Ngahuru 1999**			
Genre: Explaining			
Logico-deductive relations	**Text segment**	**Associative relations**	**Tempero-contigual relations**
Grounds-/Conclusion	E ai ki te kōrero 1910 rawa ake te tau kua tīmata te heke haere o te nui o te hunga matatau ki te reo Māori, arā, mai i te 100 ōrau ki te 92 ōrau.	Amplification (Term specification)	Chronological Sequence
	Nāwai, nāwai i roto i te wā heke rawa atu ana ki te āhua 25 ōrau i te wā i whakahaeretia ai e Tākuta Richard Benton tāna rangahau i te ora, i te mate kē rānei o te reo Māori i ngā tau 1975 - 78.	Contrastive Alternation	Bonding
	Ko te tūhuratanga a taua rangahautanga rā ko tōna āhua 70 mano nei te hunga matatau ki te reo, ā, ko te nuinga o taua hunga rā kua eke kē ki te karangatanga kaumātua.		Bonding Bonding (Rhetorical Coupling)
	I te whakahaeretanga o te rangahau o te tau 1995, te tau i kīia ai ko Te Tau o te Reo Māori, kitea ana e tērā rangahautanga ko tōna āhua 10 mano noa iho nei te hunga e pērā rawa ana te matatau i ērā kua ngaro atu nei i te tirohanga kanohi. Me kī ko ngā mōrehu ēnei engari i tua atu i a rātou ko tōna āhua 163 mano i kī he mōhio rātou ki te kōrero Māori, ā, ko taua 'mōhio' rā ko tērā o te mōhio ki te mihi tae atu ki ērā e tino matatau ana nei.	Comparative Similarity Concession-Contraexpectation Simple Contrast	Chronological Sequence Bonding
	Nā reira kei te kitea e piki ake ana te nui o te hunga kōrero Māori ahakoa kāore i te eke te reo o te katoa ki ōna taumata engari pea hei roto anō i te wā, otirā koirā te wawata!	Concession-Contraexpectation Concession-Contraexpectation	Bonding (Rhetorical Coupling)

Translation: *Whose language is this?* by Timoti Karetu			
Genre: Explaining			
Logico-deductive relations	**Text segment**	**Associative relations**	**Tempero-contigual relations**
	According to the reports, towards the end of 1910, the number of proficient Māori language speakers had begun to decline, that is, there was a drop from 100% to 92%.	Amplification (Term specification)	Chronological Sequence
	In due course this decreased even further to 25%, as discovered in Dr. Richard Benton's 1975-78 research on the survival, or indeed, the death of te reo Māori.	Contrastive Alternation	Bonding
	That research revealed that 70,000 people claimed to be proficient in te reo Māori, and most of these were of the older age group. It is evident these days that the majority of this older group are no longer here.		Bonding Bonding (Rhetorical Coupling)
	The research of 1995, the Year of the Māori Language, showed that only 10,000 people were as proficient as those speakers now no longer with us. It could be said that these are the survivors, but besides this, approximately 163,000 did claim an ability to speak Māori ranging from those who are able to use greetings, to those who are very fluent.	Comparative Similarity Concession-Contraexpectation Simple Contrast	Chronological Sequence Bonding Bonding
Grounds- Conclusion	Therefore, it is clear that the numbers of speakers are increasing although not all are reaching the higher levels of proficiency, but perhaps in time they will. Indeed, that is the hope.	Concession-Contraexpectation Concession-Contraexpectation	Bonding (Rhetorical Coupling)

Te Romene nā Apirana Ngata

The Romney, a hardy breed of sheep, is discussed in this text segment which is in the *describing* genre. The physical characteristics of the Romney and the many features it possesses are outlined, as are the areas throughout New Zealand where it is being farmed.

***Te Romene* nā Apirana Ngata (Kaa & Kaa , 1996, 158)**			
Genre: Describing			
Logico-deductive relations	**Text segment**	**Associative relations**	**Tempero-contigual relations**
	Ko te momo tēnei e whakatupuria nuitia ana ki Aotearoa, a, kei te atetea e ia te nuinga o ērā atu momo. Ko tōna tinana, he pakari, he ora, he nui, ahakoa ki te whenua wai, ahakoa ki te whenua maroke: ahakoa ki te whenua whai kai, ahakoa ki te whenua iti te kai. He tinana nui tōna: he pai nga kātua ki te whakawhānau kūao ki te rau hipi kātua o te kāhui. Ko tōna wūru, he māmā iho i to te Rikini, he taimaha ake i to te Hāwhe purere: he wūru utu nui, e tauwhainga ana ōna utu ki o te hāwhe purere i ēnei tau e whitu kua taha ake nei ki te mākete o Ingarangi. Ko nga hipi utu nui o tēnei motu, he Romene. I Wairarapa tae noa ki Waiapu, i Poneke tae noa ki Whanganui, i Opotiki, i Waikato, i te Rohe Potae, tae noa ki te nuinga o nga whenua whakanoho hou o te Taitokerau, ko te momo tēnei kei runga. (Kaa & Kaa, 1996, 158).	Amplification (Term specification) Concession-Contraexpectation Contrastive Alternation Simple Contrast Concession-Contraexpectation Amplification (Term specification)	Bonding Bonding Bonding Bonding (x 3) Bonding Bonding Bonding (x2) Bonding Bonding (x2) Bonding (Rhetorical Coupling)

Translation: The Romney by Apirana Ngata			
Genre: Describing			
Logico-deductive relations	**Text segment**	**Associative relations**	**Tempero-contigual relations**
	This type of sheep is widely bred in New Zealand and is quite different from most other breeds.	Amplification (Term specification)	Bonding
	This sheep is strong, it is healthy and large, whether it is farmed on land with water or land without water, and it can survive where the grass is lush or sparse.	Concession-Contraexpectation Contrastive Alternation	Bonding Bonding
	The sheep is very big, it lambs very well, it remains healthy and produces a high percentage of lambs within the group.		Bonding (x 3) Bonding
	The wool weighs lighter than that of the Lincoln but is heavier than that of the Half-breed. The wool fetches a good price and the prices have competed well with the Half-breed, in the British markets over the last seven years.	Simple Contrast Concession-Contraexpectation	Bonding (x2)
	The Romney Marsh is the highest priced sheep in the land. From Wairarapa over to Waiapu, from Poneke over to Whanganui, in Opotiki, in Waikato, in Rohe Pōtae and indeed in most of the areas of Te Taitokerau recently introduced to rearing sheep, this is the breed of sheep on the land.	Amplification (Term specification)	Bonding Bonding (x2) Bonding (Rhetorical Coupling)

A comparison of the analysed text segments exhibiting the genres *arguing, explaining* and *describing* in terms of relational organisation

The eighteen analysed text segments texts exhibiting the three genres of *arguing, explaining* and *describing* were compared in terms of the occurrence of the three cognitive process types: *logico-deductive, associative* and *tempero-contigual* (see *Table 10*):

Table 10: *Comparison of eighteen text segments exhibiting the genres of* arguing, explaining *and* describing *in terms of percentage occurrence of cognitive process types*

	Arguing	Explaining	Describing
Logico-deductive	47%	18%	3%
Associative	30%	34%	40%
Tempero-contigual	23%	48%	57%

Thus, on the basis of the text segment analyses conducted, it would appear that there is a marked difference between the genres of *arguing, explaining* and *describing* in relation of the engagement of the three cognitive processes to which reference has been made.

For *arguing,* the predominant cognitive process is *logico-deductive*, followed by *associative* and then *tempero-contigual.* For *explaining*, the predominant cognitive process is *tempero-contigual,* followed by *associative* and then *logico-deductive.* For *describing,* the predominant cognitive process is *tempero-contigual*, followed by *associative,* with *logico-deductive* relations very much in the minority:

ARGUING:	*logico-deductive*	*associative*	*tempero-contigual*
	(47%)	*(30%)*	*(23%)*
EXPLAINING:	*tempero-contigual*	*associative*	*logico-deductive*
	(48%)	*(34%)*	*(18%)*
DESCRIBING:	*tempero-contigual*	*associative*	*logico-deductive*
	(57%)	(40%)	(3%)

The three genres can also be compared in terms of the actual relations occurring in each category (see *Table 11*).

Table 11: ***Comparison of eighteen text segments exhibiting the genres of*** **arguing, explaining** ***and*** **describing** ***in terms of percentage occurrence of particular relations belonging to the cognitive process types***[6]

Genres	**Logico-deductive process relations** (% of overall number of relations)				
	Reason-Result	**Grounds-Conclusion**	**Reason-Result & Grounds Conclusion combined**	**Condition-Consequence**	**Means-Purpose**
Arguing	20%	10.5%	30.5%	10.5%	
Explaining	3.6%		5.5%		9.1%
Describing	-	-	-	-	-
	Associative process relations (% of overall number of relations)				
	Concession-Contraexpectation	**Amplification**	**Supplementary Alternation**	**Comparative Similarity**	**Comparative Similarity & Simple Contrast combined**
Arguing	6.6%	9%	5.3%		
Explaining	7.3%	7.3%	5.5%	3.6%	9%
Describing	10%	17.3%		3.9%	6.3%
	Tempero-contigual process relations (% of overall number of relations)				
	Bonding (Coupling)	**Bonding (Rhetorical Coupling)**	**Bonding (Coupling) & Bonding (Rhetorical Coupling) combined**	**Chronological Sequence**	
Arguing	13%	8%		8.3%	
Explaining	32%	6.4%			
Describing	52%	4.7%	56.7%		

For each of the three genres, the most common types of relation (in descending order of significance) are indicated below:

ARGUING:
Reason-Result & Grounds-Conclusion combined (30.5%)
Bonding: Coupling & Rhetorical Coupling (21%)
Condition-Consequence (10.5%)
Amplification (9%)
Chronological Sequence (8.3%)
Concession-Contraexpectation (6.6%)

EXPLAINING:
Bonding: Coupling & Rhetorical Coupling (38.4%)
Means-Purpose (9.1%)
Comparative Similarity & Simple Contrast (9%)
Amplification (7.3%)
Concession-Contraexpectation (7.3%)
Supplementary Alternation (5.5%)
Reason-Result & Grounds-Conclusion (5.5%)

DESCRIBING:
Bonding: Coupling & Rhetorical Coupling (56.7%)
Amplification (17.3%)
Concession-Contraexpectation (10%)
Comparative Similarity & Simple Contrast (6.3%)

Thus, although *explaining* and *describing* both have a higher percentage of *tempero-contigual* relations, followed by *associative*, and, finally, *logico-deductive*, the actual proportion of *logico-deductive* relations is considerably lower (almost insignificant) in the case of *describing*. Furthermore, whereas the *logico-deductive* relations of Reason-Result and Grounds-Conclusion together account for 30.5% overall of the relations in the text segments exhibiting the arguing genre, the relation of Bonding (Coupling and Rhetorical Coupling) is considerably more common than any other relation in the case of *explaining* (accounting for 38.4% of relations overall in the text segments examined) and *describing* (accounting for 56.7% of relations overall in the text segments examined). However, a major difference between *explaining* and *describing* is that in the case of *describing*, the relation of Amplification (Term specification) – which accounts for 17.3% of all relations in the text segments analysed – appears to operate as a 'framing relation', the generic part of the relation introducing the description, and the specific part/s following and being spread throughout the remainder of the text segments.

Knapp and Watkins (1994, p. 22) define *arguing* as involving the expansion of propositions in order to persuade readers to accept a point of view. In fact, although persuasion may be fundamental to the *arguing* genre, the phrase 'the expansion of propositions' might be applied with more accuracy to *describing*. What appears to characterise Māori text segments exhibiting the *arguing* genre is a preponderance of relations belonging to the *logico-deductive* process type and, in particular, a combination of Reason-Result (20%); Grounds-Conclusion (10.5%) and Condition-Consequence (10.5%) relations.

The process of *explaining* involves, according to Knapp and Watkins (p. 22), a sequencing of phenomena in a temporal and/or causal relationship. In fact, however, so far as the text segments analysed here are concerned, causal (*logico-deductive*) relations are far more typical of *arguing* than *explaining*. Although *tempero-contigual* relations were found to be the most frequent relational type in the Māori text segments analysed, the vast majority of these were *contigual* (Bonding) rather than *temporal* (Chronological Sequence and Temporal Overlap). Not only were *contigual* relations found to be the most common type, but *associative* relations were also considerably more common than *logico-deductive* ones (which accounted for only 18% of relations overall).

According to Knapp and Watkins, *describing* involves a process of ordering things into technical or commonsense frameworks of meaning (p. 22). Certainly, this does appear to be true of the Māori text segments analysed here. However, the actual process can be described more specifically as involving a preponderance of *tempero-contigual* relations (largely the *contigual* relation of Bonding (56.7%)), followed by *associative relations* (largely Amplification (17.3%)) and Concession-Contraexpectation (10%)) and a combination of Simple Contrast and Comparative Similarity (6.3%)). The Amplification (Term specification) relation appears to play a particularly important framing role in *describing*, with the *Preview-Details* type of *General-Particular* characterising the overall rhetorical patterning.

Implications of the findings

These findings – findings that relate to the analyses of authentic text-segments of a

type typically required of students in upper secondary and selected tertiary settings – have, I believe, important implications for Māori-medium education in that they provide a firm empirical foundation for the creation of teaching resources designed to develop students' capacity to understand and produce written texts in Māori which are consistent with the textual practices of educated and highly competent users of the language. Although the analysed texts are likely to have been influenced by English textual practices in that both writers were educated in English-medium universities, they were written by scholars who have attempted to preserve as much as possible of authentic discourse in Māori. They can, therefore, be regarded as good examples of what students can aim to achieve.

Endnotes

1. What are referred to in this section as 'genres' (e.g. novels, biographies) would now often be referred to as 'text-types'.
2. The term 'genre' is used by Croce in the way in which 'text-type' is used in this paper.
3. I believe that most texts exhibit genre mixing. Thus, a text may exhibit a range of different genres such as, for example *arguing* and *explaining*. In analysing genre, I therefore focus on text segments rather than on whole texts. In analysing text-type, however, I focus on whole texts and examine overall textual organisation.
4. The term 'Rhetorical Coupling' is used in the analyses that follow when the Bonding relation occurs in a marked form.
5. In the texts written by Ngata, the macron (length mark) is not used in the way in which it is generally used now. The macron usage in the source text is retained here.
6. Note that relations that occur fewer than 4 times overall are not listed in this Table, although they are included in the total number for the purpose of calculating overall percentages.

References

Arnold, M. (1966). On classical tradition. In R.H. Super (Ed.), *The complete prose works of Matthew Arnold*. Vol 1. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Atkinson, J.M., & Drew, P. (1979). *Order in court: The organisation of verbal interaction* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson, J.M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.), (1984*). Structures of social studies in conversational analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bain, A. (1867/1996). *English composition and rhetoric.* New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints Delmar.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1935)(1981). *The dialogic imagination.* (Trans. M. Holquist & C. Emerson.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1936)(1986). *'Speech genres' and other late essays.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barthes, R. (1966/1977). *Introduction to the structural analysis of narrative.* West Midlands: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham.

Bartholomae, D. (1986). Inventing the university. *Journal of Basic Writing, 5*, 4-23.

Bazerman, C. & Paradis, C. (1991). Introduction. In C. Bazerman & C. Paradis (Eds.), *Textual dynamics and the professions: Historical and contemporary writing in professional communities.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press

Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Ben Amos, D. (1976). *Folklore genres.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bergmann, J.R., & Luckmann, T. (1995). Reconstructive genres of everyday

communication. In U. Quasthoff (Ed.), *Aspects of oral communication.* Berlin: de Gruyter.
Bhatia, V. K. (1993). Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings. London: Longman.
Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Biber, D. (1989). A typology of English texts. *Linguistics, 27*, 3-43.
Biber, D. (1992). On the complexity of discourse complexity: A multidimensional analysis. *Discourse Processes*, 15, 133-163.
Bizzell, P. (1996). *Academic discourse and critical consciousness*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
Christie, F. (1989). Genres in writing. In *Writing in schools: Study guide.* Victoria (Australia): Deakin University Press.
Christie, F. (1990). Young children's writing: From spoken to written language. In R.A. Carter (Eds.), *Knowledge about language: The LINC reader*. Sevenoaks: Hodder & Stoughton
Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric. Cross cultural aspects of second language writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cooper, C. (1985). *Aspects of article introductions in IEEE publications.* Unpublished MSc dissertation. Birminghan, (United Kingdom): University of Aston.
Cope, B & Kalantzis, M. (1993). Introduction: how a genre approach to literacy can transform the way writing is taught. In B. Cope and M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *The Powers of Literacy: A Genre Approach to* Teaching Writing (pp. 1-21). London: Falmer Press.
Croce, B. (1968). *Aesthetic* (trans. D. Ainslee). New York: Doonday.
Crombie, W. (1984). *A semantic relational approach to the design of language syllabuses for non-native speakers.* Unpublished PhD (Educ), University of London, London.
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.
Crookes, G. (1985). Towards a validated discourse analysis of scientific texts. *Occasional Paper*, No. 4. Department of Linguistics, University of Sydney.
Crookes, G. (1986). Towards a validated analysis of scientific text structure. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 1, 57-70.
Derewianka, B. (1990/1994). *Exploring how texts work.* Victoria, (Australia): Australian Print Group.
Derrida, J. (1967/1978). *Writing and difference.* (A. Bass, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Drew P., & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dubrow, H. (1982*). Genre.* London: Methuen.
Dudley Evans, T. (1986). Genre analysis: An introduction to the introduction and discussion sections of MSc dissertations. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Talking about text*. Discourse Analysis Monographs, No. 13. English Language Research, University of Birmingham.
Dudley Evans, T. (1994). Genre analysis: An approach to text analysis for ESP. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in Written Text Analysis.* London: Routledge.
Dundes, A. (1964). *The morphology of North American Indian folktales.* Helsinki: Dundes, Alan.

Eggins, S. (1994). An introduction to systemic functional linguistics. London: Francis Pinter.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. London: Longman

Fishelov, D. (1993). *Metaphors of genre: The role of analogies in genre theory.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Fowler, A. (1982). Kinds of literature: An introduction to the theory of genres and modes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Freedman, A., & Medway, P. (1994*). Genre and the new rhetoric*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Graetz, N. (1985). Teaching EFL students to extract structural information from Abstracts. In J.M. Uijn and A.K. Pugh (Eds.), *Reading for Professional Purposes.* Leuven, Belgium: ACCO.

Grimm, J. &W. Grimm. (1891). *Deutsche Sagen.* 3rd edition. Berlin.

Guenthner, S., & Knoblauch, H. (1995). Culturally patterned speaking practices-the analysis of communicative genres*. Pragmatics,* 5, 1, 1-32.

Gumperez, J.J. (1962). Types of linguistic communities. *Anthropology Linguistics,* 4, 1, 28-40.

Gumperez, J.J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gunawardena, C.N. (1989). The present perfect in the rhetorical division of biology and biochemistry journal articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 8, 265-273.

Gupta, R. (1985). Language status planning in the ASEAN countries. In David Bradley (Ed.), *Pacific Linguistics: Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics No. 9. Language policy and language planning and sociolinguistics in Southeast Asia*, 1-4.

Gupta, R. (1995). Managing general and specific information in introductions. *English for Specific Purposes,* 14, 1, 59-75.

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

Hanks, W. (1987). Discourse genres in a theory of practice. *American Ethnologist,* 14*,* 668-692.

Hanks, W. (1996). *Language and communicative practices.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Hasan, R. (1989). The structure of a text. In M.A.K. Halliday & R. Hasan. *Language context and text: aspects of language in a social semiotic perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Hopkins, A. (1985). An investigation into the organising and organisational features of published conference papers. MA dissertation, University of Birmingham.

Houia-Roberts (forthcoming). The overall structuring of authentic Maori text-types. *Journal of Maori and Pacific Development*.

Hymes, D.H. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin and W.C. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and Human Behaviour.* Washington D.C.: Anthropology Society of Washington.

Hymes, D.H. (1964). Introduction: toward ethnographies of communication. In J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (Eds.), *The ethnography of communication. American anthropologist,* 66, 6, 1-34. Washington: American Anthropological Association.

Hymes, D.H. (1967). Models of the interaction of language and social setting. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23, 2, 8-28.

Hymes, D.H. (1972). Models on the interaction of language and social life. In J.J. Gumperez, (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Iser, W. (1978). *The act of reading: A theory of aesthetic response.* Baltimore: John

Hopkins Press.
Jauss, H.R. (1974 /1982). *Towards an aesthetic of reception* (trans. T. Bhati). Brighton: Harvester Press.
Kaa, W., & Kaa, Te O. (1996). *Apirana T. Ngata: Āna tuhinga i te reo Māori*. Wellington, (New Zealand): Victoria University Press.
Karetu, T. (1999). Nō wai kē ia te reo nei? *He Muka, Putanga* 12, 2, *Ngahuru 1999.*
Kehler, A. (2002). *Coherence, reference and the theory of grammar.* Stanford, U.S.: Centre for the Study of Language and Information.
Kinneavy, J.L. (1971). *A theory of discourse: The aims of discourse.* Englewood Cliffs, (N.J): Prentice Hall.
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. (1990). Critical discourse analysis, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 11*, 84-99.
Kristevan, J. (1980). Word, dialogue and novel. In L.S. Roudiez (Ed.), *Desire in language a semiotic approach to literature and art.* New York: Colombia University Press.
Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Lechte, J. (1994). Mikhail Bakhtin. In J. Lechte. *Fifty key contemporary thinkers. From structuralism to postmodernity.* London: Routledge.
Lemke, J. (1992). Intertextuality and educational research. *Linguistics and Education,* 4, 257-267.
Levi Strauss, C. (1968/1983). *Structural anthropology* (trans. C. Jacobsen & B. G. Schoepf). London: Allen Lane.
Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Longacre, R. (1968). *Discourse, paragraph and sentence structure in selected Philippines languages.* Santa Ana, (California): Summer Institute of Linguistics.
Lotman, Y. (1997). *The structure of the artistic text.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Luckmann, T. (1992). On the communicative adjustment of perspectives, dialogue and communicative genres. In A.H. Wold (Ed.), *The dialogical towards a theory of language and mind*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
Maier, P. (1992). Politeness strategies in business letters by native and non- native English speakers. *English for Specific Purposes,* 11, 189-205.
Malinwoski, B. (1923/1935). The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In C. K. Ogden & Richards, I.A. (Eds.), *The meaning of meaning.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Malinwoski, B. (1935). *Coral gardens and their magic.* Vol. II. London: George
Martin, J.R. (1986). Intervening in the process of writing development. In C. Painter & J.R. Martin (Eds.), *Writing to mean: teaching genres across the curriculum.* Applied Linguistics Association of Australia, Occasional Papers, 9, 11-43.
Martin, J.R. (1995). Text and clause: fractal resonance. *Text*, 15, 1, 5 -42.
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*. Norwood: N.J. Ablex.
McHoul, A. (1978). The organisation of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language*

in Society, 7, 183-213.
Miller, C.R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech.* 70, 151-167.
Miller, C.R. (1994). Rhetorical community: the cultural basis of genre. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric.* London: Taylor and Francis.
Morrow, P.R. (1989). Conjunct u se in business stories and academic journal articles: A comparative study. *English for Specific Purposes,* 8*,* 239-254.
Nwogu, K.N. (1991). Structure of science popularizations: A genre analysis approach to the schema of popularized medical texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 10. 111-123.
Olrik, A. (1921/1992). *Principles of oral narrative research.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Oring, E. (1986). Folk narratives. In E. Oring (Ed.) *Folk groups and folklore genres.* Logan: Utah State University Press.
Painter, C. (1985). *Learning the mother tongue.* Victoria, (Australia): Deakin University Press.
Paltridge, B. R. (1997). Genre, discourse and academic listening. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *New ways in teaching adults.* Alexandra, VA: TESOL.
Propp, V. I. (1928). *The morphology of the folktale* (trans. L. Scott). Austin: University of Texas Press.
Richterich, R., & Chancerel, J. L. (1980). Identifying the needs of adults learning a foreign language. Oxford: Pergamon.
Rohrich, L. (1979/(1991). Folktales and reality (trans. P. Tokosfky). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Salager-Meyer, F. (1994). Hedges and textual communicative function in medical English written discourse. *English for Specific Purposes,* 13, 3, 149-170.
Samraj, B.T.R. (1995). Exploring current issues in genre theory. *Word.* 40, 2,189-200.
Saville-Troike, M. (1989). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction (*2nd edition). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Schegloff, E.A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational opening. *American Anthropologist*, 70, 1079-1095.
Scott, C.T. (1965*). Persian and Arabic riddles: A language centred approach to genre definition.* Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Research Centre in Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics.
Sommers, N. (1992). Between the drafts. *College compositions and communications. 43,* 23-31.
Spellmeyer, K. (1989). A common ground: The essay in the academy. *College English, 51*, 262-276.
Swales, J. (1981). Aspects of article introductions, *Aston ESP Research Reports,* No.1. Language Studies Unit, University of Aston at Birmingham.
Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Swales, J., & Najjar, H. (1987). The writing of research article introductions. *Written Communication*, 4, 175-191.
Thompson, S. (1994). Frameworks and context. A genre-based approach to analysing lecture introductions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13, 2, 171-186.
Threadgold, T. (1994). Genre. In R.E. Asher (Ed.), *The Encyclopaedia of Language* and Linguistics, Vol. 3. Oxford: Pergamon.
van Dijk, T.A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures, discourse interaction and cognition.* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
van Dijk, T.A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. In Teun A. van Dijk (Ed.), Studies in Critical Discourse Analysis. Special issue of *Discourse & Society*, 4 (2),

1993, 249-283.
Weissberg, B. (1993). The graduate seminar: another research process genre. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 23-25.
Wilkins, D. (1977). *Notional syllabuses: A taxonomy and its relevance to foreign language curriculum development*. London: Oxford University Press.
Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.