CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Background to text analysis

The study of genuine texts is found in some early linguistic traditions. Malinowski (1923) developed a theory which was then continued by Firth which viewed language as 'doing'. This tradition is often referred to as 'British contextualism' and the offshoots of this tradition is the scale and category linguistics and systemic linguistics.

Malinowski's theory includes the following. Firstly, in the lives of members of a society, language realizes action, expresses social and emotive functions and realizes phatic communion. Secondly, language cannot be seen in isolation from its social context and that the meaning of an utterance was found essentially in the use to which it was put. Thirdly, to understand the meaning of what is said, it is necessary to have some knowledge of the total cultural background and the cul-
tural history of the participant and the practices they are engaging in. Both the context of situation and the context of culture are necessary for the adequate understanding of the text.

This view of meaning as function in context became central to Firth's view of language and was expanded upon by him. It was this view of language that Halliday inherited from Firth. Firth was interested in language that appeared in a text and the study of texts in relation to their situation. His description included the following: (1) who the participants were; (2) what their verbal or non-verbal actions were; (3) what objects and events were relevant to the situation and (4) what the effects of the verbal action were ((Firth, 1957:182). Once the contextual analysis has been performed the analysis is carried out for the linguistic levels.

There are two general kinds of theoretical relations recognized in Firth's linguistic analyses: syntagmatic and paradigmatic. Syntagmatic relations show how meanings in texts are made up of language forms as structures. Structures are generated at different levels (syntactic, phonological etc) and each kind of structure consists of elements of its own type. Paradigmatic relations are set up between features or terms of systems which specify the values of the elements in the structures (Firth, 1957:200).
The concept of renewal of connection is another important aspect of Firth's theory. Whether we are speaking or writing, we always relate the on-going text to previous texts which we have come across.

Actual speech and genuine texts have also been the concern of speech act theorists such as Austin (1962, 1975) and Searle (1969) who have a strong functional orientation to how acts are performed in utterances (locutions, illocutions, perlocutions). They look at what a particular linguistic act is in terms of a question, a command and so on and what effects the utterances could have, whether it persuades or frightens someone. However they do not describe how members of a society behave in certain situations or take into account the context in which the speech acts occur and what can be said of the unfolding of their behaviour.

At around the same time, an approach which is more textually orientated arose from the ethnography of speaking which is anthropologically orientated, and ethnomethodology which is sociologically orientated. Both have some similarities with the Malinowski and Firthian tradition in that they focus on language used as a means of social interaction in different speech communities and how language expresses cultures and social structures.

The ethnography of speaking is concerned with the study of forms and speech as an activity in different situations in various cultures (Hymes, 1962, 1964,
1971, 1971). Anthropological studies have come up with different types of linguistic actions such as 'pray' and 'reproach', but do not have systematic methods for describing their linguistic characteristics. Ethnomethodologically based linguistics like Hymes' method of investigation of ethnographic data combine both anthropology and linguistics.

Speech events which can be categorized into types according to the names given by members of the community (eg. Sunday morning service); colloquial expressions (eg. chat) and verbs, phrases and sentences used to characterize the events (eg nice talk) are the focus of ethnography (Hymes, 1962:198-9). The following factors are analysed in speech events: sender; receiver; message form; channel; code; topic; and setting (Hymes 1962:198). These factors are correlated with the functions of speech: expressive; directive, pragmatic, rhetorical, persuasive; poetic; contact; metalinguistic; referential; contextual (or situational) (Hymes 1962:204).

Hymes' study of speech events does not look at the staging of social encounters to determine how people achieve their goals using language in context.

Systemicists in the 1950s and 1960s agreed that context was necessary in the study of language in situations. A constant feature of Hallidayan linguistics is the claim that the relationship between text and
context is a systematic one. This distinguished systemic models from the approaches such as transformational grammars which preferred to view language as if produced by a homogeneous speech community. However, at the time, the level of context was not defined clearly and there was no unified description of it. Perhaps the most lucid description of context and situation was given by Gregory (1967) who defined situation and context as follows:

By SITUATION is meant the study of those extra-textual features, linguistic and non-linguistic, which have high potential relevance to statements of meanings about the texts of language events. By CONTEXT is understood the correlations of formally described linguistic features, groupings of such features within texts and abstracted from them, with those situational features themselves constantly recurrent and relevant to the understanding of language events (Gregory, 1967:177-8).

Halliday has also made it clear that he is not interested simply on language for itself but in what linguistic theory can offer to the applied study of texts (Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens, 1964:139).

Discourse analysts, on the other hand, are interested in 'the level of the function of a particular utterance in a particular social situation and at a
particular place in a sequence, as a specific contribution to a developing discourse' (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975:13). They are also keen to show how one utterance follows another in a rational and rule-governed way.

2.2 Register

The analysis of genuine written and spoken discourse has been of interest to linguists since the 1950s and 1960s. Discourse analysis, register and genre variation and text linguistics examine communicative events that have actually taken place. Of relevance to the present study is register and genre analyses and because these two terms have been described and used in different ways detailed account of the emergence, theoretical changes and development is deemed necessary.

Firth is probably the first person to delve into the area of register when he examined what he termed 'restricted languages'. By 'restricted languages' he meant scientific language, commercial language, mathematical language etc. He referred to them as 'a particular form or genre' or to a type of work associated with a single author. He looked at a particular language as 'serving a circumscribed field of experience or action' and 'having its own grammar and dictionary' (Firth, 1957:124). This was very different from the then current trend of looking for abstractions from all the
different languages in the linguistic universe. The linguist in his analysis of texts is supposed to set up structures and systems for the field of application (Firth, 1968:108, 116).

After Firth, models which relate text to context have been developed. One of the most influential people in this area is Halliday (Halliday, 1978:142) who believes that if the context of situation is characterized in appropriate terms the relationship between language and the environment will be revealed.

The term 'register' first came into use in the fifties. According to Halliday, it was first used by Reid in 1956 and later developed and defined by various linguists, notably linguists working within the discipline of systemic grammar. Halliday and his associates gave meaning to the term 'register' in 1964 and described it as 'a variety according to use, in the sense that each speaker has a range of varieties and chooses between them at different times'. They distinguished it from dialect, which is 'a variety according to user, in the sense that each speaker uses one variety and uses it all the time' (Halliday, MacIntosh and Strevens 1964:77).

The dialect is what a person speaks, determined by who he is or what group he is in a language community. The register is what a person is speaking, determined by what he is doing with the language at the time (Halliday, MacIntosh
and Strevens, 1964:87).

Ure and Ellis (1977) and Basil Bernstein (1973) also took up and developed the term but Bernstein called it 'variant' instead.

Halliday's later definition of register tends to place more emphasis on semantic patterns and context.

Register is the set of meanings, the configuration of semantic patterns, that are typically drawn upon under the specified conditions, along with the words and structures that are used in the realization of these meanings (Halliday, 1978:23).

Register is also determined by who is taking part, what is taking place and what part the language is playing (Halliday, 1978:31). Emphasis is found on the broader social context:

A register can be defined as the configuration of semantic resources that the member of a culture typically associates with a situation type. It is the meaning potential that is accessible in a given social context (Halliday, 1978:111).
Halliday points out that while register may be recognized by its formal linguistic characteristics, its structure is semantic (Halliday, 1978:111). Priority seems to be given first to contextual elements and secondly to linguistic ones.

Halliday found the notion of register to be very useful as it was 'a means of investigating the linguistic foundations of everyday social interaction from an angle that is complementary to the ethnomethodological one' (Halliday, 1978:31, 62). The theory of register attempts to uncover the general principles which govern the ways the language we speak or write varies according to the type of situation (Halliday, 1978:32). But 'little is yet known about the nature of the variation involved, largely because of the difficulty of identifying the controlling factors' (Halliday, 1978:32).

Halliday claims that register is determined by three categories: field, tenor and mode (Halliday, 1978:62, 125). Field is the 'type of social action', tenor is the 'role relationships' and mode is the 'symbolic organization' (Halliday, 1978:35). In proposing that the situation types are analysed according to values of the field, tenor and mode variables, Halliday is attempting to show how the context of situation influences the selection of meanings for the construction of a text. His hypothesis is that these three
concepts are related respectively to the ideational, interpersonal and textual components of the semantic system' (Halliday, 1978:125). The dimension of field correlates with the ideational function of language, formality correlates with the interpersonal function and mode correlates with the textual function.

Halliday claims that if we compare texts differing in field, the most likely differences in the meaning choices made will be those concerned with the types of process, participant, circumstance while if we compare texts differing in tenor, it is more likely that the differences in meaning will be in the area of speech roles, attitude and styles of address and if we compare texts differing in mode, the semantic difference will be in the areas of theme, organization of information and cohesion (Halliday, 1978:117).

The relationship between field, tenor and mode and the particular linguistic features found are as follows:

(i) The field tends to determine the vocabulary used, the transitivity patterns which are the types of process, for example, relational process clauses, material process clauses and also the minor processes such as circumstantials and locatives. The field is expressed through the experiential function in the semantics.

(ii) The tenor involves choice of person, speech function such as request, imperatives, declaratives and
modals. The tenor is expressed through the interpersonal function in the semantics.

(iii) The mode tends to determine the forms of cohesion and the patterns of voice and theme. It is expressed through the textual function in the semantics.

Each of the three components, field, tenor and mode may be thought of as a variable that functions as a point of entry to any situation. They are the options that can be chosen in any situation. Halliday calls each set of options a CC (contextual configuration). 'A CC is a specific set of values that realizes field, tenor and mode' (Halliday and Hasan, 1985:55).

Similar to Halliday's work, Gregory and Carroll (1978) describe register as a 'useful abstraction linking variations of language to variations of social context' (1978:64).

It can...be described in terms of phonological, lexical and grammatical indexical markers (peculiar to a text) and common-core features (shared by texts). Register...defines what can be meant in situation. Register is, then, culturally determined since it is the culture of a society which determines the patterns of
environments in which language can occur (1978:64).

From the above descriptions, it can be seen that both situational and linguistic variables are an essential part of the process of register characterization. A register is a way of matching language use to the requirements of the situation.

There are marked and unmarked registers (Gregory and Carroll, 1978:68-69). Marked registers or restricted registers offer a narrow range of options and show a high degree of predictability. Unmarked registers offer a wider range of options and a greater variety of linguistic features. They are less predictable than marked registers.

Martin's (1985) definition of register differs from Halliday's in the sense that it views register as a semiotic system.

Whereas neo-Firthians tended to view register as an interlevel (context) relating language to the real world, in this view register is seen as another semiotic system in its own right (Martin, 1985:24).

This semiotic system is different from all the others 'because it is a parasite' and 'the only way
it can make meaning is by borrowing the words and structures of the semiotic...language' (Martin, 1985:24).

The choices open to speakers as far as field, mode and tenor are concerned and how the different register choices are realized need to be made if register is a semiotic system. Martin's meaning of field, tenor and mode has been changed considerably from Halliday's. According to Martin, Halliday's inclusion of purpose in his definitions of field, mode and tenor causes two problems.

First of all it makes the correlation between register categories and functional components of the grammar less clear. Second, it fails to give a satisfactory account of the goal oriented beginning-middle-end structure of most texts (Martin, 1985:24).

Martin and his colleagues felt that the two semiotic systems of register and language were insufficient to account for a clearer relation between register choices and metafunctional components and the schematic structures which characterize writing. They then recognized a third semiotic system which they called genre, underlying both register and language. This system is also a parasite dependent upon register and language.
2.3 Genre

The study of register in the 1960s and 1970s involved recognizing types of interaction in different situations. No attention was given to the unfolding of social interaction and how this unfolding influences the way linguistic features and patterns are manifested differently at each stage of the unfolding process. Within the types found in register studies there are typical ways of unfolding an interaction for each type.

The concepts of register and genre have been much discussed and at times are used interchangeably. But in the last two decades, genre, particularly within the work of Australian Systemic linguists and linguists of the Birmingham school, has assumed an important place in functional linguistics, a place which had at one time been occupied by register.

Genre theorists emphasize on social and cultural factors as the generating factor of all actions including linguistic action.

Genres are primarily defined as the socially ratified text-types in a community, which make meaning possible by contextualizing in a meta-grammatical way the actual linguistic or semantic patterns that constitute the lexico-grammar of texts (Kress and Threadgold, 1988:216).
Halliday uses the term register in discussing the relationship between texts and social processes. Genre to him is used in a limited sense, similar to its use in literature. The term 'generic structure' is seen by Halliday as an organizational or schematic structure and it is one of three factors, generic structures, textual structure and cohesion, which distinguish text from non-text (Halliday, 1978:145). This generic feature is a feature of all texts, written as well as spoken. Thus for Halliday genre is a lower order semiotic concept than register and that it contributes to register.

The term 'genre' has been interpreted in various ways. Early interpretations of 'genre' is typical of that of Hymes (1974) who sees genre as categories such as tale, poem, myth etc. Hymes study of genre was restricted to formal categories/characteristics and is not able to account for language as a social process.

Genre theorists found register as insufficient to account for the relationship between text and context but they nevertheless acknowledged that Hallidayan linguists formed the basis of their theories.

The genre theory underlying the so-called 'genre-based' approaches to writing development was developed by Hasan 1978, Kress 1982, Martin 1983 and others as
an extension of earlier work on register by systemic linguistics including Halliday, Gregory, Ure and Ellis (Martin, Christie and Rothery, 1987:119).

Genre theory differs from register theory in some respects. One of them is the emphasis placed on social purpose as a determining variable in language use (Martin, Christie and Rothery 1987:119). Register theory is seen to place too little emphasis on social processes and functional aspects of texts. This theory is considered to place linguistic features above social context and context of situation over the broader social context (give exs). This may be because Halliday, in one of his earlier works on register stated that ‘if two samples of language activity from what, on non-linguistic grounds, could be considered different situation-types show no differences in grammar or lexis, they are assigned to one and the same register’. Halliday appeared to be placing linguistic characteristics above contextual factors.

In his later work Halliday admitted the early over-emphasis on lexicogrammar and attempts to rectify this by shifting the emphasis on to semantics. He states that ‘while a register is recognizable as a particular selection of words and structures...it is the selection of meanings that constitutes the variety to which a text
belongs'. He then defines register in semantic terms, as the configuration of semantic resources, the meaning potential accessible in a given social context (Halliday, 1978: 110-111). This however has not prevented others from associating register with linguistic characteristics. Register theory is also seen to place too much weight on context of situation.

To genre theorists, context refers more to the context of culture. Genre theorists 'attempt to understand how the construction and reading of texts meshes with other social practices in a historical context' (Kress and Threadgold, 1988:218). Genre theory is a 'means of describing ways in which texts and the social agents which produce them construct and are constructed by the social and the cultural' (Kress and Threadgold, 1988:216).

Genre theorists feel that an investigation into genres is important because 'genres are the most stable and the most solid of communicative events' (Tickoo, 1986:14). Swales defines genre as 'a recognized communicative event with a shared public purpose and with aims mutually understood by the participants within that event, a structured and standardized communicative event with constraints on allowable contributions in terms of their positioning, formand intent'. Those who belong to a particular genre have an 'overt knowledge of the conventions of the genre' (Tickoo, 1988:13). Genres, therefore, provide a precise indicator of the
relevant social occasions of a community at a given time.

Traditionally, genre has been associated with literature so studies on poems, sonnets, novels have been carried out extensively. But interest in genre outside the field of literature has over the last two decades arisen. Work on interviews and classroom lessons started in the 1970s with Sinclair’s and Coulthard’s being a well-known example (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975). However, their study did not relate the form of the lesson to the social system. Later work on genre tended to connect texts to the institution from which it derives and the social occasions on which they arise. A description of linguistic form must incorporate the broader social context in which it appears. A description of register, on the other hand, concentrates on the form of the text which is related to the context of situation determined by field, mode and tenor choices.

This focus of register theorists on linguistic features has resulted in the study of texts as products, a synoptic view of texts. Genre theorists, in contrast, prefer to look at both the synoptic view and the dynamic view of texts which means that they examine both the product and the process.

The study of register is usually confined to the study of linguistic features of sections of texts whereas the study of genre involves whole interactions
and the unfolding of whole texts. Halliday himself does not see the distinction as necessary and perceives register as sufficient to show the relationship between text and context at all levels.

A number of language experts have drawn attention to the inadequacy of register analysis with the main reason being that there is an overemphasis on linguistic structures at the expense of communicative events or functions. Both are actually important in that they approach a text in different ways. Register focusses more on the syntax and lexis and genre more on discourse structures. Register looks at sections of texts and genre on whole texts.

2.4 Approaches to genre

The work on genre within systemic linguistics is closely related to anthropological and ethnographic views on discourse. In spite of this, there exists a considerable number of differences in their approaches to genre.

2.4.1 The Birmingham School

Sinclair and Coulthard carried out a study in the social context of classroom interaction at the University of Birmingham in 1975. The fundamental claim in this work is that 'the discourse value of an item depends on what linguistic items have preceded it, what
are expected to follow and what do follow' (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975:34).

Sinclair and Coulthard emphasize the lack of any necessary one-to-one correspondence between discourse categories and grammatical categories. 'While elicitations are always realized by questions, directives by commands, and informatives by statements, the relationship is not reciprocal: questions can realize many other acts and the expression 'rhetorical question' is a recognition of this fact' (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975:34). It is for this reason that they justify a level of discourse structure separate from the grammar.

For the formal analysis of discourse patterning, Sinclair and Coulthard take over the apparatus of Halliday's Scale and Category grammar. The system that they have produced is hierarchical and the method of presentation is modelled on Halliday's 'Categories of a Theory of Grammar'. The terms which are used, structure, system, rank, level, delicacy, realization, marked and unmarked originate from Halliday.

The model recognizes a discourse level, where among other things, global structures are seen to operate. The act is simply the lowest unit on a discourse rank scale and it corresponds mostly to the grammatical units of clause. But whereas grammar is concerned with the formal properties of an item, discourse is concerned with the functional properties, that is, what the speak-
er is using the item for. The next rank of unit, the move, is made up of acts and is concerned centrally with each discrete contribution to a discussion made by one speaker and is thus the minimal free unit of discourse. Sinclair and Coulthard have come up with five classes of move which realize two classes of exchange, boundary and exchange. 'Framing and Focusing moves realize boundary exchanges and Opening, Answering, and Follow-up moves realize teaching exchanges' (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975:44).

Moves from different speakers combine to form exchanges, which in turn combine to form transactions. The largest unit proposed is, in the most general terms, the interaction, of which the lesson is the subclass which is specific to the classroom situation.

Sinclair and Coulthard's work was restricted to a single context, that of classroom interaction. Their work spurred several others to use their model to examine other situational contexts. The ultimate aim of this group of researchers was to provide a discourse model which can be applied to various contexts, a model with more general validity.

The Sinclair and Coulthard model of discourse seeks to capture the linear and hierarchical nature of discourse. The model is heavily dependent on the early scale-and-category theory of grammar and just a single layer of structure is recognized. The case for recognizing more than one layer of structure has been strongly
put forward by Berry (Halliday and Fawcett, 1987). She argues that an account of discourse structure based on a single linear structure for each unit does not allow one to take into account of enough similarities and differences between texts. It is also too limited to enable one to predict the distribution of surface forms, to generate 'grammatical' forms of discourse and to block 'ungrammatical' forms (Coulthard and Montgomery, 1981:121-122). She suggests that exchange structure should not be seen in linear terms but as made up of the three components, ideational, interpersonal and textual components of Halliday's clause grammar.

Berry suggests that the minimum amount of information for an exchange is a completed proposition. The propositional structure of the exchange containing the information itself is seen as constituting the ideational layer of structure. One layer of ideational structure, the 'propositional completion' which has the function of completing the proposition, is obligatory under all circumstances, and other elements, the 'propositional base' and 'propositional support' may also be present, and indeed must occur under certain circumstances. The interpersonal layer of functions is concerned with the knowledge relationships between participants who transmit and receive information. In all exchanges involving information transmission, there must be a 'primary knower' who has the information, and a
'secondary knower' to whom the information is imparted. The textual layer of functions is concerned with the turn-taking by the participants in the discourse. It consists of alternate contributions from each speaker (Coulthard and Montgomery, 1981:132).

For her work on exchange structure, Berry argues that it is not necessary to propose a new level of analysis, namely discourse. The observations that she wishes to make about sentences in exchanges can be made by identifying three layers of structure, textual, interpersonal and ideational, directly comparable to those recognized by Halliday for the clause. Whereas Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) take the sentence to be the largest unit of grammar, Berry (1981) does not see any grounds for taking it as the cut-off point.

Like Berry, Turner (Halliday, 1987) deals with aspects of the Birmingham work on discourse structure and attempts to relate it to the sociosemantic network approach by Halliday. Both approaches utilize the Hallidayan linguistic model, though different versions of it, representing different stages in development. Both the Birmingham approach and the sociosemantic one are linguistic approaches to discourse: they are both concerned with language as situated social behaviour. Turner's work aims to show the extent to which the two approaches can be brought together.

Turner interprets most of Sinclair and Coulthard's analysis as relating to the textual layer of
discourse, the rest as relating to the interpersonal layer based on Halliday's 1978 discussion on what is 'text' and what gives a text 'texture' (Halliday and Fawcett, 1987:88).

Turner claims that the sociosemantic work has largely been concerned with the actual communication roles that the speakers adopt in negotiating information and action, such as informing, acknowledging, questioning, answering, threatening, warning, which is found in the interpersonal layer of structure. Both the Birmingham work and the sociosemantic work are, of course, concerned with propositional content, though in differing ways. Halliday (1981), in fact describes the Birmingham work as being concerned with ideational structure. Turner qualifies that by saying that Sinclair and Coulthard have identified a textual structure that reflects hierarchically ordered content, but they have not directly analysed the structure of the content: they have not been concerned with the proposition. The sociosemantic work in its sub-classification of speech acts, such as threats, has been concerned with content.

The more recent work in Birmingham by Swales (1981, 1985, 1990) who later moved to the United States of America, Dudley-Evans (1986) and their colleagues focus on genre but they approach it in a different way from the earlier model. Their study of genre is due to
its applicability to applied linguistics, especially in the field of ESP. Swales was the first to use the term "genre analysis" in ESP in his work on article introduction. By the term he meant "a system of analysis that is able to reveal something of the patterns of organization of a "genre" and the language used to express those patterns" and the reason for this type of analysis is "to gain insights into the nature of a genre that will be useful in ESP materials writing and teaching (Dudley-Evans, 1987:1). It is perceived to be prescriptive and applied in nature but it is "not prescription in the old fashioned way of prescribing certain grammatical forms to the correct forms". Instead it "makes suggestions about the layout, ordering and language appropriate to a particular writing or speaking task (1987:3).

The most extensive study done in this approach has been on the analysis of written texts, in particular the research article. Swales has focussed mainly on the study of introductions and has adopted the term "move" in his analysis. The term has been defined by Mckinlay (1983) as "a semantic unit which is related to the writer's purpose" (Coulthard, 1986:131). It could consist of a single sentence or more but is usually not more than a paragraph long.

Swales has come up with firstly, four and later, three main moves in introductions with the steps which appear under each move and has commented on the language which is used in the different steps. Although
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a suitable model for the analysis of introductions it may be too simple for the analysis of the other sections which have several recycling moves and where the occurrence of moves are far from fixed. Swales' (1990) model is given below.

**Move 1 Establishing a territory**

Step 1 Claiming centrality

and/or

Step 2 Making topic generalization(s)

Step 3 Reviewing items of previous research

**Move 2 Establishing a niche**

Step 1A Counter-claiming

or

Step 1B Indicating a gap

or

Step 1C Question-raising

or

Step 1D Continuing a tradition

**Move 3 Occupying the niche**

Step 1A Outlining purposes

or

Step 1B Announcing present research

Step 2 Announcing principal findings

Step 3 Indicating RA structure
A number of writers have applied the moves analysis to the different sections of academic articles. Swales' first and second models for article introduction have been used by some writers in the analysis of introductions in different disciplines (Peng, 1987; Swales and Najjar, 1987; Crookes, 1986). Peng's analysis of data reveals that Swales' first model was applicable to it whereas Crookes' concludes that results seem to agree that there are four basic units but that only in the shorter introductions are the four-move schema given in Swales' first model found. In more complex introductions a variety of alternative arrangements is possible, involving repeated use of moves two and three.

2.4.2 Systemic representations of genre

In the search for a theory of text typology, systemic linguistics seems to have a slight advantage over some other approaches. The groundwork laid by Malinowski, Firth and scale-and-category theory has provided systemic theory with a theory of language and context and a theory of register. This has enabled systemic linguists to capture the relationships between the social structure of a society and the linguistic realizations of this social structure.

Malinowski and Firth were the first to relate situation to language. Halliday then found field, tenor and mode to be the variables which determine the context
of situation and which correlate systematically with the linguistic strata of semantics-lexicogrammar-phonology. Semantics has taken the place of context which has become part of situation, as the third linguistic stratum and is seen in terms of semantic components. Registers which describe text variation are now defined by looking downwards from the social semiotic to the linguistic system (Halliday, 1978:69). The field, tenor and mode are hypothesized to determine the respective choices from the ideational, interpersonal and textual components of semantics. This is done probabilistically by the pre-selection of certain semantic choices from the total semantic meaning potential of language. These pre-selections constitute a description of register and enables texts to be classified as types.

Halliday has concentrated mainly on variations of texts and neglected the study of the unfolding of texts and how the unfolding reveals the genre of the text. Work on this aspect has been done by other systemic linguists. The following is a review of the approaches to genre which have emerged in systemic linguistics.

2.4.2.1 Hasan's Linear Generic Structure Potential

Hasan (1985) proposes that when we look at a text we have to consider what kind of a CC (contextual configuration) such a text would be embedded in. To do this, one has to examine the field, tenor and mode of
the text. 'The obligatory elements define the genre to which a text belongs' and 'an optional element is one that can occur but need not occur'. 'Their optionality arises from the fact that their occurrence is predicted by some attribute of a CC that is non-defining for the CC and to the text-type embedded in that CC' (Halliday and Hasan, 1985:61-63). Genre in their model is the verbal expression of the CC, in other words it is the genre-specific semantic potential.

Halliday and Hasan claim that the possibility of a text structure for every text type that can be appropriate to a particular CC can be discovered by looking at the range of obligatory and optional elements and their order. What this means is that 'it is possible to state the STRUCTURE POTENTIAL of this genre, or its GENERIC STRUCTURE POTENTIAL' (Halliday and Hasan, 1985:64). This can be compared to Sinclair and Coulthard's work on exchanges described above.

Halliday and Hasan state that knowledge of the CC (which variables from field, tenor and mode are chosen) informs us what meanings are relevant to what stage of an ongoing activity, and if those meanings are not being made at the relevant stage, something can be done about it. They provide the example of sales requests which should contain information about the identity and quantity of the commodity sought by the customer. If it does not contain either of these, then some kind of repair can be applied (Halliday and Hasan, 1985:67).
They recommend that the boundaries of a text's structural elements should be established because 'without this, the analysis will remain so intuitive that two persons analyzing the same text might differ greatly' (1985:67).

Unlike Swales, they state that there is 'no neat one-to-one correspondence between a structural element and a clause or a sentence' or a structural element and an individual message or act. Texts belonging to the same genre can vary in their structure.

The linear Generic Structure Potential has been found to be unable to account for certain phenomena in some data. Ventola, in her analysis of service encounters, used the GSP of service encounters as a starting point. According to Halliday and Hasan's findings, the obligatory elements of SALES REQUEST, SALES COMPLIANCE, SALE, PURCHASE and PURCHASE CLOSURE and some of the optional elements GREETINGS, SALE INITIATION, SALE ENQUIRY and FINIS must be included and that all texts which belong in the same context of situation and which do not have the obligatory elements of the GSP must be considered incomplete (Halliday and Hasan, 1980/85:83).

The limitations of the GSP is that there appears to be a strict sequencing of elements, for example, all SALES REQUESTS and SALES COMPLIANCES must be realized before the exchange of money can take place.
Also recycling or repetition of elements can take place and this may not be demonstrated in a linear model.

In Hasan's approach, the absence of obligatory GSP elements means that the text is incomplete or that the genre in which it belongs cannot be determined. The presence of all the obligatory elements classify the text into a particular genre. This can be misleading because an obligatory GSP element may be left out of the text for reasons known to the speaker or writer and that does not make the text a non-text. According to the linear GSP slight changes in field, tenor or mode will result in changes in the obligatory and optional elements.

2.4.2.2 The Connotative Semiotics Model

In the connotative semiotics framework which has been elaborated by Martin and a group of researchers, register and genre are proposed as semiotic systems in their own right, the same as language. The difference between register and genre, and language is that language is considered a denotative semiotic system which means that it has its own means of organizing expression via phonology whereas register and genre are connotative and hence have no expression. Register and genre have to use language as their expression plane.

Martin's framework shares with the Halliday/Hasan framework the view of the language plane as a tri-stratal organization. The description of the
phonological and lexicogrammatical systems and structures are similar to the Halliday and Hasan framework (Halliday 1985). The third stratum differs from theirs in that it does not constitute the ideational, interpersonal and textual semantic networks, but is the discourse stratum. This stratum has distinct text creating systems which generate discourse structures. Genre is realized by register and register by language.

In this model, field, tenor and mode are no longer seen as the extralinguistic contextual variables to which certain context-specific values are assigned on the register plane and which then give rise to registral and generic features in text, as it is in the Halliday/Hasan framework. Instead the field, tenor and mode will formally capture 'the kinds of institutions we participate in, the ranges of role, status, power, solidarity, affect and contact relations in respect to other members of the speech community and orientation to communication channels which we can select for transmitting messages' (Ventola, 1987:60). Since in this framework, genre is realized by register and register by language, the view of register as a linguistic reflection of context of situation is redefined.

It is necessary to have genre as an abstraction underlying register and language because 'genre constrains the possible combinations of choices from the register networks of field, mode and tenor in texts of
the same type' (Martin, 1985:250). In fact it does more than that: 'it actually regulates what combinations of field, mode and tenor are relevant at a particular stage of the unfolding of an activity' (Ventola, 1988:62). Martin uses the term 'schematic structure' and Ventola uses 'generic structure' for a staged unfolding of a text. The terms are different from Hasan's GSP in that they are not generating potentials but are actualized structures consisting of certain linguistic patterns. The generating potential in Ventola's framework are captured in systems networks and the structure potentials by a flowchart representation.

In this model the generic structures in the genre plane are generated by genre system networks which capture not only similarities in texts of the same kind, but also similarities in texts of a similar kind (sub-generic qualities of texts) (see Martin, 1985:253-4). 'The hypothesis is that the generic choices in the culture of a society are captured by generic system networks, which define how one genre is related to another by evermore delicate features' (Ventola, 1988:63).

In both Ventola's network and Hasan's linear GSP representation, the concept of text variation is in-built from the beginning. This makes them stand out from the other text approaches which have rigid notions of text structure variation. Ventola find the network to be more flexible in capturing particular genres 'and the hypothesis of systematic realizational links with the
register and language planes makes the network representation more lucrative'. It appears to have more explanatory potential than the GSP' (Ventola, 1988:63).

Ventola gives the following reasons to support the above. Firstly, in some interactions the obligatory genre-defining elements do not always appear in the texts. In the network representation, two texts are classified to be the same on the basis of shared features. The text which has selected the obligatory element has simply more delicate features than the text which does not. Secondly, the optional elements in the texts can be brought together with the other features which define generic qualities of texts in this network representation. Thirdly, unlike the GSP framework, if an element does not appear, the text is not considered a non-text, but still a functional text of which the feature selection in the network has not proceeded to a certain stage.

The generation of variant generic structures within one text type can be accounted for in the network representation. The realizational rules which are present in Martin's genre network seem analogical to Hasan's obligatory elements. The selection of a feature from this network is realized by a particular generic structural element. However, not all elements appear in the actual text even though the features have been selected. Ventola gives the example that not all texts
which deal with goods require the realization of the element PAY. This genre network which views texts as synoptic, static products does not capture the fact that at various points of the social process the interactants can opt out from a typical stage of the social process or complete the activity in an alternative way.

Ventola's explanation for the limitations of networks and how they generate structures is that 'the selections in the genre network are expected to explode into a linear structure where one element follows another in a predictable sequence' and 'this view of the unfolding of generic structures is too rigid' and that 'it cannot account for the fact that some elements can reoccur in texts and that some elements may sometimes be left out' (Ventola, 1988:66).

Ventola proposes that a flowchart representation is able to capture the dynamic, process aspects of text creation unlike the genre network which generates in the realization actual, but static texts, texts viewed as finished products.

The dynamic flowchart representation aims to capture the potential linearization of texts over time. It represents the various ways in which interactants continuously have to make decisions about the development and the direction of the social process. The flowchart shows how in the process of creating
a text interactants stop and negotiate which elements are realized step by step...The dynamic flowchart captures how in individual texts the synoptic view of genre can be 'manipulated' to generate structurally unique texts which nevertheless belong to the same genre (Ventola, 1988:67).

In this particular framework recursion is handled easily and obligatory elements may be easily bypassed. This means that different texts of the same genre can have different actualized generic structures and they would still be perfectly functional as textual realizations of that particular genre.

The connotative semiotic framework of genre-register-language appears to be suitable as the theoretical basis from which one can account for the facts found in spoken data, and in some cases to written data.

Ventola's flowchart meets the following minimal requirements for a dynamic model for generating interactions given in Ventola (1987:139): it represents the canonical sequence of elements in a genre, as well as show how variation in sequencing is achieved; it shows how interactants can reiterate elements; it accommodates optional elements in a genre; it brings in verbal as well as non-verbal activities as realizations of elements; it shows how interactants jointly negotiate the social process in question, ie show that a text is a
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shared construction (Ventola, 1987:77).

2.5 Concluding Remarks

The above review shows that a lot of work has been carried out on how texts can be classified into types and how they are generated. The earlier work in Birmingham by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) is disappointing in that it ignored global generic structures and that no analysis of the different categories was really done except in a general way. The later work by Swales' and others focussed on genre mainly for its usefulness in applied linguistics especially in the teaching of ESP. Their analysis aims to discover the patterns of organization of genre and the language used to realize those patterns. The work of the systemic linguists on genre reflects an interest in the suprasentential patterning of texts.

The different models described have similarities and differences. In spite of this, in my view, the framework of genre has a lot to offer because models for interaction are developed, and a better understanding of what variation is in genres can be obtained. Thus, the appropriate conventions and realizations within a genre leading to the understanding of cultures will be achieved. The research undertaken here will attempt to make the genre of the medical research article explicit and present models which can be tested and experimented with by applied linguists.