TAB	ABLE OF CONTENTS	
Origi	nal Literary Work Declaration	ii
Abstr	ract	iii
Abstr	rak	iv
Ackn	owledgement	V
Dedic	cation	vi
Table of Contents		vii
List of Figures		xi
List c	of Tables	xii
Abbre	eviations	xiii
СНА	PTER ONE : AN OVERVIEW	
1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose statement	1
1.2	Background to the Study: Legal knowledge and legal genre 1.2.1 Legislations 1.2.2 The Participants 1.2.3. The communicative purpose 1.2.4 Production strategies 1.2.5 Legal textbooks 1.2.6 Mental schemata 1.2.7 Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity 1.2.8 Law of Tort	1 2 2 3 3 3 4 4 6
1.3	Research Questions	6
1.4	Significance of the Study	7
1.5	ESP and Legal genre 1.5.1 EALP (English for Academic Legal Purpose) 1.5.2 ESP and Easifications	7 7 9
1.6	Limitations of the Study	
1.7	Structure of the Report	10

CHA	PTER	TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	12
2.0	Intro	duction	12
2.1	Langu	age and Legal language	12
2.2	2.2.1 2.2.2 2.2.3	Genre as frame Genre as reflection Theory of genre	12 14 14 15 15
2.3	Theor	etical Framework	17
2.4	Concl	usion	18
СНА	PTER	ΓHREE: RESEARCH DESIGNS	20
3.0	Introd	uction	20
3.1	Data (Collection Segments of Data	21 21
3.2	Who	writes these texts?	22
3.3	These	texts were written for whose benefits?	22
3.4		odology Macro Structure Micro Structure	22 23 24
3.5	Justifi 3.5.1	cation for Methodology Identifying generic structure of the Introductions of Tort textbooks	25 25
3.6	Concl		26
СНА	PTER	FOUR: RESULTS OF ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	27
4.0	Introd	luction	27
4.1		by Cooke : Structural Interpretation at o level	27
	4.1.1	Structural Interpretation at Micro level	28
4.2		by Harpwood: Structural Interpretation at level Structural Interpretation at Micro level	32 32

4.3	Macro	by Murphy: Structural Interpretation at Level Structural Interpretation at Micro Level	40 40	
4.4	Text 4 Macro 4.4.1		47 48	
4.5	Text 5 Macro 4.5.1		51 52	
4.6	Result 4.6.1	ts of Analysis and Findings Main Findings: Common Patterns/Moves	56 56	
	4.6.2	Orientation	58	
	4.6.3	Difficulty of the Tort 4.6.3 (a) Interpretation of the Difficulty of the Law	60 61	
	4.6.4	Topoi of "WE" 4.6.4 (a) Interpretation of Topoi of "WE"	61 62	
	4.6.5	Typifications	62	
	4.6.6	General Headings	65	
	4.6.7	Analogies and Hypothesis 4.6.7 (a) Interpretation of the Analogies and Hypothesis	65 66	
	4.6.8	Linearity	67	
	4.6.9	Generic Expectations	68	
	4.6.10	Footnotes	69	
	4.6.11	Intertextuality	70	
4.7	Concl	usion	70	
CHAI	PTER	FIVE: SUMMARY	72	
5.0	Introd	uction	72	
5.1	Answe	ers to RQ	72	
5.2	Implic	eations and Applications	75	
5.3	Recon	nmendations and Contribution to Study	75	

5.4 Conclusion	75
APPENDICES	77
Appendix A:Text 1 by Cooke	77
Appendix B: Text 2 by Harpwood	90
Appendix C: Text 3 by Murphy	99
Appendix D: Text 4 by Quinn	109
Appendix E: Text 5 by Heuston	117
Appendix F: Feature chart of Various Types of Liability available to claimant (s).	e 122
BIBLIOGRAPHY	123

Х

LIST OF FIGURES	PAGES
Figure 1.1 - Example of interdiscursivity in the legal genre.	5
Figure 1.2 - Dialectical relationship between caselaw and legislation by BHATIA	5
Figure 1.3 - Example of Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity	5
Figure 1.4 - Functional sequence of Legal Reasoning Moves and Steps	9
Figure 3.1 - An illustration of how Bunton Structure is applied to this present study	23
Figure 4.1 - A mathematical formula which depicts the legal doctrine of negligence	60

	LIST OF TABLES	PAGES
Table 4.1 –	Chart representation of common moves and features	57
Table 4.2 –	An illustration of Element/ Theme/ Move Sequence from Harpwood	59
Table 4.3 –	An illustration of Element/Theme/ Move Sequence from Cooke	59
Table 4.4 –	Frequency of Occurrence of a landmark case in the law of Tort	63
Table 4.5 –	Frequency of Occurrence of obscurity of legal doctrines	63
Table 4.6 –	Frequency of Occurrence of claims apart from tortious actions	63
Table 4.7 –	Frequency of Occurrence of Introduction of legal doctrines	64
Table 4.8 –	Frequency of Occurrence of remedy for damages and compensation culture	64
Table 4.9 –	Frequency of Occurrence of Conclusion of the Introductions chapter	64
Table 4.10 –	Frequency of Occurrence of how legal doctrines are analogised, hypothesised and distinguished	66
Table 4.11 –	Linear description of the schemata structure	68

ABBREVIATIONS

AC = Appeal Cases

All ER = All England Law Reports

CARS = Create a Research Space

doi = Digital Object Identifier

Excerpts from text/s or citations from authors.

Eg = example

EGLR = Estate Gazette Law Reports

EWCA = Court of Appeal (England and Wales)

EALP = English for Academic Legal Purposes

EAP = English for Academic Purposes

ESP = English for Specific Purposes

ed. (eds) = edition, editor(s)

et al = and others

ex parte = on behalf of

i.e = that is

IRLR = Industrial Relations Law Reports

ISBN = International Standard Book Number

no.(nos) = number(s)

NSPCC = National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children

OCLC = Online Computer Library Centre

QB = Queen's Bench

QBD = Queen's Bench Division

PNLR = Professional Negligence and Liability Reports

p. pp = page(s)

R = Crown

RA = Research Article

RQ = Research Question

rev = revised

sec = Section(s)

SFL = Systemic Funcional Linguistics

UKHL = United Kingdom House of Lords

Vol = Volume

vis a vis = (Noun) a person or thing having the same function or

characteristics as another.

(Adv) -face-to-face with; literally 'face to face