



功能语言学论丛

Investigating the Reading to Learn
Program Adapted in a Tertiary Setting

读写教学法在高校实施的案例研究

刘 毅◎著



中山大學出版社
SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY PRESS



功能语言学论丛



深圳大学学术著作出版基金资助

Subsidized by Shenzhen University Foundation for the Production of Scholarly Monographs

Investigating the Reading to Learn Program Adapted in a Tertiary Setting

读写教学法在高校实施的案例研究

刘 毅◎著



中山大学出版社
SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

• 广州 •

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

读写教学法在高校实施的案例研究 = Investigating the Reading to Learn Program Adapted in a Tertiary Setting: 英文/刘毅著. —广州: 中山大学出版社, 2017. 8

(功能语言学论丛)

ISBN 978 - 7 - 306 - 05871 - 3

I. ①读… II. ①刘… III. ①英语—阅读教学—教学研究—高等学校—英文 ②英语—写作—教学研究—高等学校—英文
IV. ①H319.4 ②H315

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2016) 第 257193 号

出版人: 徐 劲

策划编辑: 熊锡源

责任编辑: 熊锡源

封面设计: 林绵华

责任校对: 刘学谦

责任技编: 何雅涛

出版发行: 中山大学出版社

电 话: 编辑部 020-84111996, 84113349, 84111997, 84110779

发行部 020-84111998, 84111981, 84111160

地 址: 广州市新港西路 135 号

邮 编: 510275 传 真: 020-84036565

网 址: <http://www.zsup.com.cn> E-mail: zdcbs@mail.sysu.edu.cn

印 刷 者: 佛山市浩文彩色印刷有限公司

规 格: 880mm × 1230mm 1/32 8.75 印张 360 千字

版次印次: 2017 年 8 月第 1 版 2017 年 8 月第 1 次印刷

定 价: 30.00 元

如发现本书因印装质量影响阅读, 请与出版社发行部联系调换

中文摘要

读写教学法 (Rose 2005a, 2005b, 2006a) 是基于韩礼德 (Halliday 1994) 的系统功能语言模型和马丁 (Martin and Rose 2008) 的体裁理论建立的悉尼学派体裁教学方式。本书以马丁 (Martin 2008, 2010) 的语义投入理论和梅顿 (Maton 2009) 的语义学理论为分析框架, 探讨读写教学法在应用于高校环境的条件下教师如何运用语义投入资源帮助学生掌握学术阅读技能。本书还讨论相关教师对读写教学法的观点和应用时的调整情况及学生对该教学法的反馈意见。用于研究的语料源于 Rose (2003) 的示范课、两次课堂教学录音和两次采访录音。课堂教学录音和采访对象是澳洲一所高校英语教学中心的两位使用该教学法的教师。在学生课程结业时, 对他们进行了一次问卷调查。

课堂分析显示, 语义投入资源可分为三大类, 即元话语、准备提示语和去隐喻化。元话语的讨论集中于书写名词和抽象名词的教学功能, 书写名词的功能分为点题和投射两类, 抽象名词在教师话语中的语义体现为示例功能。本研究发现三种示例功能, 彼此交叉使用, 将抽象名词语境化, 使语义投入增加, 达到降低语义波的效果。

关于准备资源的讨论围绕特殊疑问句和概括资源开展。在读写法课堂中, 特殊疑问句可与位置提示语单独使用, 但通常与位置提示语和意义提示语并用。在特殊疑问句的具体使用中, 根据词语的难度, 语义投入呈现一个连续体的状态, 以不提供支持的概括性特殊疑问句为一端, 含有特别具体支持的特殊疑问句则为

另一端。这一语义投入的差异与语义引力和语义密度成正比。此外，意义提示语还以概括资源的形式呈现。本书分析了分类与构成两种概括资源的课堂使用情况。

对语法隐喻解构的教学问题，作者具体考察了 Rose 和两位英语中心教师的处理方法。理论上，读写教学法仅局限于对语法隐喻采用卸载的方法。然而，Rose 的示范课显示，他的去隐喻教学策略还包括使用同义词和改述。两位英语中心的教师将语法隐喻作为生词处理，并对同一隐喻在不同的教学步骤中采用不同的去隐喻化方式。A 教师去隐喻化的方式更加多样，而 B 教师在教学中则趋于使用语法隐喻，然后给予去隐喻化解释。在去隐喻化过程中，两位教师基本依赖于自身的教学经验和教学直觉。

关于对读写教学法的看法和实施中的调整情况，两位中心教师对该教学法均持有积极态度，对实施该教学法的原因及其局限性具有一致的看法。但他们对读写教学法优势的看法则明显不同。A 教师认为读写法的优势为改述，通过改述作为桥梁帮助学生理解学术话语。而 B 教师认为该教学法的主要优势为段落大意的讲解。由于看法不同，他们课堂教学的重点存在差异。在详细阅读阶段，A 教师投入的精力远多于 B 教师，能够创造性地实施读写教学法。

关于调查问卷的结果，学生对读写教学法的看法总体趋于正面。阅读阶段的教法特别有益于学生理解生词意义和段落的主题思想，划分核心词的步骤可以使学生更好地理解课文的组织结构，而合作复写的环节对学生的选词造句提供了有效的帮助。尽管该课程为写作课，但调查表明，读写法对学生的写作信心提高并不明显。这一情形可能与教师的主导角色与写作任务的难度有关。

Abstract

The Reading to Learn (hereafter R2L) program (Rose 2005a, 2005b, 2006a) is a Sydney School approach to genre pedagogy, grounded in a functional model of language founded by Halliday (1994) and a theory of genre developed by Martin and his colleagues (Martin and Rose 2008). Drawing from Martin's (2008, 2010) commitment theory and Maton's (2009) semantics, this book examines the teachers' use of commitment resources for scaffolding academic readings in the Reading to Learn pedagogy adapted in a tertiary setting. It also investigates the teachers' views and their adaptation of the approach as well as the students' feedback. The data for analysis come from Rose's (2003) demonstration lesson, two audio-taped classroom lessons and two interviews given respectively by the two English teachers, using the approach at a center for English teaching in an Australian university. A questionnaire investigation was conducted among the students of the course at the time of their graduation.

The analysis identifies three types of commitment resources, namely metadiscourse, preparation cues and demetaphorization. The discussion of metadiscourse focuses on the pedagogical functions of graphological nouns and abstract nouns. Graphological nouns are discussed in the light of topicalization and projection. As regards abstract nouns, the way they are specified in the teacher talk functions as exemplification. Three types of exemplification are identified and found to interact with one another, contextualizing abstract nouns with increasing commitment to lower the semantic wave for students.

Preparation cues are discussed with reference to the use of wh-interrogative and generalization. In the R2L classroom, wh-questions are prepared with commitment ranging from the most general to the most specific, depending on the difficulty of the wordings to be identified. They may be used with positional cues only, but more often they are used with both positional and

meaning cues. There is a continuum of commitment varying from no-support generalized wh-questions to specialized supportive ones. The variation corresponds with the movement of semantic gravity and semantic density. Meaning cues may also take the form of generalization, a type of commitment relationships within a sentence or/and between sentences where one entity more general is related to something more specific. Classification and composition are the two types of generalization examined in the thesis.

The book also examines the pedagogical treatment of grammatical metaphors given by Rose, designer of the R2L program and the two teachers from the English center respectively. Three types of demetaphorization are identified and analyzed. In theory, the R2L pedagogy focuses on the unpacking of grammatical metaphors. However, Rose's demonstration class shows that his way of demetaphorization also involves the use of synonyms and paraphrases. The two teachers treat grammatical metaphors as new words. They may demetaphorize the same metaphor differently in different steps of teaching. Teacher A's ways of demetaphorization are more varied while Teacher B tends to use grammatical metaphors himself and immediately demetaphorizes them. Both seem to depend largely on their teaching experience and pedagogical intuition in demetaphorization.

As regards the teachers' views and adaptation of the approach, the two English teachers hold a positive attitude towards the R2L pedagogy. They agree on both the reasons for its adoption and its limitations. However, the two English teachers show marked differences in their understanding of the R2L's strengths. Teacher A attributes the strength of the program to paraphrasing which serves as a bridge for students to access academic discourse while Teacher B holds that preview is the main advantage of the approach. Out of this difference in opinion, their focus in the classroom becomes different too. With some of his creative adaptation, Teacher A seems to have put in far more energy than Teacher B in Detailed Reading.

The questionnaire survey shows that students' response is generally positive towards R2L. The reading stage is perceived to be

particularly successful in helping students understand the meaning of new words and important points of a paragraph while the highlighting step proves to be most effective in comprehending text organization. The joint-rewriting is found to be most helpful to students in the choice of words. However, R2L is perceived to be relatively weak in improving students' confidence in writing though it is perceived to be more a writing program than a reading program. The unexpected perception probably results from the daunting nature of the writing task and the dominant role of the teacher.

The discussion of pedagogical implications is concerned with the importance of teacher directions, the problem of co-text and the possibility of repacking abstraction in Detailed Reading.

序

黄国文

攻读博士学位是作为学者的一个历练过程，很多人获得了博士学位后，也顺利评上了教授。但是，对于刘毅，情况并不是这样，因为他早在 2005 年就已经晋升为正教授了。刘毅是我指导毕业的 36 名博士生，同时也是我指导的第一批应用语言学方向博士生之一。他撰写的专著《读写教学法在高校实施的案例研究》就要出版了，邀我写个序言。

我和刘毅相识于 20 世纪 90 年代中期。那时，他在深圳大学文学院当外语系主任，热心英语专业的课程改革，在本校进行了有益的探索，并在《外语界》发表了两篇有关论文，提出应强化高校外语专业课程的专业性质，建议削减语言技能性课程，增加专业知识性课程。当时我国的外语院系非常关注外语专业复合型人才的培养问题。他认为国内外语界对复合型人才理解比较狭隘，为适应我国社会主义市场经济建设的需要，复合专业的选择不应局限于几个热门专业，应尽可能拓宽专业选课自由。就综合性大学来说，可以提供诸多文理工方面的专业课程，供外语专业学生作为副修。同时外语专业课程，也应向其他专业学生开放，形式可以不拘一格。提倡建立灵活多样的选修课体系，使学生可

黄国文，广东饶平人，教育部“长江学者”特聘教授，中山大学外国语学院教授、博士生导师，华南农业大学生态语言学研究教授、博士生导师，北京外国语大学“外研”讲席教授。研究方向：功能语言学，生态语言学，应用语言学，语篇分析，翻译研究。

以自主选择知识结构。他的这些观点给我留下了深刻的印象。

我是1996年担任功能语言学研究方向的博士生导师的。2006年我开始增加招收应用语言学方向的博士生，那一年刘毅也顺利考上我的博士，开始跟我攻读应用语言学的博士学位。我之所以要增开应用语言学研究方向，是因为我心中一直记住应用语言学：我最早于1986年获得语言学与应用语言学硕士学位（广州外国语学院，现广东外语外贸大学的前身之一），1992年获得英国爱丁堡大学应用语言学博士学位，然后于1996年才获得英国威尔士大学功能语言学博士学位，应用语言学可以说是我学术生命的一个不可或缺的部分。

众所周知，系统功能语言学自创建之初，其理论的发展与语言教育的发展就互为促进、密不可分。早在1964年，Halliday (Halliday *et al.* 1964) 就指出语域在语言教学中具有重要地位。随后，他提出了基于语言的学习理论——人类学习就其本质而言是一个“学习如何表达意义，即扩大意义潜势”的过程，语言学习则包括“学习语言、通过语言学习、学习有关语言的知识” (Halliday 1993: 113)，从中可见系统功能语言学与语言教学的统一性。Martin (1992; Martin & Rose 2014) 更是在语言教育实践中扩展了系统功能语言学理论，重塑语类 (genre) 和语域 (register) 模型，由此产生了“悉尼学派”语类教学法 (Sydney School genre-based approach)，直接作用于语言教学实践。本世纪初，Rose (2005) 在语类教学法的基础上发展了读写教学法 (Reading to Learn)。该教学法强调教师的主导作用，通过显性的授课模式帮助学生有效提高语文读写水平。读写教学法对澳大利亚、南非、瑞典、香港等地的语言教学起到了重要的影响和推动作用。

刘毅的这本《读写教学法在高校实施的案例研究》以 Martin (2008, 2010) 的语义投入理论和 Maton (2009) 的社会语义学

理论为分析框架，讨论读写教学法在应用于高校环境下教师如何运用语义投入资源帮助学生掌握学术阅读技能，并调查了教师对读写教学法的看法和应用时的调整情况及学生对该教学法的反馈意见。作者结合定性与定量研究，采用课堂话语分析、采访及问卷调查等方法，多方位探讨一个新的教学方法在高校英语课堂实施时教师的教学策略、对该教学法的态度与观点及学生的反馈等问题，从理论和实践两方面研究读写教学法的实施效果。我感觉本书有以下三个特点。

第一，作者首次运用语义投入理论研究学术英语课堂中教师的教学策略，提出了一些新的看法。本书将语义投入资源分为三大类，即元话语、准备提示语和非隐喻化，对每一大类又进行了细致的分类和新的命名。如将元话语中的书写名词功能分为点题和投射两类，将抽象名词在教师话语中的语义具体化为示例功能。对学术语篇的教学需要涉及语法隐喻解构的问题，作者提出非隐喻化概念，比隐喻解构的概念涵盖更广的意义。作者通过大量课堂例证，表明教师的非隐喻教学策略还包括使用改述和同义词，并对非隐喻化的三种策略作了细致的分析。

第二，读写教学法旨在帮助学生有效提高语言的读写水平。准备提示语是读写法帮助学生完成学习任务的一个主要手段，也是该教学法的一个显著特色，但相关研究还比较缺乏。本书对准备提示语的语义功能开展了系统的分析，展示了教师是怎样通过准备提示语来帮助学生理解课文的语句意义的。如在读写法课堂中，教师经常使用特殊疑问句提问。为了帮助学生正确回答问题，教师会在特殊疑问句中镶嵌各种准备提示语。作者根据词语的难度，将特殊疑问句的准备所包含的语义投入范围划分为一个连续体，以不提供准备提示语支持的概括性特殊疑问句为一端，含有特别具体支持的特殊疑问句则为另一端。这样的划分涵盖了准备提示语的使用范围，为教师在课堂上怎样使用准备提示语提

供了一个有意义的参考框架。

第三，一个新的教学法能否成功实施，离不开教师和学生的实际参与。除了课堂分析，作者还描述了有关教师对读写教学法看法和他们在该教学法实施中的调整情况，并通过调查问卷分析了学生对读写教学法的具体态度。这些研究使我们对读写教学法实施的过程和结果有了一个比较全面的评价，对进一步改进该教学法也提供了有益的借鉴。

刘毅的这本专著在系统功能语言学适用性这一领域做了些开拓性的工作，但要完全客观地揭示其广度和深度还有漫长的路要走。希望刘毅在这一领域能继续努力。

最后，引用孔子的一句话，与刘毅共勉。子曰：“学如不及，犹恐失之。”两千多年前的孔夫子对学习知识的要求十分强烈，他自己那样做，希望学生也是这样做。对于今天的我们，无论是个人发展，还是所从事的学科发展，都像逆水行舟，不进则退，因此我们要学而不厌，从容面对新的生活、新的科技、新的文化、新的知识、新的挑战，抓住机遇、抓住当下、不待明日，跟上时代的步伐，以不变应万变，永远立于不败之地。

2016年9月8日

参考文献

- Halliday, M. A. K. (1993) Towards a language-based theory of learning. *Linguistics and Education* 5 (2): 93-116.
- Halliday, M. A. K., A. McIntosh & P. Strevens. (1964) *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*. London: Longmans.
- Martin, J. R. (1992) *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Martin, J. R. (2008) Innocence: realisation, instantiation and

- individuation in a Botswanan town. In N. Knight & A. Mahboob (eds.) *Questioning Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 27-54.
- Martin, J. R. (2010) Semantic variation: modeling realisation, instantiation and individuation in social semiosis. In M. Bednarek & J. R. Martin (eds.) *New Discourse on Language: Functional Perspectives on Multimodality, Identity and Affiliation*. London: Continuum.
- Martin, J. R. & D. Rose (2014) *Working with Discourse: Meaning beyond the Clause* (2nd Edition). Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Maton, K. (2009) Cumulative and segmented learning: exploring the role of curriculum structures in knowledge-building. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 30 (1): 43-57.
- Rose, D. (2005) Literacy across the Curriculum. *Teacher Resource Booklet*. Sydney: Learning to Read: Reading to Learn.

Preface

It has been a great pleasure to read this study by Liu Yi. Its insights about the Reading to Learn pedagogy, and its potential for teaching academic English, are well beyond what I could have expected. Its first point of interest is a survey of fashions in theories of language learning, under “Background of the study”. It sometimes seems that language teachers are taken on an endless roller coaster that swings continually between “restructuring or creative construction”, “explicit or implicit”, “code or communication”, “grammar translation or direct method”, “audiolingual or cognitive method”, “natural or task-based approach”.

Reading to Learn (or R2L) cuts through all of these dichotomies, to analyse and design language learning as an unfolding relationship between teachers and learners. This is of course a Vgotskyan perspective on learning as a social process, but R2L goes further than Vygotsky in two ways. Firstly, using discourse analysis, it describes the teacher/learner relationship as a sequence, centred on the learning task, in which teachers and learners exchange roles to build knowledge. The purpose of this analysis is to design teacher/learner interactions that enable learners to continually succeed with learning tasks, and so most effectively build their knowledge. Secondly, R2L analyses the classroom as a learning community, in which learners may be more or less engaged and more or less successful. The purpose of this analysis is to design interactions that engage all students equally in the classroom community, and provide success for all (Rose 2014).

The outcomes of these careful analyses and designs are that teachers using R2L consistently accelerate the language learning of their students at double to four times expected growth rates. This has been repeatedly shown for both school students and tertiary students (Rose 2015, Rose & Martin 2013, Rose, Rose, Farrington & Page 2008). In response to these kinds of results, the University of KwaZulu Natal invited me to initiate an R2L program

in South Africa in 2007. This project continues as a teacher inservice program (Reading to Learn South Africa 2016), and as a postgraduate research program (Childs 2008, Makathini 2015, Millin 2011). In 2009, the University of Sydney's Centre for English Teaching invited me to train their teachers in the methodology. This project was brief, but fortunately coincided with Liu Yi's research in Australia.

Liu Yi has brilliantly analysed and compared teacher/learner interactions in these two contexts, to show precisely how teachers and learners exchange roles in the language learning process. He has applied the theory of "commitment" (Martin 2008, 2010) to show how teachers adjust their use of language to prepare students for learning tasks, and then elaborate on each learning task to build new knowledge. The insights he provides us are powerful tools to enhance our teaching/learning designs. Can I recommend that readers closely study his analyses and findings in this regard?

Also fascinating are the interviews and surveys that Liu Yi conducted with teachers and students at the Centre for English Teaching. The teachers' training had been brief, and their classroom implementation was in its early stages when they were interviewed. From a teacher educator's perspective, it is illuminating to see how they interpret the R2L methodology in the light of their existing knowledge and practice. This is one reason that Liu Yi's summary of language learning theories is so useful. A constant theme in many theories is the influence or "interference" of L1 in L2 language learning. In this case, what is interesting for teacher education is the interference of these theories in teachers learning to use the R2L methodology and to understand its principles. Particularly illuminating is their uncertainty about the engagement and learning of their students during R2L lessons. In vivid contrast, Liu Yi's surveys of student responses show that they overwhelmingly enjoyed and benefited from the lessons.

One of the major benefits of R2L's focus on the classroom as community is the insights it gives teachers into the learning of each one of their students, while they are learning together. In contrast, the great teacher educator Graham Nuthall lamented that normally,

“The teacher is largely cut off from information about what individual students are learning They are sustained, however, by the commonly held belief that if students are engaged most of the time in appropriate activities, some kind of learning will be taking place” (2005 :919-20). R2L sees this as a fundamental problem in classroom practice, and seeks to overcome it by enabling teachers to continually interact with all their students, around learning tasks. Liu Yi’s study makes a significant contribution to understanding how this works, and how we can improve it, both for language learners in tertiary education, and for every classroom.

David Rose
Sydney
August 2016

References:

- Childs, M. (2008) *A reading based theory of teaching appropriate for the South African context*. PhD Thesis, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa
- Makathini, B. (2015) *Trampoline trajectories: A dialectical analysis of the correlation between the teaching of reading and the learner-academic performance in a South African rural primary school*. Ph. D. Thesis. University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa
- Millin, T. (2011) *Scaffolding Academic Literacy with Undergraduate Social Science Students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal using the Reading to Learn Intervention Strategy: an Evaluative Study*. MSc Dissertation, The University of Edinburgh Moray House School of Education
- Nuthall, G. A. (2005) The cultural myths and realities of classroom teaching and learning: A personal journey. *Teachers College Record*, 107 (5), 895-934.
- Reading to Learn South Africa 2016. <http://readingtolearnsouthafrica.weekly.com/>
- Rose, D. (2015) New developments in genre-based literacy

pedagogy. In C A MacArthur, S Graham, J Fitzgerald (eds.) *Handbook of Writing Research, 2nd Edition*. New York: Guildford, 227-242

Rose, D (2014) Analysing pedagogic discourse: an approach from genre and register *Functional Linguistics*, 1: 11, <http://www.functionallinguistics.com/content/1/1/11>,

Rose, D. & J. R. Martin (2013) Intervening in contexts of schooling. J. Flowerdew [ed.] *Discourse In Context: Contemporary Applied Linguistics Volume 3*. London: Continuum, 447 - 475

Rose, D., M. Rose, S. Farrington & S. Page (2008) Scaffolding Literacy for Indigenous Health Sciences Students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 7 (3), 166-180