Educational Linguistic Studies

教育语言学研究

主编　赖良涛　严明　江妍

2021年

上海交通大学出版社
SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

Educational Linguistic Studies

教育语言学研究

（2021年）

主编　赖良涛　严明　江妍

上海交通大学出版社
SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

内容提要

本书分为名家访谈、学科话语研究、教育话语研究、语言认知心理与教育研究以及语言政策规划与教育研究五个部分，共收录原创论文 21 篇，主要从系统功能语言学、社会符号学、教育社会学和语料库等视角分析数学、体育、语言学、科普、学术英语等领域的知识建构以及学生、教师、教材、教法等方面的教育话语，从语言心理与认知视角探讨早期英语阅读、二语形态、词汇习得有效性、具身教学等话题，并从语言政策规划视角探讨我国英语基础教育政策、法国双语教育规划以及我国法律英语人才培养。本书适合高等院校从语言学角度研究教育教学的研究者、大中小学一线语言教师和其他教育研究者和实践者使用。

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

教育语言学研究. 2021 年 / 赖良涛，严明，江妍主编. —上海：上海交通大学出版社，2021.12
ISBN 978-7-313-25171-8

Ⅰ. ①教… Ⅱ. ①赖… ②严… ③江… Ⅲ. ①教育学—语言学—文集 Ⅳ. ①H0-05

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2021)第 143201 号

教育语言学研究(2021 年)
JIAOYU YUYANXUE YANJIU (2021NIAN)

主　　编：赖良涛　严　明　江　妍
出版发行：上海交通大学出版社
邮政编码：200030
印　　制：常熟市文化印刷有限公司
开　　本：889 mm×1194 mm　1/16
字　　数：413 千字
版　　次：2021 年 12 月第 1 版
书　　号：ISBN 978-7-313-25171-8
定　　价：74.00 元

地　　址：上海市番禺路 951 号
电　　话：021-64071208
经　　销：全国新华书店
印　　张：14.75
印　　次：2021 年 12 月第 1 次印刷

编　委　会

目　录

名家访谈

学科话语研究

教育话语研究

语言认知心理与教育研究

语言政策规划与教育研究

名家访谈

系统功能语言学教学之反思：麦蒂森访谈录（第二部分）

克里斯蒂安·麦蒂森[①]　王　博[②]　马园艺[③]
湖南大学　暨南大学　广东科学技术职业学院

导　读

本次访谈的主题是克里斯蒂安·麦蒂森（Christian Matthiessen）教授关于系统功能语言学教学的体会。本文是该系列访谈的第二部分，采访时间为2017年12月29日，地点位于麦蒂森在香港理工大学英文系的办公室。本文讨论了七个问题，包括：① 如何讲授系统功能语言学的元功能理论，讲授时应该从哪个元功能开始；② 如何介绍活动语场理论；③ 如何介绍实例化等系统功能语言学的不同维度；④ 如何对学生进行评价及测试；⑤ 如何在系统功能语言学教学中使用学习日志；⑥ 如何处理学生在课堂中提出的问题；⑦ 如何结束一个学期的课程。

麦蒂森认为，在课堂中讲授元功能理论与该访谈第一部分谈及的划分小句问题有着紧密的联系，因为三种元功能在小句中得到了统一。麦蒂森还分享了自己关于元功能教学顺序的经验，他曾经尝试从人际逻辑功能开始讲授课程，但最终还是选择了他与韩礼德（M.A.K. Halliday）在《功能语法导论》（*Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*）中确立的顺序，即语篇功能、人际功能、经验功能及逻辑功能。他还探讨了从词组或经验功能角度开始授课的可能性，并介绍了他和韩礼德曾经尝试的“螺旋式”课程设计理念。

谈及在第四版《功能语法导论》中增加的活动语场（field of activity）理论，麦蒂森表示，这一理论可以帮助读者对语篇（话语）进行分类，进而使读者更好地理解语法的应用及语法和语境的联系。同时他还介绍了为《功能语法导论》建设配套网站的计划，以期在该网站中使用语域构图学（registerial cartography）概念将语篇归类。

系统功能理论包含了多个维度，如实例化（instantiation）、精密度（delicacy）和轴（axis）等。麦蒂森认为，是否向学生介绍复杂的各个维度应视学生需求而定。实例化连续体一方面可以帮助教师选取语篇；另一方面，引入语域（register）的概念可以帮助教师控制课程的难度。

在一学期的教学之后，我们往往都需要对学生进行测试。由于麦蒂森讲授的课程都是通过语篇分析的方式来开展的，因而测试方面也采取了语篇分析的形式。这种语篇分析基于现有的语言描写，属

① 克里斯蒂安·麦蒂森（1956—），男，湖南大学特聘教授。主要研究方向为系统功能语言学。通信地址：湖南省长沙市岳麓区麓山南路2号湖南大学外国语学院，邮编：999077。电子邮箱：cmatthie@icloud.com
② 王博（1984—），男，博士，暨南大学翻译学院讲师。主要研究方向为系统功能语言学。通信地址：广东省珠海市前山路206号暨南大学翻译学院合作学院，邮编：519070。电子邮箱：bo.wang@connect.polyu.hk
③ 马园艺（1979—），女，博士，广东科学技术职业学院讲师。主要研究方向为系统功能语言学。通信地址：广东省珠海市金湾区广东科学技术职业学院国际合作学院，邮编：519090。电子邮箱：yuanyi.ma@connect.polyu.hk

于对语言描写的应用。同语篇分析相比,语言描写的难度更大,因为研究者在从音位、词汇语法或语义角度描述语言潜势时需要考虑到多种语域的文本。

麦蒂森经常在教学中鼓励学生通过学习日志的方式来记录新掌握的术语,并对学习过程进行反思。这一教学方法由日本学者照屋一博(Kazuhiro Teruya)率先使用,并在香港理工大学得到沿用。记录学习日志有很多好处,比如可以帮助学生构建自己的语篇档案,激发学生对于语言现象的兴趣,并使学生有意识地关注自己身边的不同语篇。

谈及学生在课堂上提出的问题,麦蒂森认为,学生的反馈和课堂互动在系统功能语言学教学中很有意义。此外,麦蒂森还介绍了一项在香港理工大学进行的基于学生反馈的教学项目。在对香港本地学生的学习态度进行了评价的同时,他将教学方式的变化同医患沟通方式的变化研究相联系,介绍了以教师为核心的教学方式以及以学生为核心的教学方式。他主张将两种教学方式相结合,尝试使用以师生关系为核心的教学手段。

在一个学期的系统功能语言学课程结束时,麦蒂森主张将学生引向更高的层次。因此,最后一堂课不仅要总结整学期的内容,还要为学生提供一个新的视角。如果是关于语法的课程,可以在最后以新语境下的语篇分析为范例,让学生通过整个学期对系统功能语言学知识的学习,对语言分析有更深层次的理解。

Some Reflections on Teaching Systemic Functional Linguistics (Part Ⅱ): An Interview with Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen

Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen, Bo Wang and Yuanyi Ma
Hunan University; Jinan University;
Guangdong Polytechnic of Science and Technology

Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen is Professor of Hunan University. He has degrees in linguistics from Lund University (BA) where he also studied Arabic and philosophy, and from University of California, Los Angeles (MA, PhD), and has previously held positions at Sydney University, Macquarie University and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University. He has co-authored several books with Michael Halliday, such as *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* and *Construing Experience Through Meaning: A Language-based Approach to Cognition*.

Bo Wang and Yuanyi Ma are active members of the PolySystemic Research Group, an SFL working group with both an international and a regional focus in the Pearl River Delta, China and Southeast Asia. They received their doctoral degrees from The Hong Kong Polytechnic University and their research interests include systemic functional linguistics, translation studies, discourse analysis and language description. They are co-authors of *Lao She's Teahouse and Its Two English Translations* (Routledge, 2020), *Translating Tagore's Stray Birds into Chinese* (Routledge, 2021), *Systemic Functional Translation Studies* (Equinox, 2021) and *Systemic Functional Insights on*

Language and Linguistics (Springer, forthcoming). They are also translators of Wang Li's *Modern Chinese Grammar*. Bo Wang is Lecturer at Jinan University. Yuanyi Ma is Lecturer at Guangdong Polytechnic of Science and Technology.

This interview took place on December 29, 2017 in Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen's office at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University. In the interview, he continues to talk about his experiences of SFL teaching. He discusses the challenges in teaching the metafunctions, introduces his way of teaching the field of activity and the organizing principles in SFL, and gives suggestions for assessing a course on SFL. Also, he recommends the application of keeping a learning journal as a tool for study, reflects on the questions that students raised in class and comments on how to present the last lecture of a course on SFL.

1 Challenges in Teaching the Metafunctions

Bo Wang: Last time we have talked about clause chunking. Are students ready to learn about the metafunctions after they have learned how to chunk clauses?

Christian Matthiessen: Yes, this is an interesting question on how you go about the sequence and when to interleave. The reason for a clause being a clause already presupposes the metafunctions, because a clause is the mapping of the unification of the three metafunctional contributions. To put it in semantic terms, a clause is the unification of a figure, a move and a message (message in the sense of the quantum of the flow of information). The principle is that these three semantic units with different metafunctional origins map onto one another in the clause that is unified. Incidentally, that is an interesting and central source of variation across languages. That is the motivation behind the clause.

To understand what a clause is, you need to grasp the above principle. But then you could say maybe it is useful to learn how to chunk text into clause complexes, clause complexes into ranking clauses and then recognizing downranked (embedded) clauses before you go more deeply into the metafunctional principles.

One of the major challenges in teaching about language informed by SFL is that there is no beginning. The relations are all multidimensional. Then how do you linearize this? Where do you start? That is one way of thinking about clause chunking. That could certainly be one starting point. We touched on the various starting points last time (see Matthiessen, Wang & Ma, 2021), assuming that people do not have a particular background and it would then be useful to come in from above and from below, because that is the way for you to relate language to something that people are more easily to become aware of before you move into the strata or form in the Hjelmslevian sense (cf. Hjelmslev, 1943). You move in from substance (phonetics and semantics) before you begin to explore the inner strata of language.

Bo Wang: Which metafunction should be first introduced to students?

Christian Matthiessen: In *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014), we start with the textual metafunction. I have done that in different courses over the years myself. I have tried out the interpersonal. I have tried out the logical. The reason why I tried out the logical was that the logical metafunction is where you get the maximal grammatical domain of a clause complex. I was thinking that this may be useful as far as a

grammar will take you in systemicized and tactic patterns.

As a usual thing, you have trade-offs. But not surprisingly, in the end I settled on Michael Halliday's way in through the textual. With the development of the hyper-theme and macro-theme and hyper-new and macro-new (see Martin, 1993), that is helpful in giving students a sense of the overall organization of text related to the grammar.

But that is not to say that you could not use different ways in for different purposes and different contexts. As I recall, Lise Fontaine (2013) published a book — *Analysing English Grammar* — a couple of years ago. In her book, she used the nominal group quite early on. It makes sense because she has done a lot of research on the nominal group (e. g. Fontaine, 2008).

Bo Wang: The experiential metafunction can also be a starting point, but it could be too difficult for beginners.

Christian Matthiessen: One of the reasons is that you have to introduce a fair bit of complexity from the start, because the ideational metafunction has evolved to cope with the complexity of our experience of our world. That could be a consideration that stops you from choosing this path. You could say that it is a natural choice given that people often think about language as "knowledge delivery", as content, or as the representational function of language and so on. It is interesting to try the different ways in and to adapt them to the teaching contexts. For example, it might be different if you are teaching students who are really in a linguistics program versus students who are in translation studies or some kind of an educational context.

Both Michael Halliday and I are in favor of a helical curriculum (as opposed to a linear one): you touch on things fairly lightly and then you come back, you deepen it in a new context, and then you come back again in another context and deepen it. I think that can work out quite well if you have enough time and if you have the other conditions, e. g. teaching materials, to support that. You do not go back in a circle. Say, you start lightly with the textual, a little bit about the interpersonal and a little bit about the experiential; and then you leave that for a while, you come to the textual more detailed, but you are not coming back in a circle, you come back against the background of whatever is possible to be introduced since then. This helical move is very useful and it is a way of overcoming this constraint that it is very difficult to linearize something not linear in the first place.

If you are not only talking about the grammar, if you are talking about all of language, what do you use as a way in? Metafunctions? Rank within a stratum? The stratification of language itself? Possibly the cline of instantiation? There are different ways of moving in. In principle, they are all interesting.

Bo Wang: In your class, the order of teaching the metafunctions is: textual, interpersonal, experiential and logical. Do you prefer that order?

Christian Matthiessen: In a sense, after experimenting, that is what I settle on. Also, it is supported by various textbooks and materials, including *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004/2014) and our *Working with Functional Grammar* (Martin, Matthiessen & Painter, 1997) and *Deploying Functional Grammar* (Martin, Matthiessen & Painter, 2010). You do not have to move around in the textbook material if you are using a

textbook to support that.

That was an experience I had quite early on since well over thirty years ago in working with Michael Halliday. After discussing and dialoguing with him, I tried out other things, such as the account of modality. Then after a while, I came to realize why he was doing things the way he was even though that may have departed from the traditional grammar and formal grammar for various reasons. This is what I often feel when people criticize Michael Halliday's position by saying he should not take something for granted. I would say: "Yes, I've been there and I know what he has proposed even though it may conflict with the tradition or the so-called mainstream." He had various reasons for doing that. Relatively speaking, if you are working against the mainstream with somebody who has a real insight into language, I think it is not a waste of effort to try to work with that and develop it instead of just always reverting to the default account, the mainstream or the tradition. I could go through any area of the account, e.g. the distinction between downranked clauses and hypotactic dependent clauses. There is a very good reason to continue to try to explore and develop Halliday's interpretation and account instead of just saying it is against the traditional notion of subordination.

There are a number of examples. I think that needs to be written up. As we know, if you have an approach to the account of language that essentially tries to follow the organization of language itself and to report on and survey language, you will get a map of language as in *Lexicogrammatical Cartography* (Matthiessen, 1995) and *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004 & 2014), but you do not get a debate about language. In a way, you have to choose what to start with. As a consequence, because of the value of holistic theorizing and comprehensive descriptions in SFL, it is fair to say that we have not got enough discourse that explores the different options in a way that draws on the insights that come from a holistic theory and comprehensive description. Lots more can be done and needs to be done.

2 Introducing the Field of Activity

Bo Wang: I have also noticed that not everything in IFG can be included and taught in one semester.

Christian Matthiessen: Indeed. This was something we had discussed when we embarked on the third edition of *IFG* (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). We were both keen to include more about the grammar of word, i.e. morphology (cf. Matthiessen, 2015a), but we were already testing the patience of the publisher to expand as much as we did. We worked on this, but it was not included. Some part was published in Halliday's (2008) *Complementarities in Language*, where he had a little bit of the systems of word grammar in English, but that was more illustrative than a full-fledged account.

Bo Wang: In *IFG 4*, you have included the registerial cartography (Halliday & Matthiessen 2014: 37), so that we can use it to categorize the texts we analyze.

Christian Matthiessen: Yes, that was the idea. I still owe the publisher on this. The idea was to have a companion website, which would include materials (e.g. more texts) that would have been too much in the book. The idea was to use this registerial cartography as an index into those

texts. Whenever I wake up late in the night, I think about my sins and that is one of them.

Bo Wang: When will be the time for students to know about the field of activity (e. g. Matthiessen, 2015b, 2015c, 2020)?

Christian Matthiessen: I thought it was helpful to include the field of activity and context in general in *IFG 4* to build up the sense of looking at texts and position in the grammar because that is the point of the departure. At the same time, it was also helpful to build up the sense of the way that the grammar is deployed and exploited in different ways depending on the nature of the context. In relating the grammar to text (discourse), it was important to build this up.

If you look at one of the most important reference grammars of English in the second half of the 20th century — *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (Biber *et al.*, 1999), they worked very hard to ensure that it was corpus-based. They also ensured that they had accounts from different registers and genres. They had four broad registers and I think that is an important contribution. At the same time, in some sense, these registers are far too broad and general. If you really want to understand grammar in operation, you need to take a few more steps in the delicacy of the characterization of context. These steps need to be taken in terms of field, in terms of tenor and in terms of mode.

3 Introducing the Organizing Principles

Bo Wang: We know that there are several dimensions (organizing principles) in SFL, such as the cline of instantiation, rank, delicacy, and axis. As discussed previously, we can introduce stratification early on. Are you going to teach your students the other dimensions?

Christian Matthiessen: An interesting theoretical and pedagogical question. One of the considerations is simply the management of complexity — the amount of information that students are exposed to at a given point. That would vary according to what students need it for. You can use the cline of instantiation as a way of managing the complexity in a natural way, i.e. choosing registers you sample text from as a way into the grammar and as a way of illustrating, and choosing them in such a way that you stage the challenges in terms of grammatical metaphor (especially the ideational kind, but possibly also other aspects). You use a natural principle in language, e. g. register variation, as a way of trying to control the complexity of what you introduce at different stages. I think we touched on that the other day (see Matthiessen, Wang & Ma, 2020) — the conception of a program for translation studies that is essentially based on a kind of helical move through registers increasingly in complexity but ensuring that students are exposed to different registers that foreground different challenges to them. This is rather like having a second foreign language program that is based around the principle that you work with text but you work with text that is selective from a succession of different registers or genres, like what Heidi Byrnes (e. g. 2009, 2013) and her colleagues had done with the teaching of German as a foreign language at Georgetown University at the college level. One could do much more along these lines.

4 Assessing of a Course on SFL

Bo Wang: After the lectures in one semester, how should a course on SFL be assessed?

Christian Matthiessen: In various places, the course is taught through text (discourse) analysis in context, so the assessment is through text (discourse) analysis. I think that is a good way in, because you really have to engage with language and you get an empirical foundation of anything you do with language further on. I suggest this kind of hierarchal complexity. The simplest task in some sense is text analysis where you take an existing description and you look at the instantiation, and you apply it to the analysis of text. The challenge of the task is limited by the fact that you are using an existing description. You may feel that it does not support what you need to do. You may find evidence that suggest that you need to renovate the description and so on. The next step would be: you do not start with a description, but rather your task is to develop a description. That is more difficult, because that means you cannot limit the complexity based on your selection of registers, you are really aiming towards a description of a general phonological or lexicogrammatical or semantic system (i. e. the potential of language). You need to skate over many more texts. You need to ensure that you have some kind of reasonably rich variation in the text from a registerial point of view. Then the next order of magnitude might be comparing descriptions of different languages, and then you will be responsible for two or more languages. That moves towards typology. You could say the next order of magnitude would be to develop a theory, because if you develop a theory, you could say the theory is a theory of language as a general human system. In principle, you have to be aware of it at least and have some degree of familiarity with quite a large number of different languages. One temptation and danger is that people think they are developing a theory based on one language. In a sense, you could say that happens within traditional grammar and the Chomskyan generative grammar, with English replacing Latin in ancient Greek. So, you try to build that into the program too. That is why you want to work with the "architecture" of language itself. To return to your question, you use the dimensions to the best of your ability to gradually introduce the complexity.

5 Applying Learning Journal in Teaching

Bo Wang: In your class, you have asked your students to write learning journals. Do you find it helpful?

Christian Matthiessen: Actually the learning journal was something that I borrowed from Kazuhiro Teruya who was then at the University of New South Wales while I was at Macquarie University. We applied it in the teaching of text analysis to translation students and found it really helpful for a number of reasons. One reason is that it is an invitation to the students themselves to reflect on their learning processes and to make sure that they keep track of new terminology, look it up and document it. At the same time, it is a way of feeding back to the teachers, so that they are able to see where the students are up to. I think it is a very good resource. It is somewhat related to what Bill Mann used to call an intellectual diary. This is assuming that you are now a researcher and you have gradually gone through your degrees. But in daily life, you keep a diary of your ideas, the development of your ideas, your readings and so on.

This is a very good idea. I myself have never been disciplined enough to do this, and in a

way, I regret that. Somehow it does not click with the way I operate. But I think it is a good thing to try out. There are lots of positive things about the learning journal and that can be paired with a text archive and a discourse diary, helping the students to become active observers of language in daily life by chronicling their own movements through discourses and also becoming observant of discourses.

The problem of the learning journal is: when we get into teaching situations, we have not got enough support, because they are actually a huge amount of work to read through and comment on. It is very productive, but if you are under pressure in terms of teaching resources, in some sense reading the journals will become too expensive. We were still pursuing this in the Hong Kong context here at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU). Student were puzzled at first and they were not interesting in doing this. But once they got their hands around it, they could use it very positively.

Some time ago, talking to Kazuhiro Teruya, I said: "We borrowed the idea of learning journal from you at Macquarie University and it was brilliant, but it is such hard work." He laughed and said: "Well, I wouldn't do that any longer. It's too much work in the PolyU context." He now encourages his students to do this as a kind of blogging, they themselves share these and comment on these and so on. At the same time, this could be more interesting collective experiences and could facilitate group work.

6 Collecting the Questions in Class

Bo Wang: Two years ago, you had a research assistant to collect the questions that students raised in your class. What was this project about?

Christian Matthiessen: That was a teaching-learning project. It was actually defined and written up as a project application to the department of teaching-learning committee by Elaine Espindola. She was in charge of that and she got Carol Webster involved. I do not actually know whether it was completed or not because Elaine had then left to take up a position in Chile. It was an interesting project. I am glad that you mention that, because there is much more that we can do if there are opportunities or some funding to support teaching and learning activities.

Bo Wang: What do you think of the student feedback in different regions in the world?

Christian Matthiessen: It depends on where you are teaching. If you are teaching in Australia, the US, Denmark, India, Brazil or Argentina and so on, there are different student cultures and students are more or less interactive in different places. It seems like a stereotype, but people do say that students in Hong Kong tend to be less interactive. They may be a bit too shy to ask questions in class. Today we just had the last lecture in the series of research methods for undergraduate students. It is the usual situation. I asked the class if there were any questions. No questions. When the class finished, you got a group of students came in to ask questions. The point is: it would be more interesting and productive if they share these questions. You need better pedagogic techniques than I have to elicit this kind of interaction. There are a number of colleagues who have gone through some kind of program in education because they were originally trained as teachers, but I have never been through any kind of teacher training. What I have seen or what we get locally have not impressed me.

One of the interesting things is that there are different learner styles. I do not just mean culturally or sub-culturally, but I mean within a given cultural context or academic context, you would have different learner styles among the students. Halliday (2014) has talked about this specifically in terms of language learners and there are four different parameters, but that is also true of learning in general. Some students like to be active. Some students like to be quiet, to reflect and to sort things out from the shelves.

After finishing my undergraduate studies in the Swedish academic context and moving to the US in 1979, I sat in a seminar for research students and I was wondering why the students interrupted to ask questions. If they waited for a while, I could tell that the answer would come. It took me a while to realize that those were displayed questions. They were asking questions to say: "Look at me! Please notice me! I'm active and engaged." That is another kind of style, but certainly not the Hong Kong style. (One has to be very careful not to have that stereotype.)

I have discussed this with a number of the teachers here. When you have postgraduate students, it is more likely to have students from different backgrounds. But for undergraduate students, on the whole, they tend to be predominantly Hong Kong locals (maybe with a few from China's mainland and maybe some from Korea). If you get some students from Europe, that can really change the whole environment. That is why it is very interesting and important to have these internationalized environments, which are very helpful for the local students.

The whole question of feedback and interaction is very challenging. You have these notions coming in from attempts of flipped classrooms. It is also interesting to think about what that means in terms of teaching SFL. There is the danger that you get these fashions, but ultimately what really matters is the kind of relationship that teachers and students can develop. That is why I say it is a bit like healthcare. In the prescientific days, all doctors essentially talked to the patients and got information about how others felt; but when scientific medicine started with the technology of stethoscope in the 1830s that allowed the doctor to go beyond what he/she or the patient can observe, there was the beginning of ignoring the patient in just using the ways of going beyond the naked ear and the naked eye. That became the doctor-centered healthcare. Then there was a movement against that, leading to the patient-centered healthcare. But now, from the thesis (doctor-centered) to the antithesis (patient-centered), there was the beginning of synthesis (relationship-centered). We have the same relationship in education: there is the thesis (teacher-centered) and the antithesis (student-centered), but you could argue that what we really need is the analogue of relationship-centered care that builds up the relationship. There are challenges there.

People may differ from one another. I myself always love listening to somebody for three hours (There is the danger of taking oneself as the measure of the students.) I do not need to be activated with the little activities, talking to my neighbor about some problem. I find that destructive, irritating or pointless. Other people will find that very useful. That is why you have to think about this not in terms of the individual class but the whole spectrum of what students get with different teachers and what different teachers get with different students and a kind of more awareness and information about the value of having different approaches in

the totality of teaching and learning experience.

7 Concluding a Course on SFL

Bo Wang: How would you conclude teaching a course on SFL at the end of one semester?

Christian Matthiessen: I always felt that the last lecture should be a move to a higher level. It is some kind of a recontextualizing summary, but it is also in a sense with a new perspective or a perspective that is only possible at the end. I do remember that at Macquarie University that was what I tried to do. I did less so here because I had been less involved in the kinds of courses that would lend themselves to this. There would be a bit of firework at the end — something that is an interesting take-away for the students. If this is a course on some systems of the grammar, there will be an example of an analysis of a text in its context that is quite interesting in itself, where students can get a sense that they are suddenly seeing something and understanding something about it that they would not be able to at the beginning of this semester before being empowered by building up their mastery of knowledge about the language and knowledge about language in general.

It depends on the level of the course. Only the very best teachers can have access to first-year students. These teachers can really captivate and engage students, make things accessible, make the courses interesting and generate a deep interest in this.

8 Conclusion

In this interview, Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen, as a teacher of SFL, has reflected on his teaching in the past decades and has provided more insights on teaching SFL. In the future, we will continue to work with Professor Matthiessen and publish books and journal papers with him on more topics.

References

[1] Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad. and E. Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*[M]. London: Longman.

[2] Byrnes, H. 2009. Systemic-functional reflections on instructed foreign language acquisition as meaning-making: An introduction[J]. *Linguistics and Education*, 20, 1-9.

[3] Byrnes, H. 2013. Systemic Functional Linguistics in the round: Imagining foreign language education for a global world[A]. In Y. Fang and J.J. Webster (Eds.). *Developing Systemic Functional Linguistics: Theory and Application*[C]. 322-343. London: Equinox.

[4] Fontaine, L. 2008. A systemic functional approach to referring expressions: Reconsidering postmodification in the nominal group[D]. Cardiff: Cardiff University.

[5] Halliday, M. A. K. 2008. *Complementarities in Language*[M]. Beijing: The Commercial Press.

[6] Halliday, M.A.K. 2014. Notes on teaching Chinese to foreign learners[J]. *Journal of World Languages*, 1(1), 1-6.

[7] Halliday, M. A. K. and C. M. I. M. Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*[M]. Third Edition. London: Hodder Arnold.