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要 旨
選択体系機能文法（SFG）は、使用コンテクスト内の理解と当該テキストのコミュニケーション効果の評価に対する深い見識を提供してくれる。このような見識を活かせる場面として、外国語学習のための教室がある。この稿では、まず筆者は選択体系機能文法の枠組みを用いて、クッキングに関する3つのテキストの検証を行う。次に、外国語教授用教材として、そのテキストを使用することの影響について議論する。これらの議論より、このようなテキストを、教師が授業でどのように活用することができるのか、その方法を提示する。
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Abstract
Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) provides insights into understanding and evaluating the effectiveness of texts within their context of use. One area of application for SFG is the foreign language classroom. In this paper, the author utilizes the systemic functional framework to examine three texts related to cooking. Following this, implications for using the texts as foreign language teaching materials are discussed. The findings suggest ways that SFG can help teachers to better understand how authentic texts can be utilized in the classroom.
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1. Introduction
Language enables people to organize experiences, interact with others, and accomplish tasks. Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) provides a framework for understanding how people are able to achieve such communicative goals through their selection of language patterns, which express appropriate meanings in context. As Bloor and Bloor (1995) have noted, “When people use language to express meanings, they do so in specific situations and the form of the language that they use is influenced by the complex elements of those situations” (p.3).
The relationship between language choices, context, and meaning applies across a variety of text types. Whether casual conversation, a brief memo, or academic writing, texts are embodiments of people’s communicative endeavors. Thus it is texts that form the main object of examination and evaluation of the systemic framework of analysis.

One application of SFG concerns teaching English as a foreign language. Butt (2009) has discussed general applications of SFG to English language teaching. Moreover, the field of genre analysis has also been applied to English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and the teaching of professional genres (Flowerdew, 1993). The aim of this paper is to examine three texts from the same field of discourse, cooking, with regard to their use in as foreign language teaching materials. In order to do this, the author applies the systemic functional framework to identify the differences in each text’s lexicogrammar and textual organization as a basis for reaching conclusions about their stylistic and communicative differences. Section 2 presents an overview of Systemic Functional Grammar. After introducing the method of analysis in Section 3, Section 4 presents an overview of the results of each text’s lexicogrammatical analysis. Based on these results, the author draws conclusions about each text in Section 5 by discussing three topics in particular: 1) the communicative and stylistic differences in relation to context; 2) an evaluation of these differences in relation to meaning and style; 3) implications for the foreign language classroom. Despite being based on a specialized field of linguistics, the conclusions drawn from the SFG analyses can be relevant to teachers of English as a foreign language.

2. The systemic framework

Systemic Functional Grammar can be described as a tool for investigating the ways in which texts create meaning. Halliday and Hassan (1976) have defined a text as “any instance of language, in any medium, that makes sense to anyone who knows the language” (p.1). Text will be taken here to mean a comprehensible and contextualized instance of language whether written, spoken or visual. The creation of meaning can be related to the speaker’s communicative purpose, in other words, what they hope to achieve by communicating.

Within the systemic functional framework, meaning is created by the interaction of the speaker’s choices of lexis and grammar (lexicogrammar) with the surrounding context. A change to one element of either the lexicogrammar or the context can alter the type of meaning that is conveyed by text. Thus, by examining language in context, SFG provides a framework for understanding not only what texts mean but also, as a necessary condition, “why texts mean what they do” (Eggins, 2004, p. 2). Furthermore, since texts do not exist in isolation, SFG is also concerned with answering the following: “Why is it [the text] valued as it is” (Halliday & Matthieson, 2004, p. 3). Hence, these two questions point to the explanatory and evaluative concerns that underpin the types of conclusions, which SFG seeks to make about a text’s communicative and stylistic characteristics.

In order to understand how the systemic functional framework is applied to texts, it
is important to first become familiar with
how lexicogrammatical choices and context
are described in SFG. Lexicogrammatical
descriptions usually occur at the clause-level
of texts (Bloor & Bloor, 1995). A clause can
be defined as an instance of language con-
taining a process that is realized by a verbal
group (Thompson, 2004). Moreover, clauses
exist on a rank-scale of language forms that
range from morphemes to clauses (see Fig-
ure 1). Lexicogrammar can be analyzed
along three parallel lines of meaning (also
called metafunctions): 1) experiential, 2) in-
terpersonal, and 3) textual. These meta-
functions correspond to the three main
functions ascribed to language within SFG:
1) to discuss experience; 2) to interact with
people; 3) to organize messages (Thompson,
2004).

The counterpart to lexicogrammar is
context, which relates to the world outside
the text. If one wishes to examine the cre-
ation of meaning, words alone are not enough.
Language exists within a context of situa-
tion and a context of culture which affect
people’s selection and understanding of
words (Butt, 2009). Put another way, “a
crucial part of our language ability is know-
ing how things are typically - or even
obligatorily - said in certain contexts”
(Thompson, 2004, p. 39).

The link between language and context
is strong enough that based on a given
amount of text it becomes possible to predict
the context to a certain degree and vice versa.
If, on the other hand, there is not enough
knowledge of context it can hinder
understanding. For instance, the expres-
sion first down and 10 would be unintelligible
to anyone who lacks basic knowledge of
American football. The above examples il-
strate some of the ways that context can
influence how words are understood, if at all.

Two ways to account for context are to
examine register and genre. Register is
connected to the context of situation and con-
cerns the variety of language used in a text.
It consists of the three register variables
(field, tenor, and mode), which correspond
to the three types of language meaning
(experiential, interpersonal, and textual).
Genre is connected to the context of culture
and concerns a text’s purpose - what Thomp-
sen (2004) has refered to as “register plus
purpose” (p.42). Martin has defined genre
as a “staged, goal-oriented, purposeful activ-
ity in which speakers engage as members of
our culture.” Genre will be defined here as
the ways in which register variables are ma-
ipulated and structured to achieve one’s
communicative purpose within a given
culture. Examples include: road signs, po-
etry, recipes, and movie reviews. Thus, if a
reader can identify the genre, they will be
more likely to understand the meanings be-
hind the texts that they encounter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Rank level</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combine to form</td>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>The drinking fountain was repaired yesterday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Noun: The drinking fountain / Verb: was repaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morpheme</td>
<td>〈drink〉〈ing〉〈fountain〉〈repair〉〈ed〉</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Rank scale (based on Thompson, 2004, p. 30)
3. Method

Three texts (cited in Goddard, 1998, p. 47–8, 53) concerned with cooking and providing guidance for preparing recipes will be examined. Text 1 (Figure 2) is a Ceefax transcript of a television cooking program. Text 2 (Figure 3) is a spoken transcript from the same program. Text 3 (Figure 4) presents three excerpts of the beginnings of recipes from a cookbook by Delia Smith. The method of analysis is based on Butt (2009) whereby a lexicogrammatical analysis is performed that analyzes the experiential, interpersonal and textual meanings for each clause. This method was chosen to highlight the central role that lexicogrammatical choices play in the creation of meaning. As such, the results of the lexicogrammatical analysis in Section 4 form the basis for the contextual description and evaluation of each text in Section 5.

---

**Figure 2. Cookbook excerpts** (Goddard, 1998, p.53)

**Chinese style duck with pilau rice**

Ingredients

(for 2 persons) 2 duck breasts 1 oz root ginger, peeled and crushed 4 tbsp water

Method

1. Heat a heavy-based frying pan and cook the duck breasts, skin side down, for five minutes over a medium heat. Do not add oil, or the breasts will produce a surprising amount of fat.
2. Pour most of the fat out of the pan and discard. Turn the breasts over, add the root ginger and water. Cook for about 10 minutes until the water has evaporated and the duck is cooked through.

---

**Figure 3. Text 2 Spoken excerpt** (Goddard, 1998, p.48)

---

**Figure 4. Text 1 Ceefax recipe** (Goddard, 1998, p.47)
4. Results

This section discusses the main points of the lexicogrammatical analysis. Beginning with experiential meaning, it is apparent that both Text 1 and Text 2 focus on material processes while Text 3 is concerned more with the mental processes of the author (Table 1). Also, Text 2 has been analyzed to include three processes based on visual cues in the form of body language of the presenter. Accounting for instances of body language is consistent with the definition in Section 2 that texts include visual instances of communication. In this way, Text 2 provides an example of 'performance as text'.

In terms of participants, Text 1 contains only food and a frying pan - the essentials for completing the recipe. The participant roles in Texts 2 and 3 extend further to include the people who make it. For circumstances, manner and extent are the most common types in Text 1; whereas time is the most common circumstance in Texts 2 and 3.

Looking next at interpersonal meaning (Table 2), Text 1 is straightforward with eight imperative clauses and no person selections or modality. On the surface, Texts 2 and 3 appear quite similar because of the dominance of the declarative mood, use of I and you as person selections, and the presence of modality. The different meanings they create, however, will be discussed in the next section.

In examining thematic meaning, Texts 1 and 2 appear to be different sides of the same coin. Themes in Text 1 reflect the imperative mood of cooking processes with limited textual themes and cohesion. Text 2 reflects the declarative mood and uses people and food for the majority of its themes with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Process types in each text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material : 8 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Interpersonal meanings in each text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood selections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative : 8 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No people identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a wider range of marked and textual themes, and cohesive devices. Text 3 is difficult to analyze accurately since it actually spans excerpts of three different recipes. Hence, it could be argued that Text 3 does not exist as a cohesive text at all. Nevertheless, it appears similar to Text 2 with people and food as topical themes plus a similar range of textual meanings. Overall, the lexico-grammatical choices of each text comprise the resources for creating meaning and achieving the author’s intended communicative purpose. How (and how well) this is achieved will form the topic of the next section.

5. Discussion of context and meaning

Having identified the key aspects of each text’s lexico-grammatical variation, this section applies the results to the context in order to reach conclusions about each texts stylistic and communicative differences. Tables 3–5 present the results of the description of context for the register variables of field, tenor, and mode.

5.1 Description of context

The first contextual element that will be examined here is the field (Table 3). For field, one seeks to determine the content of each text based on its patterns of experiential meaning. A brief look at the participants clearly posits each text within the realm of food and cooking. On the other hand, a look at the processes and circumstances reveals that the texts do not share the same communicative goal.

Whereas Texts 1 and 2 provide instruction for cooking duck breasts, Text 3 discusses people’s relationship with food. This can be seen in the transitivity patterns (the types of lexico-grammatical functions) of the texts, with the use of material processes in the former, and mental and relational processes in the latter. Text 1 relies solely on material processes so one might predict that the act of cooking consumes the entire text. Text 2 is similar but includes several relational processes that provide commentary in addition to the action. Text 3 relies heavily on mental and relational processes that comprise the discussion about food. Two of the three material processes here relate to food but only as dependent clauses that further support mental processes of the author’s opinions about food. The other material process concerns receiving mail with questions about food. The circumstances in Text 1 primarily supplement the cooking processes. In Text 2, they provide information about the actions and materials used for cooking. Meanwhile, the circumstances in Text 3 help communicate the speaker’s point of view. Hence, the circumstances provide more evidence that Text 1 is about cooking, Text 2 is about describing cooking and Text 3 is about ideas of cooking.

Turning next to the texts’ tenor, the focus shifts to identifying how interpersonal meanings function in the text (Table 4). In Text 1, no speakers or listeners are identified. This, combined with the imperative mood and lack of modality, establish the text as impersonal and incontrovertible, thus putting the reader in a subordinate position. The reader’s relationship to Text 1 is simply to follow the recipe’s instructions. Texts 2 and 3 both use I and you where I is a professional chef or food writer. Goddard (1998) has stated that cookbooks (and per-
haps, by extension, cooking programs such as Text 2 try to form a connection with their audience to gain their trust in order to sell themselves. Hence, use of the 1st and 2nd person would seem to be a logical manifestation of such a strategy (“I’ve been cooking these breasts for a little while now,” “I love individual steamed puddings”). Likewise, there is a noticeable lack of formal language or jargon (“a little water,” “dead simple”). The declarative mood and use of modality also contribute to establishing a friendly expert position. In Text 2, the modal finite can is used to convey polite commands to the audience (“Meanwhile you can be starting”); moreover, the use of need to convey obligation is de-personalized, which allows the speaker to not impose on the viewer (“That needs to simmer”). In Text 3, modality communicates inclination (seem, find), usuality (always), and obligation (need) and allows the discussion of food to be filtered through the writer’s personal opinions.

The final area of context to be examined is the mode (Table 5). This concerns the variety of textual meanings employed throughout the text. Both Text 1 and Text 2 originate from the same source, a TV cooking program, but only in Text 1 does language constitute the entirety of the text. It functions as a practical record of the program in the form of a standalone recipe with a standard ingredients and method section broken down into two steps.

Text 2 is excerpted from the actual program and hence relies on its element of visual performance to elucidate instances of vague language such as “in here” or “these duck breasts.” There are also three instances when processes are supplied by the performance, most likely referring to the action of adding or doing: (“[visual cue] an ounce of ginger”, “[visual cue] a little water”, and “[visual cue] a quick stir”). This is not to say that the processes have been ellipsed. It is a fine distinction but since each clause must contain a process, visual cues exemplify the dual mode nature of Text 2. The spoken nature of the text is further reflected in the amount of textual and inter-
personal themes used as cohesive devices (“In fact,” “And then”).

The language in Text 3 constitutes the entirety of communication and, as mentioned above, is written in a personal manner that resembles speech. Nevertheless, there are lexicogrammatical choices that identify it as a written text for example, “8oz (225 g)” and “the description above.” Another example is the inclusion of the dependent clause “- yielding three each and a few extras for inevitable second helpings.” The use of “at the moment” to mark ephemeral experience is a more overt example of the tension between using a conversational tone within a written mode.

5.2 Evaluation of meaning

Text 1 exists for the purpose of providing step-by-step instructions for cooking duck breasts. The lexicogrammatical choices are goal-oriented and concise. Thus readers who have already seen the program or who simply want to start cooking are likely to find the strictly imperative mood and impersonal tone appropriate because it contributes to creating a text that is easy to follow and helpful in achieving the goal of cooking duck breasts.

Text 2 exists as a performance (of cooking) in time. Consequently, the lexicogrammatical choices can be seen to account for both the visual and temporal elements of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>Text 2</th>
<th>Text 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agentive or societal roles</td>
<td>Agentive or societal roles</td>
<td>Agentive or societal roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No agents</td>
<td>Professional TV chef and viewer</td>
<td>Professional author and reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>Unequal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social distance</td>
<td>Social distance</td>
<td>Social distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>Text 2</th>
<th>Text 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role of language</td>
<td>Role of language</td>
<td>Role of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive</td>
<td>Ancillary</td>
<td>Constitutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of interaction</td>
<td>Type of interaction</td>
<td>Type of interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monologue</td>
<td>Monologue</td>
<td>Monologue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium and channel</td>
<td>Medium and channel</td>
<td>Medium and channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written to be read</td>
<td>Spoken and performed to be heard and seen</td>
<td>Written to be read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical thrust</td>
<td>Rhetorical thrust</td>
<td>Rhetorical thrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural/instructional</td>
<td>Procedural/instructional</td>
<td>Procedural/instructional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text type</td>
<td>Text type</td>
<td>Text type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard recipe</td>
<td>TV cooking show</td>
<td>Stylized cookbook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the text. The shared context permits vague language and incomplete clauses to occur without impeding understanding. In this way, the material processes in the declarative mood play a supportive and descriptive function. Comments extraneous to the purpose of cooking could function as time-fillers between stages and ways to engage viewers throughout the duration of the program, which would undoubtedly satisfy the show’s sponsors. When read on paper, such comments may seem distracting. However, one needs only to contemplate the absence of such comments in performance to understand how they help to keep the text together as a cohesive whole. Therefore, this text can also be considered effective.

Though short excerpts such as those found in Text 3 make a comprehensive evaluation difficult, one can see that Text 3 comes from a cookbook but does not appear to offer practical help about cooking. When viewed in their full context as one part of an online recipe (Smith 2011a; Smith 2011b; Smith 2011c) the excerpts appear to introduce the recipe to viewers and provide commentary about the culture of food. Thus, generating interest and promoting the Delia Smith brand are likely to form the incentives behind the lexicogrammatical choices in the text. Delia Smith’s success may be testament enough to the effectiveness of employing such a writing style. At the same time, by mediating each recipe through this person’s/brand’s perspective there is also the risk that some readers will find the style ostentatious or insincere and therefore be put off.

5.3 Implications for language teaching

The insights gained from SFG the analyses may be inherently interesting to systemic functional linguists, but it can also be utilized in professional fields, such as language teaching, where texts play a prominent role. This section will discuss some possibilities for engaging teachers and students with what has been learnt about the communicative and stylistic differences of the three texts at hand.

The first point concerns the selection of texts. The discussion so far indicates that an understanding of a text’s genre and communicative purpose should inform its selection and utilization in class. If the teacher does not have an understanding of how language functions in context to achieve a communicative purpose, it will be difficult to make all but the most superficial language features salient to students. SFG also provides a systematic way for discussing such language features. A discussion situated in how lexicogrammatical choices create meaning could serve to compliment more abstract explanations of grammar rules and ‘correct’ usage.

Text 1 presents a realistic example of an instructional genre that students are likely to encounter outside the classroom when dealing with food or other goods from English speaking countries. The language in Text 1 presents a strong link between form and function in expressing commands in a depersonalized context, and could serve as a model for students to create their own instructional texts on a number of different topics. For example, students could create their own recipes or describe step-by-step procedures, such as how to do the Japanese
tea ceremony or the operating instructions in a technical manual. Based on the analysis of Text 1, such texts can be created by way of using material processes in the imperative mood (cook the breasts for 10 minutes). This type of assignment would be appropriate for even beginner-level students.

Text 2 could be used to model an authentic spoken demonstration. Students could perform the text (or one of their own creation) while paying attention to communication in a high-context environment. Thus, students could find opportunities to incorporate visual cues and vague language as part of their performance. Moreover, to maintain the audience’s interest and properly pace the performance, the language of explanation, commentary, and procedure (experiential, interpersonal, and textual meanings) will likely need to be accounted for by students. To raise awareness of the three types of meaning conveyed in the text, teachers could have students identify clause boundaries and rewrite Text 2 as if it were a written text.

The domain of food allows for multiple perspectives on a familiar topic. Text 3 could be utilized as an example of personalized communication, not unlike an advice column or piece of persuasive writing. In this type of writing, the author has a point of view on the topic and communicates it from a specific position, such as the friendly expert. Thus, students could be assigned a topic in which they discuss food in a similar manner to Text 3. To produce an effective text, students could focus especially on mental and relational processes, and the use of modality.

This section has presented examples of how to apply SFG principles to the three texts in an EFL classroom, to which one could add many more. The above discussion has proposed that ‘a text about cooking’ will never be simply just that. SFG provides teachers with an effective resource for using texts to meet the language learning needs of their students.

6. Conclusion

This paper has presented an overview of the Systemic Functional framework and its application to three texts about cooking. SFG was identified as a systematic framework for understanding how lexicogrammatical choices in context function to create meaning and achieve a communicative purpose. Conclusions about each text’s communicative and stylistic differences were considered within the dual process framework of explanation and evaluation. The explanation of each text described how experiential, interpersonal, and textual choices of lexicogrammar act to realize the field, tenor, and mode of texts. Evaluation consisted of identifying how well a text communicated its message within a cultural context. Finally, practical application of the systemic analysis of the three texts was discussed in connection to English Language Teaching. It was suggested that an understanding of the basic principles of SFG could inform teachers’ selection and use of texts in the classroom. One point of convergence between SFG and ELT is the need to match the communicative purposes of texts with the communicative and language learning needs of students.

It is not difficult to imagine the phrase ‘grammatical analysis’ producing feelings in
people ranging from fear to boredom. However, texts and meaning creation are an integral way that human beings express themselves and take action in the world. Systemic Functional Grammar provides an opportunity to better understand this basic element of human social behaviour and the way our lives are shaped through texts.
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