Abstract. The New National Standards issued at the end of 2016 set more clear requirements and targets for the cultivation of English major students: cultivating students’ ability to use English language comprehensively, to appreciate literature and to communicate across cultures. The four elements in CLIL model are highly consistent with the targets. The author in this article has a try to exemplify substantive writing in literature CLIL teaching model under the guidance of the New National Standards, hoping to help teachers in literature teaching course to find a new and effective way of fostering students’ critical thinking, as a result, to help students realize the three abilities mentioned above since critical thinking is a key issue and plays a crucial part in them.

1. Introduction

The importance of teaching literature has been illustrated over and over again with slight difference by many scholars, among which the most prominent ones were Joanne Collie and Stephen Slater (1987), and Ronald Carter and Michael N. Long(1991). Joanne Collie and Stephen Slater answered the question why literature should be taught by listing four important functions literature has: valuable authentic material, cultural enrichment, language enrichment, and personal involvement. [1] Similarly, Ronald Carter and Michael N. Long provided three main reasons for the teaching of literature. These are: the cultural model, the language model, and the personal growth model. Based on its significance, the study of certain classic pieces of literature is likely to be considered as a sine qua non for the truly educated person. [2]

The New National Standards issued at the end of 2016 set more clear requirements and targets for the cultivation of English major students: cultivating students’ ability to use English language comprehensively, to appreciate literature and to communicate across cultures. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language. What separates CLIL from some established approaches such as content-based language learning, or forms of bilingual education, is the planned pedagogic integration of contextualized content, cognition, communication and culture into teaching and learning practice.[3] Effective CLIL takes place as a result of the symbiotic relationship that exists between the content, communication, cognition and culture of the 4Cs Framework as follows:

![Figure 1. The 4Cs Framework.](image-url)
The 4Cs Framework integrates four contextualized building blocks: content (subject matter), communication (language learning and using), cognition (learning and thinking processes) and culture (developing intercultural understanding and global citizenship). It can be seen that the four elements of the CLIL teaching or learning model are highly consistent with the targets of the New National Standard for the cultivation of English major students. Therefore the application of this model in English major courses should help improve students’ comprehensive ability of English language application, the ability of literature appreciation and the ability of cross-cultural communication. Among the three abilities, we can see critical thinking is a key issue and plays a crucial part in them. Therefore how to cultivate students’ critical thinking becomes an urgent task for teachers when they teach the literary courses.

2. Combination of Critical Reading and Writing in Literature CLIL Teaching Model

According to Richard Paul and Linda Elder, critical reading consists of five levels of close reading, that is, paraphrasing, explicating, analyzing, evaluation, and role-playing.[4] Each level has different requirements for learners’ abilities. The first level “paraphrasing” requires learners to state the meaning of each sentence in their own words as they read, and the second level “explicating” requires learners to explicate the thesis of a paragraph which can be detailed as the following contents: one, state the main point of the paragraph in one or two sentences. Two, elaborate on what learners have paraphrased. Three, provide examples of the meaning by integrating it into concrete situations in the real world. Four, generate metaphors, analogies, pictures, or diagrams of the basic thesis to connect it to other meanings learners already understand. The third level “analyzing” requires learners to analyze the logic of what learners are reading such as the author’s most basic concepts, the key question the author is trying to answer, the author’s fundamental purpose, the author’s point of view with respect to the issue, the assumptions the author makes in his or her reasoning, the implications of the author’s reasoning, the information the author uses in reasoning through the issue, the most fundamental inferences or conclusions in the article, etc. The fourth level “evaluation” requires learners to assess the logic of what they are reading from the following nine aspects: one, does the author clearly state his or her meaning, or is the text vague, confused, or muddled in some way? Two, is the author accurate in what he or she claims? Three, is the author sufficiently precise in providing details and specifics why they are relevant? Four, does the author introduce irrelevant material, thereby wandering from his or her purpose? Five, does the author take readers into the important complexities inherent in the subject, or is the writing superficial? Six, does the author considers other relevant points of view, or is the writing overly narrow in its perspective? Seven, is the text internally consistent, or does the text contain unexplained contradictions? Eight, is the text significant, or is the subject dealt with in a trivial manner? Nine, does the author display fairness, or does the author take a one-sided, narrow approach? The fifth level “role-playing” requires learners to speak in the voice of an author. Of course, the reflective reader or learner doesn’t always use the five levels of reading together when they read, but chooses from among them depending on the purpose for reading.

Richard Paul and Linda Elder (2016) in their book HOW TO WRITE A PARAGRAPH: THE ART OF SUBSTANTIVE WRITING put forward a concept about “substantive writing” which is defined as the following: “clearly, one’s purpose in writing influences the writing skill one needs and uses. Nevertheless, there are some fundamental writing skills we all need if we are to develop the art of saying something worth saying about. We call this substantive writing.”[5] In other words, the work of substantive writing is the work of first choosing a subject or idea worth writing about and then thinking through something worth saying about the subject or idea. From the definition, we can draw three layers of inference, one is that some fundamental writing skills or tools are vital for writing about anything substantive; the other is something might be a subject or idea worth writing about, and another is that something you say about must be significant or is of great importance. In substantive writing, we can focus on analyzing the author’s reasoning from the following eight basic elements of reasoning aspects, i.e. the author’s purpose, the main question the author addresses in the article, the most important information the author uses in reasoning through the
question, the most important inferences or conclusions the author comes to, the key concepts the
author uses in his or her thinking in writing the article, the assumptions underlying the author’s
views, and the main point of view presented in the article.[5] Through substantive writing practice,
learners can acquire four abilities, namely, the ability of stating the thesis in their own words, the
ability of elaborating the thesis, the ability of providing one or more examples of the thesis, and the
ability of illustrating the thesis with a metaphor or analogy.[5] Whereas when we assess the quality
of the writing piece, we can judge it by applying standards such as clarity, precision, accuracy,
relevance, significance, depth, breadth, logic, and fairness. [5]

When we go back to make a comparison between critical reading and critical writing, we find
some similarities both critical reading and critical writing share, such abilities as paraphrasing,
explicating, elaborating, analyzing, and evaluating. Therefore, in the CLIL teaching model of
teaching literary courses, we can combine the critical reading and critical writing together in order
to achieve an effective result to the most extent.

3. A Sample of Substantive Writing in Literature CLIL Teaching Model

It’s not so difficult for the instructor to exemplify the critical reading during their literature
teaching process, and it’s not so difficult for the instructor to exemplify how to evaluate a piece of
substantive writing to students too. However, the task of letting students has the ability to write a
piece of substantive writing is a real tough job and has a long way to go. In order to reach the goal,
it’s necessary and effective for the instructor routinely to provide lots of substantive writing pieces
with high qualities( the best choice is chosen from the articles either written by some excellent
students or by the instructor himself or herself if possible) to students during students’ process of
practising substantive writing. The following is a sample from one of my students in the course An
Introduction to Literature under my supervision when I assign them a task in the final exam. to
analyze an author’s work by applying a theory. The student applies Denis Diderot’s aesthetic
ideology about “Beauty Originates from Goodness, and Goodness Truth”, in short, “Beauty Is Truth”
into analyzing Carl Sandburg’s most artistically designed nature poems, aiming at revealing the
author’s aesthetic ideology in two layers: The Innocence of a Child—“the Spirit of Infancy”, and
The “Monotone” of Nature—the Simple Pure Fairness.

3.1 Theory Introduction: Denis Diderot’s Aesthetic Ideology about “Beauty Originates from
Goodness, and Goodness Truth ”

Denis Diderot (October 5, 1713 – July 31, 1784) was a French philosopher, art critic, playwright
and writer. He touched upon a little bit on the trinity of beauty, goodness and truth. Diderot once
said that “if the observation of nature is not the dominant preoccupation of the man of letters or the
artist, don’t expect anything worthwhile from him”[6]. This statement justifies well the reason why
many great literary men and artists show deep affection towards nature. And by nature, Diderot did
not just mean the natural world; he referred the social life and its laws as well. Diderot indicated
that realistic stuff may not be regarded as something beautiful, but beauty is surely rooted in reality,
that is, aesthetic perception shall build its foundation on truthfulness, which stems from scrupulous
observation of the objective world—the source of goodness. And at this point, any kind of art
should reveal its beauty through exposing goodness and truth.

Proper regards should also be paid to the other notion that relates to the word "goodness".
Diderot agreed that beauty could be presented through simplicity, but he added that "in addition to
the simplicity which it expresses, one must add innocence, truth and the pristine quality of a
childhood which knows no constraint...thus defined, the naive will be an essential feature of every
artistic creation”[6]. Diderot admired the simple goodness of the ordinary people, the innocent mind
of a child, those people are more likely to discover truth and appreciate beauty better than the many
sophisticated and corrupted masses who are busy chasing fame and money and honor. From this
quotation, goodness here refers to a piece of pureness and simplicity, and from which beauty is
derived. Or, the simple purity of the heart itself is an article of beauty. It is, in some measure, like
what John Keats put, "beauty is truth, and truth beauty".

Be the truth implies the natural world, the laws of the society, or the simplicity of a piece of mind, this truth always bears its goodness and unveils its beauty. Just as Diderot suggested, beauty originates from goodness, and goodness truth (genuineness).

3.2 Practice: Analyzing the Aesthetics Thought in Sandburg’s Nature Poems by Applying the Theory “Beauty is Truth”

3.2.1 The Innocence of a Child—"the Spirit of Infancy"
As it is mentioned earlier in this paper, Diderot attached much importance of the naiveté of childhood to artistic creation, and he regarded the unsophisticated sincerity of a child as the essential character of a work. One explanation for this perspective can be the fact that children were born with curiosity and are rich in the spirit of exploration, and together with their pure eyes and mind, they unveil the most basic and touching truth of life and nature, which is what art is supposed to demonstrate. Diderot is not alone with this point. Ralph Waldo Emerson put in his book Nature that "The sun illuminates only the eye of the man, but shines into the eye and the heart of the child"[7]. Both of them valued highly the simple goodness of a child, and Sandburg was not an exception to this idea. And as a matter of fact, he deemed that the trueness of the naivety of the child is a pleasant thing both to the eye and the mind.

A simple piece of natural wonder would send the child the most excitement, they admire the magic that nature has over the common things, and they dream about it. “Child Moon”, this poem spreads a vivid picture of a child’s wonder at the moon. Night covers all in its smooth darkness, and the moon emerges itself in the sky. The child has not gone to her sleep yet and her eyes are searching in the mystical night, ready to make her last beautiful discovery of the day. Before long, she notices the golden dust on the leaves, and following the light she sees the moon, and her little heart is full of joy. "O, look! The moon!" [8]She cries excitedly, with her little finger pointing to the sky. Pleased and satisfied, she rests with her simple joy and babbles about the moon in her wondrous dream.

“Child Moon” shows the pure simplicity of the child, and sings for the little beauteous wonder the child holds. To Sandburg, the innocent mind is even more wonderful than the wonder itself, for the magnificence of the latter is derived from that of the former.

As a father of three daughters, Sandburg had a beatific time with his children at home, which, to a certain extent, may explain the vividness of the poem above. Sandburg enjoyed the pure and innocent mind of the child and he appreciated a wonder of childishness, meanwhile, he gasped with admiration at the exploring spirit of the child. Sandburg shared this point in the verse.

Children are eager to know the world and they throw about questions whenever and wherever come to their little wild mind. Many a time, the questions they brought up carry the wisdom of an old man, for instance, questions that ponder on the origin of life, and hardly any elders could offer them a satisfying answer. The young children come up with questions at their play. By the river, under the shadows of trees, alone, in group, they would never be tired of questions. They are straight and wise, and barely nothing escape from their bright eyes.

The spirit of infancy was born with all men. Unfortunately, only a few retain it into the era of manhood. For the majority, it just withers away as they age. And as a result, one can easily find out that discoveries made in his childhood outnumber all that made during his lifetime. Once the spirit is lost, all the glory of the explorations will be the memory of the past. Sandburg may not happen to think of this point when he wrote the poem, but the poem itself delivers the idea through his exclamation, "The young child, Christ, is straight and wise".

The young children bear simple trueness and carry the spirit of a pioneer, they are close to nature and they communicate with her in their childish yet beautiful way. They start with simple curiosity and end with delightful findings, and their naivety itself is lovable. No wonder Diderot and Sandburg both praised the innocence of the child.

3.2.2 The "Monotone" of Nature—the Simple Pure Fairness
Almost every poet is a lover of nature, and many masterpieces are inspirations of natural beauty. The lake poet William Wordsworth, “I Wandered Lonely As a Cloud”, which sings the harmony
between things in nature and the harmony between himself and the beauteous scene, John Keats with his “Ode to Nightingale” in which the beautiful bird stands for the ideal beauty, and Robert Frost with his “Stopping by the Woods on a Snowy Evening”, and Percy Bysshe Shelley, “Ode to the West Wind” and so on. Names of this kind could just pile themselves up, for all poets bear a sensitive mind and they are endowed with the gift of feeling the vibration of nature, and they paint it in poetic lines. Sandburg was not free from the charm of nature either, and like the many well-known poets, he expressed his feelings in poesies, but what makes him different from the so-well rhymed poetries is the simple truth he tried to deliver through his clear and pithy style.

The truth in terms of beauty was rather clear from his perspective of view, which is plainly simple and smoothly natural and reachable to everyone. “Monotone” is a brilliant justification of this point. This poem breathed Sandburg's idea of beauty and how he felt about it. In the first stanza, the poet sang for the simple beauty of the rain, which in his eyes is a thing of comeliness. The next stanza, he made a commendation for the setting sun, and the brilliance of the sundown is captured through the words "fire" and "gold".[8] And in the last three lines, Sandburg related the beauty of the rain and the sun to a pretty face which carried the charm of the both. The poem is entitled "Monotone", the lines run on in a water way, and the pictures shot directly; yet, the beautiful is presented beautifully, for the poet considered simplicity and nature as the beautiful. All the three stanzas are in the same simple structure, and the word "beautiful" is repeated three times, which, to a certain extent, all share the character of the continuation of nature, which itself is plain and "monotonous" and which bears the profound meaning of life. Beauty is recited again and again throughout this piece in a single note, and the poet's thought of fairness is revealed, and it is, simplicity and trueness.

To Sandburg, beauty is plain and modest. Be it grand as the majestic setting sun or grey as the humdrum rain, and he would be pleased with joviality. To sense beauty is one thing, and to be with it is another. Owning to the pure admiration he had towards the simplicity of the natural physical world, Sandburg uncovered the other precious trait that nature endowed from itself, the power of healing over one's soul. Poem of this case, “Pearl Fog”. [8]

Nature has no eyes and no ears; it speaks not and senses nothing. That's what science has proved. However, poets and other artists think differently. They believe that nature and other living forms and even the abstract ideas like beauty, dream, faith, etc. are loyal listeners to whom they could reveal their innermost feelings. And no one is wrong, for they all want to deliver truth. In the poem “Pearl Fog”, Sandburg connoted that the tranquility of nature has the ability to comfort one's soul and enables one to pour out his heart. The pearl fog symbolizes peace and quietness that nature bears, and the sins refer to a troubled mind. In the stillness of nature, one could recount anything with no fears and worries, for nature would not utter a word and would let out none.

To be solely alone with nature during the nighttime and to be covered in the pearl fog and surrounded by the peaceful fresh night air, one could pull himself together easily and regain his composure and clear his mind. When all is done, the night is quiet still and the pearl fog remains unchanged, one may laugh at his own fools. Why? Because the addressee says nothing at all, not even a word, and therefore, one could laugh his "sins" away.

Nature, in her peace, says nothing, yet man understands all. And that is an art of beauty, a piece of simple fairness.

3.3 Evaluation of this Sample

Richard Paul and Linda Elder also hold the view that when we are able to make connections in writing, we begin to take ownership of these connections, then we gain knowledge. Based on this assumption, they propose when we write we should relate core ideas we learn within one discipline or domain to core ideas in other systems of knowledge, the reason of which is that knowledge exists not only in a system but also in relation to all other systems of knowledge.[5] From their saying, we get to perceive the importance of interdisciplinary learning. The above sample Analyzing the Aesthetics Thought in Sandburg’s Nature Poems by Applying the Theory “Beauty is Truth” written by a student under my supervision in my literary course provides a good example of
interdisciplinary, reflective, and critical learning in learning literature. Most important of all, the sample is a substantive writing with comparative high quality among students’ handing in papers when we judge it according to the standards such as clarity, precision, accuracy, relevance, significance, depth, breadth, logic, and fairness.

4. Conclusion

“You may be selling the best goods on earth, but if you’re not a good salesman, nobody would buy it...at the end of the day you would end up facing bankruptcy”. This is a striking analogy made by a student, which possibly suits the condition of many teachers in their way of teaching literature. We can’t deny the fact that these teachers have very sound knowledge about their subject, but they haven’t the effective ways of transmitting their knowledge to students. It’s obvious to see that this problem is closely related to the teaching approach. As for the approaches of teaching literature, many various suggestions have already been put forward. Yet most of the approaches have something in common, that is, they are normally a more teacher-centered, transmissive pedagogic mode which focuses on the text as a product about which students learn to acquire information. Manifested in teaching practice, the phenomenon is like this: the teacher utilizes most of his/her time talking and explaining to students without giving much attention to individual work. Carter and Long gave a very vivid picture about this way of teaching, “In taking the center stage, teachers often ask ‘a long series of questions’ and it is they who are ‘working through’ the text, not the students [2]. Moreover, such an approach generally regards the text as a body of knowledge to be imparted and conveyed to students, often accompanying with the transmission of “back-ground” information. The objective of this teaching approach is usually to help students memorize that knowledge effectively and represent them mechanically when they have to take part in the examinations. It’s predictable that such method of teaching literature can’t achieve great success in helping students develop their skills in reading and analyzing literary texts for themselves in a further step. As a result, students might mainly rely on teachers’ explanation, drawing inference, and their only focus is memorizing the texts mechanically and duly in order to pass the exams. The negative effects resulted from those teacher-centered approaches strongly demand the necessity of equipping teachers with appropriate teaching modes, and equally the significance of classroom research which would enable the practitioners to gain insight into alternative teaching techniques used in EFL literature classrooms.

In this article, The author has a try to exemplify substantive writing in literature CLIL teaching model under the guidance of the New National Standards, hoping to help teachers in literature teaching course to find a new and effective way of fostering students’ critical thinking, thus help improve students’ comprehensive ability of English language application, the ability of literature appreciation and the ability of cross-cultural communication required by the New National Standards since critical thinking is a key issue and plays a crucial part in them. Yet, due to the author’s/my limited knowledge and inexperience at the probing stage of teaching reform, some points of view in this article may need to be revised, or polished, or improved or tested in a further step in the near future.
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