

Theoretical Foundations and System Architecture of the MSNR Teaching Model for Modern Chinese Reading in Senior High Schools

Hui Hong^{1*} , Tiam Lai Tan² 

¹Faculty of Languages and Communication, Sultan Idris Education University, 35900 Tanjong Malim, Perak, Malaysia.

Email: svipppppp2026@163.com

²Faculty of Languages and Communication, Sultan Idris Education University, 35900 Tanjong Malim, Perak, Malaysia.

Email: tiamlai@fbk.upsi.edu.my

ABSTRACT

In this conceptual study, the MSNR teaching model is proposed and expounded on as a comprehensive and systematic framework for reading teaching in contemporary senior high school education in China. Based on four classical learning theories of constructivism, social interdependence theory, humanistic learning theory, and reflective practice theory, the MSNR model incorporates modular design of teaching content, social negotiation, meaning construction through collaboration, and reflective evaluation into an effective instruction framework. With a description of the hierarchical structure, components, connections and mechanisms of the four-dimensional system/content architecture, subject architecture, interactive architecture and evaluative architecture of the MSNR model, this article demonstrates its superiority from a perspective of theoretical foundation, structural clarity, and recursive optimization, beyond the fragmented, teacher-centered and test-based features of the current Chinese classroom reading teaching practices. The study makes a contribution to the international discipline-specific reading research in that it illustrates how generic cooperative-learning theories can be adapted to contemporary Chinese literature, exposition and practical texts.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR (*):

Hui Hong
(svipppppp2026@163.com)

KEYWORDS:

MSNR model
Modern Chinese reading
instruction
Senior high school
System architecture
Core competencies
Cooperative learning

CITATION:

Hong, H., & Tan, T. L. (2026). Theoretical Foundations and System Architecture of the MSNR Teaching Model for Modern Chinese Reading in Senior High Schools. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 11(7), e004099.
<https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v11i7.4099>

Contribution/Originality: This study contributes to current knowledge through the incorporation of a variety of theoretical paradigms, such as constructivism, social interdependence theory, humanism, and reflection, into a coherent MSNR model of reading instruction in modern China. The paper contributes with the resulting genre-responsive, differentiated, and reflective approach that provides an extension of cooperative learning theory into the field of disciplinary teaching.

1. Introduction

The modern teaching of Chinese reading occupies a central place in senior high school Chinese language education. The Senior High School Chinese Language Curriculum Standards (2017 Revision, 2020 Update), published by the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China (2020), identify four main competences to be developed: (1) language construction and use, (2) thinking development and enhancement, (3) aesthetic appreciation and creation, and (4) cultural inheritance and understanding. Modern Chinese reading, including literary, expository, and pragmatic types, is considered the most effective medium through which these competencies can be achieved due to its potential in developing linguistic skills, logical abilities, aesthetics, and cultural understanding among learners.

Such curriculum reform means a clear change from the knowledge-oriented, examination-based approach to competence-based, profound learning. In this context, reading goes beyond mere decoding and preparing for tests and becomes an opportunity for the learner to work with the text, interpret it, enter into dialogue and develop humanistic values. According to the curriculum standards, teachers are to organize learning that will promote independent thinking, collaborative exploration, and reflection (Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2020). Such reforms fit well into the ongoing trend of international education aimed at promoting dialogic teaching, cooperative learning, and formative assessments that have transformed classrooms in Europe, North America, and East Asia (Alexander, 2020; Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Nystrand, 1997; Slavin, 2015).

Despite the high aspirations of the curriculum, traditional reading instruction in many senior high schools of China still suffers from disintegrated lecturing, drilling, and group work in an established routine way. Observations of classroom teaching practice show that the teacher dominates the interpretation process, the student receives ready-made answers, and collaboration is reduced to a mere exchange without any real involvement of thought. Such instructional approaches limit the learner to understanding only the surface level of texts and prevent him/her from developing higher-order thinking. Classroom observations and educational research in China have revealed a number of structural problems of instructional design: lack of theoretical foundation, unclear instructional architecture, disconnection between content design and genre differences, lack of real interaction in the class, and absence of any reflection. As a result, many reform attempts stop at separate pedagogical tricks and do not go to the systemic redesign of instruction.

In this respect, the MSNR teaching model appears to be one of the most promising alternatives to traditional methods of reading instruction in Chinese schools. This approach includes modular task design combined with collaborative work and reflective assessment. Some aspects of this model, such as grouping strategies and questions, and some preliminary results have already been studied; however, no comprehensive theoretical foundation and architectural analysis of this approach has been done yet.

1.1. Purpose and Significance

The research aims at achieving three objectives. The first objective is to combine four classical theories of education and show how they support the separate dimensions of the MSNR model, in order to address the lack of theoretical basis found in the existing

literature. The second objective is to describe the four-dimensional structure of the model, explaining the hierarchy of components and their interrelation. The third objective is to put the model in the disciplinary perspective of contemporary Chinese reading and explain how the theory of cooperative learning can be tailored to specific needs.

Theoretically, the study contributes to the development of the existing literature on reading instruction in terms of combining the Western theory of learning with Chinese language instruction. It proves that cooperative learning is not a universal strategy that can be implemented into any classroom without further considerations but a method which should be adjusted to specific circumstances. Practically, the study offers a systematic approach to creating, executing, and improving the lessons of modern Chinese reading in the classroom environment.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Modular and Cooperative Learning Internationally

Modular instruction emerged in the 1970s from the Modular Employable Skills (MES) training model whereby complex vocational material was divided into independent, sequential learning modules. The fundamental assumption is that the acquisition of advanced skills will be more effective if learners proceed through the clearly defined, mastery learning modules as opposed to non-differentiated course content. Bruner's (1960) structuralist theory of the curriculum takes the rationale one step further by advocating the use of the spiral curriculum where structures of the discipline are taught at increasingly abstract levels. These ideas have served as the basis of modular curricula in various fields but have not been thoroughly theorized within the domain of language arts.

Social interdependence theory, proposed by Johnson and Johnson (1999, 2018), serves as the major theoretical background of cooperative learning. According to this theory, there are five fundamental components: positive interdependence, individual accountability, promotive interaction, social skills, and group processing. Research findings indicate that these components contribute to academic performance, interpersonal relations, and psychosocial development across different educational levels and cultures (Johnson et al., 1994, 2014; Slavin, 2015). In the classroom context, cooperative learning techniques have been elaborated using various structured activities including group roles, interaction strategies, and rewards (Kagan, 1994). Positive interdependence creates a situation in which students perceive that they can reach their learning goals only if all group members reach theirs. Individual accountability ensures that each student is responsible for contributing to the group's success. Promotive interaction involves students helping one another learn, while group processing refers to the collective reflection on how well the group is functioning.

Constructivist scholars such as Piaget (1952), Vygotsky (1978), and Bruner (1960, 1966) emphasise the social mediation of cognition, arguing that meaning emerges through dialogue, cognitive conflict, and scaffolded interaction within the zone of proximal development. Vygotsky's (1978) concept of the zone of proximal development is particularly important because it explains why peer interaction can advance learning: more capable peers or teachers provide temporary scaffolding that enables learners to perform tasks they cannot yet perform independently. Bruner's (1966) notion of

scaffolding complements this view by specifying the kinds of temporary support-questioning, modelling, cueing, and feedback-that make higher-level performance possible. Research on collaborative learning has further shown that productive peer interaction depends on the design of tasks, group composition, and interaction scripts (Dillenbourg, 1999).

The humanistic theories of learning, propounded by Rogers (1969, 1983) and Maslow (1970), shift attention back to the total student through self-directed learning, intrinsic motivation, emotional well-being, and taking into account individual differences. As per Rogers (1969), learning situations must foster freedom of learning through the creation of circumstances under which learners can work towards their own goals. The hierarchy of needs proposed by Maslow (1970) suggests that learning takes place most efficiently when the needs of security, belongingness, and esteem are met.

Schon's (1983, 1987) reflective practice theory, meanwhile, reconceptualises professional learning as a recursive process of reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action, foregrounding the role of continuous evaluation and improvement. Although originally developed for professional practitioners such as architects and physicians, reflective practice has become influential in teacher education and classroom-based action research because it treats teaching as an ongoing experiment in which practitioners continuously diagnose and refine their actions.

Although these theories are well established internationally, their integration into a single model tailored to modern Chinese reading instruction has not been adequately addressed. Existing cooperative-learning models often originate in STEM or general social-science contexts and therefore lack the genre sensitivity required for literary, expository, and practical Chinese texts.

2.2. Modern Chinese Reading Instruction in China

Domestic research on modern Chinese reading instruction has proliferated in the past decade. Studies have investigated higher-order thinking cultivation, core competency implementation, genre-specific teaching strategies and classroom problem diagnosis. The content of reading instruction depends on the text type and the interpretive difficulties associated with it instead of depending on the standard process that is arbitrarily applied regardless of the text type. The changes in the curriculum that are required for transitioning from knowledge transfer to competence development involve authentic activities, learner autonomy, and formative assessment.

Modular instruction research has mainly focused on content restructuring in units, whereas cooperative learning research has examined methods of grouping, roles, and question design. The empirical use of the MSNR model has had positive impacts on students' engagement and reading ability, but the existing studies mainly focus on the application and evaluation issues instead of on the theoretical background and systemic design of the model.

The significant limitation of the existing literature is the predominance of practice over theory and the inclination towards a local solution as opposed to a systemic design. The current research is aimed at overcoming this deficiency through an investigation of the theoretical and architectural basis of the MSNR model.

2.3. Theoretical Foundations of the MSNR Model

The MSNR framework – comprising the four aspects of Social Negotiation, Meaning Construction, Notetaking and Reflection – is not simply a mechanical addition of the processes; rather, it is a consistent instructional theory. Each of the four theoretical components that the framework relies upon forms a separate architectural dimension of the model.

2.4. Constructivist Learning Theory: Foundation for Content and Cognitive Architecture

The constructivist theory, incorporating the ideas of Piaget (1952), Vygotsky (1978), and Bruner (1960, 1966), dismisses the theory of transmission, whereby knowledge is merely imparted to an individual. Instead, it posits that knowledge is constructed by the individual learner through his/her interaction with texts, peers, and instructors in the process of learning. Three constructivist principles are especially relevant to MSNR.

First, knowledge is provisional and context-bound. Readers do not extract a single correct meaning from a text; they construct interpretations shaped by prior experience, textual evidence, and social discourse. This view aligns with reader-response theory and transactional models of reading, which recognise that meaning arises from the interaction between reader and text (Rosenblatt, 1978). Second, cognitive development proceeds through the zone of proximal development, requiring scaffolded tasks that are slightly beyond the learner's current independent capability (Vygotsky, 1978). Third, deep learning is triggered by cognitive conflict, inquiry, and social conversation. Learning that lacks these conditions remains superficial.

These principles inform two MSNR subsystems. The content architecture is organised into three gradient modules-basic perception, in-depth inquiry, and transfer application-each providing cognitive scaffolding appropriate to different readiness levels. The cognitive process architecture follows a sequence of individual pre-study, multi-layer negotiation, and collaborative meaning construction, mirroring the constructivist cycle of "situation-collaboration-conversation-meaning construction."

2.5. Social Interdependence Theory: Foundation for Subject and Interactive Architecture

Johnson and Johnson's (1999, 2018) social interdependence theory posits that the way in which learning goals are structured determines how students interact and, consequently, what they learn. Positive interdependence, individual accountability, promotive interaction, social skills, and group processing are identified as the five pillars of effective cooperative learning.

In the MSNR model, positive interdependence is realised through 4-6 member heterogeneous groups whose collective success depends on the contributions of every member. Individual accountability is secured through rotating roles-leader, materials manager, recorder, reporter, and challenger-so that each student performs a unique and indispensable function. Promotive interaction is structured via face-to-face protocols such as the 4-3-2-1 layered speaking rule, which sequences contributions from lower-readiness to higher-readiness students. Group processing is embedded in post-lesson reflection routines that evaluate interaction quality and identify improvements.

2.6. Humanistic Learning Theory: Foundation for Differentiated and Affective Architecture

Humanistic learning theory, as articulated by Rogers (1969, 1983) and Maslow (1970), places the learner at the centre of education. It stresses respect for individual differences, the provision of emotional security, the pursuit of self-actualisation, and the integration of cognitive and affective development. Rogers (1983) maintained that the facilitator's task is to provide resources, clarify purposes, and create a climate of acceptance and understanding so that students can take responsibility for their own learning.

The MSNR model actualizes these principles in terms of the following three commitments regarding its architecture. Firstly, the differentiated adaptation is accomplished with the help of a hierarchical structure of content modules and differentiated tasks according to the students' current reading level. Secondly, equal participation is realized through the means of role rotation and speaking turns which ensure that the most successful students do not dominate, and that the weakest readers will not be marginalized. Finally, whole-person development is attained by taking into consideration knowledge, cognitive, affective and humanistic aspects of education.

2.7. Reflective Practice Theory: Foundation for Evaluative and Iterative Architecture

The reflective practice theory by Schon (1983, 1987) is a redefinition of professional learning into an iterative approach involving reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action, which are characterized by constant evaluation and improvement. Reflection-in-action takes place during the teaching process, where the practitioner makes note of unforeseen reactions and modifies his/her actions accordingly, while reflection-on-action takes place after the process, where practitioners reflect on what happened. When used in classroom learning, reflection allows learners and instructors to be able to track progress, identify problems, and modify their actions.

According to the MSNR reflective model, there is a twin-cycle approach in reflective evaluation whereby the internal cycle of the student involves self-evaluation and peer evaluation centered on the learning process, participation, and cognitive development, while the external cycle of the teacher incorporates classroom observation, student products, reflective journals, and formative data to assess task achievement, cognition, and competence development.

3. System Architecture of the MSNR Model

With the systems perspective, the MSNR model is made up of four subsystems that are inter-related. They include the content subsystem, subject matter subsystem, interactive subsystem, and evaluative subsystem. The four subsystems complement each other and together they make contemporary Chinese reading lessons dynamic and scientific.

3.1. Content Architecture: Genre-Based and Differentiated

The content architecture serves as the essential carrier of the model. Two differentiating principles lie behind its construction: differentiation horizontally by genre and vertically by readiness.

The former means that three modern genres of Chinese texts are distinguished, each having specific content emphasis. The sequence of reading for literary texts consists of plot-and-image mapping, emotional-meaning exploration, artistic-technique appreciation, and aesthetic transfer to similar texts. As literary texts include not only fiction but also poetry, prose, and drama, the reader should be able to notice imagery, tone, narrative perspective, and emotional aspects in them. In the case of the expository text, the sequence includes thesis-and-evidence extraction, argument structure analysis, fallacy identification, and critical stance establishment. Expository texts like commentaries, essays, and academic articles should be logically analyzed and criticized from the viewpoint of evidence and reason. Finally, in the case of the practical text, the sequence involves key-information extraction, logical-textual clarification, purpose analysis, and application of information. Practical texts such as news reports, government papers, and speeches presuppose functional literacy and effective use of information in the real world. Such genre-specific modularization allows designing content in accordance with genre-specific cognitive and affective requirements.

Each genre module is vertically divided into three readiness tiers: basic-perception, in-depth-inquiry, and transfer-application. The tasks of the basic-perception tier relate to surface-level understanding and are meant for the struggling reader; they include vocabulary clarification, plot description, identification of the main idea, and explicit information acquisition. The tasks of the in-depth-inquiry tier involve interpretation and analysis of the texts and are for the average reader; they include making inferences, theme analysis, argument evaluation, and technique appreciation. The tasks of the transfer-application tier promote synthesis, comparison, and real-world transfer of ideas; they include cross-text comparison, critical repositioning, response to the text, and problem-solving. All the tiers are sequenced but interrelated, thus guaranteeing universal basic achievement and individualized stretch.

To ensure easy and efficient implementation, the content architecture is supplemented with task packages, graphic organizers, and inquiry checklists.

3.2. Subject Architecture: Flat and Symbiotic

This theme overturns conventional teacher-student and student-student relations. Instead of teacher-centered education, it promotes the idea of a flat symbiotic structure, including such aspects as teacher facilitation, group agency, and collective activity.

In the instruction process, student groups of four to six participants of heterogeneous composition serve as key units. Heterogeneous composition includes factors such as reading ability, cognitive style, personality, and speaking skills. In a group of four to six people, there are five rotating roles: leader who manages discussion and idea integration; materials manager who gathers pre-reading material and organizes it; recorder who writes down agreements and disagreements; reporter who reports on the group's findings and challenger who questions group ideas. Such rotation guarantees that all students will take each of these roles throughout the week.

Teachers play the parts of architects, facilitators, and evaluators. Before class, a teacher should prepare modular packages of the content related to the genre, goals of the unit and class preparation. During class, teachers should control interaction quality, intervene in the discussion and refrain from explaining. At the end of class, the teacher should evaluate the results and design the architectural structure for the next cycle. The

phrase "empowerment without abandonment, guidance without substitution" can summarize this approach.

3.3 Interactive Architecture: Two-Layered and Critical

Interactive architecture serves as the kinetic machinery of deep learning, which consists of two consecutive layers taking students from shared basic understanding to higher-order critical thinking.

The first layer is intra-group negotiation. This is a stage focused on basic understanding consolidation and resolution of personal confusion. Groups follow the 4-3-2-1 rule of speaking: low readiness speakers go first, average ones speak, advanced speakers elaborate, and the leader synthesizes. The 4-3-2-1 rule is designed to protect the right of weaker students to participate in the discussion and to make sure that students acquire the shared basic understanding before moving on to more difficult tasks. Thus, the first layer protects weak readers, but prepares advanced readers to analyze their thoughts.

The second layer is inter-group critical debate. Groups present their findings and issues to the whole class. Students use the "three positives, one question" strategy. They comment on the group presentation with three positive remarks and raise one question. The ensuing debate focuses on multi-perspective understanding, logic, author's intention, and real-life connection. The second layer transforms individual cognition into public dialogue, developing logical reasoning and pluralistic thinking.

The two layers are consecutive and complementary. The first layer makes sure that all students have the basic understanding needed to engage in a productive debate; the second layer takes interaction to the level of critical thinking demanded by curriculum standards.

3.4. Evaluative Architecture: Closed-Loop and Multi-Dimensional

The evaluative framework is created to prevent the premature ending of the model and its continuous enhancement through recursive iterations. It is based on two reciprocal constructs – three-dimensional evaluation and two-cycle iteration.

Three-dimensional evaluation includes individual self-evaluation, peer group evaluation, and professional teacher evaluation. Self-evaluation addresses individual learning progress, cognitive growth, involvement, and weaknesses left behind. Group evaluation addresses role performance, quality of interaction, ideational input, and problem-solving effectiveness. Professional teacher evaluation addresses task accomplishment, critical thinking level, collaborative success, and core competence acquisition. Taken together, they provide an overall picture that goes beyond the boundaries of one-source evaluation and its limitations.

Two-cycle iteration links student reflection with teacher reflection. The student cycle detects individual and collective learning deficiencies, while the teacher cycle identifies architectural discrepancies in the degree of content difficulty, role assignment, rules of interaction, and grouping approach. This information is used for future adjustment of the teaching process in order to close the "teach – evaluate – reflect – optimize – reteach" loop.

Figure 1 below shows the relationship among the four subsystems. Content architecture, subject architecture, interactive architecture, and evaluative architecture have different theoretical foundations and purposes. Content architecture creates differentiated learning; subject architecture gives people their tasks; interactive architecture allows collaborative meaning-making and discussion; and evaluative architecture involves reflecting and improving upon the process.

Table 1: Overview of the Four-Dimensional MSNR System Architecture

Dimension	Theoretical Foundation	Core Components	Primary Function
Content architecture	Constructivist learning theory	Genre-specific modules; three readiness tiers (basic perception, in-depth inquiry, transfer application); task packages and graphic organisers	Provide structured, differentiated, and discipline-appropriate learning content
Subject architecture	Social interdependence theory; humanistic learning theory	4-6 member heterogeneous groups; five rotating roles (leader, materials manager, recorder, reporter, challenger); teacher as architect-facilitator-evaluator	Distribute participation, responsibility, and leadership; create flat, symbiotic classroom ecology
Interactive architecture	Social interdependence theory; constructivism	Intra-group 4-3-2-1 collaborative negotiation; inter-group "three affirmations, one query" critical debate	Move students from basic comprehension to higher-order critical discourse
Evaluative architecture	Reflective practice theory; humanistic learning theory	Individual self-assessment; peer group assessment; teacher professional assessment; dual-cycle reflection	Monitor learning, diagnose problems, and recursively optimise instruction

4. Operational Logic and Implementation Flow

The four sub-architectures operate in a temporal and cognitive sequence: architectural preparation before class, interactions with the subjects during class, and assessment after class.

4.1. Pre-Class: Architectural Preparation and Cognitive Readiness

Before the class session starts, the teacher performs a detailed analysis of the genre and the learning goals associated with it to come up with a differentiated set of modules that will be used as tasks in the class session. These activities include choosing the anchor texts, designing the tiered tasks, preparing the graphic organizers, and creating the evaluation criteria. The students will individually perform their pre-study activities,

which include reading the text, structuring the information, noting the difficult parts, and answering questions on the first tier level. Thus, before coming to the class, the students will have activated their prior knowledge and developed personalized meanings and question lists, providing the cognitive basis for further negotiations.

4.2. In-Class: Subject Interaction and Meaning Construction

The students in the group during the instruction session assume the assigned roles and do intragroup negotiations in order to strengthen the foundational knowledge and to determine the outstanding issues. The class then moves on to an intergroup debate where each group makes its presentations and answers the questions from other groups. The teacher here does not act as a dominator but rather as a facilitator, helping the students to learn how to integrate different views and consolidate knowledge, cognition and attitude developments. This is the key stage of the transition from the acquisition of information to skills development.

4.3. Post-Class: Evaluation and Architectural Iteration

Students carry out self and group evaluation after class as the teacher reviews data and products from the classroom. Feedback is used to make changes in the level of difficulty of the module, the nature of tasks, role allocation, interaction strategies, and assessment criteria for the next instructional cycle. The process of this feedback serves as the mechanism that makes the model effective. Without this step, the model will only be a static process; with this step, it becomes a self-regulating system.

5. Discussion

5.1. Systematic and Closed-Loop Design

The MSNR approach provides an integrated four-dimensional model that is fundamentally different from traditional teaching reading, where activities are usually separate from each other. In such a model, content, subject matter, interaction, and assessment are viewed as interrelated parts rather than separate skills. The double-cycled reflection process ensures that the model works as a recursively optimal system rather than as a rigid recipe. The systems thinking aspect of the model reduces pedagogical fragmentation through providing teachers with a unified design vocabulary and a set of compatible classroom practices.

5.2. Genre Sensitivity and Differentiated Adaptation

The content design of the model takes up an age-old problem that exists in Chinese reading teaching – the tendency to use the same strategy for all kinds of texts. The use of separate modules for literary, expository, and practical texts, and the further stratification of the tasks in these genres, ensures that the methods used in teaching cater to both discipline-specific knowledge and student readiness. This is especially true for China, where there are many students in a single class.

5.3. Equal Participation and Symbiotic Growth

The egalitarian subject structure along with the distribution of tasks will solve many of the common problems related to the lecture style in teacher-centered learning and the

predominance of top-performing students. By providing an inclusive classroom environment through structural participation opportunities, the pedagogy builds on the relationship between individual growth and group development, which fits the principles of humanism and social interdependence theory and considers equity concerns of quality education in China.

5.4. Critical Interaction and Higher-Order Thinking

The double-tier interactive structure takes students past ritualized cooperation. With the help of speech and debate procedures, interaction becomes structured, balanced, and intellectually challenging, thus allowing the development of the critical thinking and logical reasoning that are important for the Chinese curriculum. From within-group agreement to between-groups criticism, there is a move similar to what happens in knowledge-making communities where propositions are put forward, disputed, and sharpened publicly.

5.5. Comparison with Traditional and Conventional Cooperative Models

The process of learning how to read in China today follows a linear path that involves exposition by the teacher, students taking notes, and independent practice. Although this methodology effectively transmits knowledge, it fails to nurture the skills valued in the current curriculum. On the other hand, cooperative learning traditionally practiced is characterized by the inclusion of discussion without appropriate structure, leading to poor involvement, irrelevant discussion, and shallow learning (Slavin, 2015).

The MSNR model has an intermediate standing where it continues to have the efficiency feature associated with explicit content design but integrates that content into a process of social negotiation and reflection. By specifying roles, protocols, and iterative routines, the model addresses the implementation problems that have limited the effectiveness of less structured cooperative approaches.

5.6. Implications for Teacher Professional Development

Effective implementation of the MSNR model requires teachers to move beyond craft knowledge toward design knowledge. Pre-service and in-service programmes should therefore provide opportunities for teachers to analyse genre-specific modules, practise facilitating structured group interaction, and use evaluation data to refine instruction. Professional learning communities can support this transition by offering structured peer observation, lesson study cycles, and collaborative analysis of student work.

6. Limitations and Future Directions

The current study is conceptual in nature and therefore has several limitations. First, the model's architecture has been designed primarily for regular senior high school classes in public schools; its adaptation to lower secondary grades, graduation-examination cohorts, rural under-resourced schools, and special-needs classrooms remains to be specified. Second, the model has been developed for face-to-face instruction; its digital adaptation for blended or smart classrooms requires further design. Third, the criteria for the architecture and the performance indicators demand further quantification and verification through empirical research. Fourth, since the model is based on documents

and practices from the Chinese curriculum, its transferability to other cultures needs to be scrutinized.

There are four areas that future research should look into. First, conduct fine-grained adaptation studies for different grade levels, school types, and student profiles. Second, integrate digital tools-such as online collaboration platforms and AI-assisted feedback-into the MSNR architecture. Third, undertake large-scale quasi-experimental studies to validate the effects of each sub-architecture on reading achievement, thinking development, and core competency formation. Fourth, explore whether the four-dimensional architecture can be adapted to other humanities disciplines, such as history, moral education, and foreign-language reading instruction.

7. Conclusion

Modern Chinese reading instruction in senior high schools faces structural challenges: theoretical fragmentation, architectural ambiguity, content homogenisation, superficial interaction, and the absence of reflective feedback loops. The MSNR model addresses these challenges by integrating constructivist learning theory, social interdependence theory, humanistic learning theory, and reflective practice theory into a coherent, four-dimensional instructional system.

The model's content architecture provides genre-sensitive and readiness-differentiated learning pathways. Its subject architecture creates a flat, symbiotic ecology of teacher facilitation and student agency. Its interactive architecture channels group work from basic consensus to critical debate. Its evaluative architecture closes the loop through multi-source assessment and dual-cycle reflection. Together, the subsystems constitute a shift in current reading pedagogy in China by reconceptualizing the process from a collection of isolated actions into a theory-driven, well-defined, and constantly improving pedagogy.

This paper provides a theoretical framework for the standardization, scalability, and fine-tuning of the MSNR model. More research is needed to validate, measure, and expand the model in different educational settings.

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate

Not applicable. This is theoretical research that had no interaction with human subjects, personal information, or any educational intervention; therefore, ethics approval and consent were unnecessary.

Acknowledgement

Not applicable.

Funding

This study received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Alexander, R. J. (2020). *A dialogic teaching companion*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351040143>
- Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Harvard University Press. https://books.google.co.in/books?id=M5VqAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Harvard University Press. https://books.google.co.in/books?vid=ISBN9780674897014&redir_esc=y
- Dillenbourg, P. (1999). *Collaborative learning: Cognitive and computational approaches*. Pergamon. https://books.google.co.in/books?id=Zq4wQgAACAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning* (5th ed.). Allyn & Bacon. https://books.google.co.in/books?id=lh8iAQAAIAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2018). Cooperative learning: The foundation for active learning. In S. M. Brito (Ed.), *Active learning—Beyond the future*. IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.81086>
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1994). *Cooperative learning in the classroom*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. https://books.google.co.in/books?id=Cs-dAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (2014). Cooperative learning: Improving university instruction by basing practice on validated theory. *Journal on excellence in college teaching*, 25(3&4). https://karlsmithmn.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Johnson-Johnson-Smith-Cooperative-Learning-JECT-Small_Group_Learning-draft.pdf
- Kagan, S. (1994). *Cooperative learning*. Kagan Publishing. <https://www.kisii.gl/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Kagan-Stenlev-Cooperative-Learning.pdf>
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row. https://books.google.co.in/books?vid=ISBN9780060419875&redir_esc=y
- Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203946657>
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2020). *Senior high school Chinese language curriculum standards (2017 edition, 2020 revision)*. People's Education Press. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A26/s8001/202006/t20200603_462199.html
- Nystrand, M. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*. Teachers College Press. https://books.google.co.in/books?vid=ISBN9780807735732&redir_esc=y
- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. International Universities Press. <https://doi.org/10.1037/11494-000>
- Rogers, C. R. (1969). *Freedom to learn: A view of what education might become*. Charles E. Merrill. https://books.google.co.in/books?id=qJxpAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Rogers, C. R. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 80s*. Charles E. Merrill. https://books.google.co.in/books?id=obzOxwEACAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Southern Illinois University Press. https://books.google.co.in/books?vid=ISBN9780809318056&redir_esc=y

- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books. https://books.google.co.in/books?vid=ISBN9780465068784&redir_esc=y
- Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. Jossey-Bass. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1987-97655-000?utm_medium=email&utm_source=transaction
- Slavin, R. E. (2015). Cooperative learning in elementary schools. In E. L. Brown, M. R. Sharma, & T. K. Bouasavanh (Eds.), *Educational psychology* (pp. 150-157). Nova Science Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2015.963370>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press. https://books.google.co.in/books?vid=ISBN9780674576292&redir_esc=y