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4.0. OVERVIEW

This 'conclusion' is necessitated only by the requirements of this mode of discourse, a Ph.D. thesis. Actually, it is an on-going process that has to be carried out in every class-room and by every teacher. It reviews the argument that runs through the thesis, just a summary and not the last word on the subject. The notion of creativity in its newer perspective as against Chomsky's notion of linguistic creativity has been established through a close examination of the analyses, that is through a metaanalysis. This thesis establishes the move from the 'notion of identity' to the 'notion of transience'. As it was argued earlier, the discussions on language philosophy have been shifted to language-based activities, including language pedagogy.

4.1. IS IT A THEORY-FORMING ACTIVITY?

The aim of this research project is not promoting a well formulated theory for 'composing'. This project proposes to destructure structural grammar, desystematize the so understood systematic teaching of grammar and composition in order to generate intellectual energies which, it is believed, will help learners develop the faculty of critical thinking. Both at the school and college levels there is a component of grammar teaching and a component of composition. The two are treated as isolated activities. The much desired integration never takes place. Students who score very high marks in sentence grammar do not perform with the same success in composition, as observed by this researcher in her service of two decades. Knowledge of sentence grammar does not automatically lead to communicative ability or composing facility. Hence an attempt has been made in this thesis to unsettle the hierarchy of grammar and composition. Thus this project proposes a dynamic definition for the notion of
The notion of creativity is being projected in this research project; this is radically different from Chomsky's notion of linguistic creativity which is the abstract potentiality of the human mind to generate an infinite set of sentences using a finite set of rules. This research project 'problematises' the notion of linguistic creativity by privileging what could be called 'situational creativity' evolving and developing from decomposing and critical thinking.

In fact, the traditional grammar teaching is closely linked to the notion of 'linguistic creativity' of Chomsky; that is, the traditional grammarian believes that...
with the input of a finite set of grammar rules (taught to the learner) an infinite set of grammatical sentences can be generated by the learner as the output. This thesis is focussed on problematizing this notion of 'linguistic creativity' by formulating its 'other', 'situational creativity' as the other member of the binary set. It is possible to argue that 'linguistic creativity' is often inclusive of 'situational creativity'. Chomsky brought in 'discourse competence' only in the 1980's after he realised the lapses of his earlier models. In Chomskyan 'linguistic creativity' innovative and imaginative expansions of situation are not included upto this date. This thesis differentiates Chomskyan 'linguistic creativity' from 'situational creativity'. From the Introduction through the chapters, this 'situational creativity' has been privileged over the traditionally privileged 'linguistic creativity'. It has to be noted here that the problematization process will be complete only if 'situational creativity' is critically evaluated. Mere 'linguistic creativity' is of no use without a proper focus on 'situational creativity'. But communication is possible only if there is 'linguistic creativity'. Thus the dynamic tension in the teaching of grammar and composition is the central aspect of the teaching of composition and of this thesis.

Notions keep changing with every turn of research. In this context of ever-changing notions, it is natural that many earlier notions get revised or rejected. Based on this understanding, the present investigator does not claim either permanence or infallibility to any of her notions put forward. The focussed notion, to compose is to decompose and critically think (this decomposing should lead to recomposing because there is critical thinking) appears to be the best originally different notion from among the many that are available at this point of time.

Theory-building activity is inevitable in any branch of knowledge. But it has to be done with the understanding that a particular theoretical framework is just a stopover
in the ever-growing chain of knowledge. This thesis is just a step ahead in the continuum of ever-changing notions. ‘Composing’ (critical thinking to be exact) is an ever-growing phenomenon and this thesis is only a momentary view of this dynamic process. This research project combines various insights and applies them in certain ways without any claim on the definite or fixed nature of these insights, the combination and the application. The choice, combination and application have pedagogic implications.

Writing is a synergic process as already referred to in the second chapter. ‘Writing’ is ‘thinking’ and reading is another kind of ‘writing’; that is to say, ‘writing’ and ‘reading’ are processes of thinking. A learner has to be encouraged to develop the habit of raising relevant questions whenever he ‘reads’. In other words, ‘writing’ is related to reading and both are related to critical and creative thinking. So critical thinking must be developed along with reading and writing.

This experiment has taken only some limited aspects of writing but there are many more to be explored as inter-related areas. For example, if the students are given a chance to change the mode and style of their writing, they would keep on producing unique pieces of ‘writing’ everytime. The diagrammatic description of the possibilities in changing the mode and style is given below:

\[
\text{dialogue} \xrightarrow{\text{——}} \text{letter} \xrightarrow{\text{——}} \text{description} \xrightarrow{\text{——}} \text{imaginative story} \xrightarrow{\text{——}} \text{poem} \xrightarrow{\text{——}} \text{play} \xrightarrow{\text{——}} \text{description}
\]

Apart from these inter-related areas which initiate the students to ‘compose’ varied texts, there is yet another area where the students, can exploit their critical and creative thinking to the fullest extent i.e. Extension of the text. In the process of ‘composing’, the ‘text’ (the prescribed lesson) becomes a triggering-off point to activate originality and creativity in the students and thereby offering an unlimited scope. That is to say, it is a pretext to activate the ‘pre-text’ (creativity based on world knowledge).
In fact, an imaginative teacher does not need a written (printed) text-book as a pretext. Using a punctuation mark or a physical gesture one can develop oral composition to be followed by a written composition.

All these involve

1. freedom of expression to the learner and
2. patience on the part of the teacher to guide and evaluate the process.

The amount of freedom given to the learners would enable them to overcome the ‘fear’ of the teacher and the ‘tyranny’ of the text (that is, the slavery to a prescribed textbook). Freedom in expression also helps the learners to demonstrate their executive potential in their unique ways and consequently heterogeneity becomes the hallmark of ‘composing’. Meanings would expand with constantly modifiable projections produced by inter-textual and intra-textual relationships.

The teachers must act as co-explorers in the search for ‘meanings’ and that would make the whole process challenging and adventurous. Patience and tolerance must be the watchwords for the teachers when guiding and evaluating the learning process. The term ‘evaluate’ brings in the question “how to evaluate” and the subsequent question “how to evaluate without standardization?”. The very term standardization goes against individual freedom. Standardization (in teaching, writing and evaluating) has been the main cause for all the evils found in the present system of language learning. Standardization produces bazaar notes and ‘notes’ in turn leads to imitation, memorization and reproduction. Hence in this context, in the interests of the learners, ‘evaluate’ should come to mean ‘encourage and co-explore’; that would help the students to come up with multiple texts which in turn would allow them to pursue their reading and writing on their own. Standardization-oriented teaching/learning has obviously ignored the fact that language is a living science.

The academic world too often complains that the system is too rigid to include
these newer perspectives. What cannot be done within the system may be attempted from outside. The dichotomy of centre/periphery forms the basis of such an attempt; that is to say, if one operates from the periphery (or margin), the periphery would become the centre one day; that is to say, if the learners are made to realise the value of individual freedom, critical thinking and expression of intimate emotions, outside the class-room, in their day-to-day life, then that realization (margin) would make them 'producers' of original texts inside the class-room (centre). Friere (1977:29) succinctly summarizes this situation:

If learning to read and write is to constitute an act of knowing, the learners must assume from the beginning the role of creative subjects. It is not a matter of memorizing and repeating given syllabuses, words and phrases, but rather of reflecting critically on the process of writing and writing itself, and on the profound significance of language... (emphasis added).

Any attempt to decompose this 'composition' (that is, this thesis) is in conformity with the basic philosophical tenet of this thesis, to 'compose is to decompose'. In other words, by modifying or questioning this thesis, one is confirming the hypothesis of this thesis, because there can be neither 'permanence' nor 'definiteness' about any discourse or point of view.