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Writing is a complex process and it is a privilege which is acquired in later stages of the process of learning. People are rarely found to write extemporaneously or in response to prompts for some pair of eyes, selected to recreate language into meaning out of what have been created by a creator. Not only laymen but even scholars find it troublesome to explicate the writing behaviours undergone by those who help themselves create texts. In other words, striving to explore how a text is created is quite an intricate kind of job not every one involved can be found apt to handle. Though meeting such an expectation is seemingly impossible to be monitored and realized by the interactants themselves a set of plausible practical research techniques have been laboriously developed and approached to let such a workable speculative expectation be rendered into concrete accomplishment.

Writing is commonly seen as a three stage process: prewriting, writing, and rewriting. In the past teachers concentrated on the end of second stage i.e. after the writing had been done. They did not see how they could intervene at the prewriting and writing stages. Rewriting conducted no crucial role but as a stage of correcting the mistakes. But it is important now to consider all three stages as part of the writing process. Now
student writers master the process by participating in it rather than contending themselves with analyzing and criticizing the product. In other words, they are engaged in composition, rather than in composing without knowing about how the text was created.

Writing is a process which always extends itself in various ways and it requires preparation, drafting and revising and student-writers' involvement in writing makes them more aware of the process of writing and thereby improves the effectiveness of their writing. It is like painting or sculpting, or composing music; all evolve from a complex of decisions that must mesh together and contribute harmoniously to an outcome that one may or may not have foreseen at the start.

A clan of researchers resorted to direct observation of hand-written products but the technique employed was not found to be a successful experience since it discloses information not sufficient to unveil the underlying dynamic mechanism unconsciously experienced by student-writers. In fact this trail of commitment can not predict the disorderly sequence according to which revision as a process of creating and criticizing actually occurs. Moreover, direct observation of students whole heartedly engaged in writing can not explicitly reveal the silent invisible mechanism taking place within the innermost core of a writer. Introspective
reports although informative are not empirically accounted for since concomitant activities deter and spoil the natural, uninhibited, fluent stream of the writing process.

Writing is a discovery process. It involves discovering ideas, discovering how to organize them, and discovering what it is that one wants to put over to his/her reader. So a lot of what a writer does, doesn't actually appear on page. Hopefully by following a meditative study of the details of writing process to develop some of the things which go inside the writers' head may be crystalized in view because writing, most crucially, is a thinking process. Writing is a choice. The thinking a writer does about such elements: purpose, audience, experience, the self, the code together with the decision one makes about each of them shapes and controls writing.

Successful student-writers are mostly reported to be unaware of what they are seriously preoccupied with when they affectively and cognitively undertake writing real texts for real purposes, for real audiences in real contexts. In tandem with research on writers and writing, three versions of the process of writing are claimed to be observed and specified on reluctant patient inquiry (Graves 1975). First, a planning stage during which thoughts get organized into grammatical or lexical outline which is expected to engender, or to precede writing and drafting
behaviours. Inevitable involvement in an activity as such informs that our students-writers are reader minded aiming at gearing the texts to what readers anticipate; say, working out a sense of meaning to be conveyed to their listening eyes; to let what has been evolved by the creator to be realized and to be digested by the recreator.

Secondly, student-writers are voluntarily attending to linguistic and social conventions influencing their use of written language. They try their best to make their hand-writing as legible as possible, so as to comply with the limitations imposed by a single system. In the mean time, they avoid violating the regular conventions of graphic expressions; for example, writing in the expected direction or conforming themselves to spelling and punctuation restrictions.

Thirdly, a specific medium such as that of hand-writing, typing or word processing is exploited to express in concert with motor abilities the meaning constructed or created to some potentially awaiting audiences.

This triological dimensions of writing requirement can hardly render the whole task of writing its full legitimate right. The complexity of writing (Zamel 1982, 1983, 1985, 1987, Raimes, 1983, 1985, 1991) if reduced into such simply worked out facets
will be prematurely kept hidden from productive awarensses of writing. Writing, the unexpected text in fact, maturely evolves in the shuttling forth and back; in the recursion of rewriting as writing. Needless to say, a lot of finished written products are the inevitable outcomes of the act of incessantly kept on repeated the retrospective, non linear, cyclical, spiral, convoluted, inter embedded rewriting as writing. No product can be turned out finished without taking into account the act of untimed, unpredicted, unrehearsed, non detachable revision processes. Omnipresent revision simultaneously and concurrently co exists every minute of every stage or sub stage of the process of writing: prewriting, planning, rehearsing, writing, drafting, and post writing to the very last second of provisional finished product i.e. the eternal unfinished product. Self correction, treatment of errors as well as attending to feedback, affectively or cognitively, analytically or reflectively are indispensable extensions that writing process diachronically and synchronically incorporates within its messy schematic process.

A model of written composition must also allow for the fact that what people see when they write may affect the way they think. Meaning does not always exist prior to writing; often process works in reverse to create meaning to be recreated. Student-writers can deliberately know what they in effect know when they are drifted by the non-defensive process of writing. A scholastic
lesson one can evidently learn from such climactic remark is that the process of writing is not that matter of simple mechanical gesture of jotting down speech on page, or just an act of copying the spoken language, but it is an exploration in the use of graphic potentials of a language; a creative cycle; surely an enduring act of discovery; its an epiphany occurring in a moment governed by truth and reality; its a habitualization or an adaptation to the obligations exercised by the omnipresent nature.

Generally speaking, writing research can also be viewed to have been categorically directed by four distinct but mutually and practically interacting strands which can be represented, if simply considered, by the disciplines of Education, Psychology, Linguistics and Rhetorics.

The first of these strands involves the study of the literacy development, particularly at early stages. Those whose area of interest is researching in education within the domain of Sociolinguistics and Educational Psychology are highly interested in the development of literacy skills from early years. Educationists but mostly educational psychologists are primarily concerned with the socio-educational contexts of learning to write as well as in the stages that learners go through while they are busily engaged in developing their writing abilities. Besides, sociolinguists are capitalizing on the influences of oral interactive
processes and home environmental differences influencing the writing of texts.

In particular, researchers in this domain have come to know that exposure to literacy events and student's attitude towards school literacy are two significant conditional requirements so as to cause literacy development substantially occur. (Heath 1983 : 252).

The second strand embraces the question of how texts are constructed and organized to allow relevant interpretation by expectant readers. Sentences are systematically aggregated to form texts. Since they are not haphazardly or randomly assembled, they demonstrate interdependent dependency within its internal structure. Textual analysis specifies the linguistic features acting to cohere the sentence sequences according to which a text will be found interpretable depending on some other feature found in the text. A text in essence if narrowly detected by analysis, some cohesive ties under the title of conjunctive relation, substitution, ellipsis or lexical relationship can be found in terms of which sentence sequences can be described as hanging logically together. Having coherence and cohesion provided in a text the concepts and relationships expressed will be distinguished as relevant to each other; thus seemingly the meaning underlying the text will perhaps find its most possible functional-notional
communicative interpretation. Though some texts may boast cohesive ties, they may be identified to be incommunicative in the absence of logical coherence.

The study of the rhetorical contexts of writing falls within the domain of the third strand of writing on which research activities embarked on. Researchers from the field of Rhetorics, English Composition, Applied Linguistics, and Literary Criticism inspect variation in manipulating the skill of writing as functional realizations of writing purpose, topic, genre and audience. The study of writing from this perspective traces its history back to the Aristotle's pentad: invention, argument, style memory and delivery (Corbet 1965, Kinneavy 1971).

The fourth strand in which due to our research inclination we are startlingly involved is the one which highlights on the study of composing processes. Research in Cognitive Psychology, Educational Psychology and English Composition can be typically manifested in focussing its interest in modelling and explaining the mental processes inevitably undergone by student-writers in the act of real writing. Much of this by means of techniques as 'think aloud protocol analysis', 'revising tasks', 'task intervention' and 'treatment studies' are empirically explored and investigated (Bereiter and Scardamalia 1987). Evidently such research predicament in research which comprises a scientific finding
informs that writers in general are unceasingly shifting their processing act of writing among prewriting, writing and revising tasks. Writers retrogressively progress and regress in time of letting texts germinate to come up with unforetold story. Research, in addition, asserts that writing involves the complex combination of content, information, rhetorical demands and reader interpretation. Skilled student-writers are identified to make use of processing behaviours in ways quite diverse from those employed by poor writers.

English composition researchers, applied linguists, educators as well as sociolinguists are enthusiastically inclined to the applications of literacy and achievements acquired within, in researching second language writing contexts. Admittedly, research in educational context, sociolinguistic research on literacy applications and studies in contrastive rhetoric have drastically contributed to the transparent understanding of the unique features of writing in second language contexts.

Writing is one of the significant forms of self actualization. Every writer inherently and unintentionally tries to find his or herself. Admittedly, it is only when one develops a sense of self, he/she can communicate with his/her audience. Student-writers' intrinsic potential for actualization is great and it can not be predicted in quantity and quality if this potential is used.
People, when they behave as fully functioning writers, they are in fact struggling to be and become and the community of writers should maintain flexibility and avoid censoring different attempts to achieve growth and development.

The present study addresses itself to the multifarious dimensions of the skill of writing and evolves an eclectic model on the basis of the current researches and the knowledge available in the field.
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