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CHAPTER ONE

Product: not Process

Many of the assumptions, theories and goals of teaching student-writers how to develop their writing abilities find their origins in past centuries. Obviously, a brief overview of the history of Linguistic Science provides a credible base for understanding contributions of the past as well as the misconceptions about language, developed in earlier times and continuing among non-linguists until today. Much of the techniques used in the modern study of language dates back to ancient Greece when philosophers and literary critics resorted to, devising them to be enacted, whereby eventually explaining themselves and the intensive studies conducted by them (Falk:1978).

Firm awareness is strongly held that the bold new starts of second language teaching can be traced back to 40’s during which the historical sketch of writing L₁, composition can be innately found embedded. Apparently, a historical survey of ESL can be treated as a succession of approaches or orientations to L₂ writing, a cycle in which particular approaches achieve dominance and then fade out but never really disappear (Silva,1990:1). Depending on the belief which says, it is necessary to relate language teaching (writing as a skill, too) to an established
scientific discipline (Prator, 1979:6) a historical perspective of Linguistics as a tradition should be patiently examined and reviewed. Accordingly a preview for exposing the interdependencies existing between language studies, traditional and contemporary and other related education subdisciplines can be explicitly inferred. Research in Linguistics and psychology facilitated describing and analyzing the nature of language in general and specific languages in particular. These two salient disciplines are strongly considered in recent years as the cornerstones on the basis of which methods of language teaching concurrently the teaching of writing as a complex skill are interpreted (Prator, 1979:7). Admittedly “writing evolved as a result of cultural changes creating communicative needs which cannot readily be met by the spoken language” (Halliday, 1985 cited in Nunan 1991) accordingly the emergence of cultures based on agriculture rather than on hunting developed a need for permanent records which can be referred to over and over again (Nunan: 1991). Consequently, such an unnoticed, involuntary start led to a considerable amount of written products the creation of which stealthily abide to the very predisposed natural processes of writing (which to be discussed in details in Part IV), and thoughts into comprehensible functional communicative symbols (Nunan, 1991). Naturally after the invention of writing and when it was realized to function not only as a means of “writing down” mere notations or copying by means of graphic forms something
already written, but a more complicated assignment shouldered by the craft of writing according to which meaningful segments of language of what have been read, heard or thoughtfully constructed is implicitly or explicitly projected (Rivers:1981:294). No doubt writing comprehensibly did break out when some type of thoughtful people resorted to such an invention to precisely document their experiences. Language teaching methods because of which throughout recent history all language skills dependently and unanimously underwent fluctuations have vividly reflected recognition of changes in the kind of proficiency learners need, accompanied by modifications in theories of the nature of language learning (Richards and Rogers, 1986:1).

Just ahead of pondering willingly or reluctantly in the deep roots and the latest versions of model-based product oriented approach to writing, writing as a draft need to be practically defined. It is, in fact, considered as a means of rendering. Quite astonishingly, when man first, due to circumstances and developing need pressures got involved experiencing expressive writing, he did it in the absence of "prescriptive models of preliminary outlining" (Zamel,1983). But, as an historical novice writer, he found himself happily prewired to instinctively follow the unpredicted processes of writing. The archetype process model referred to above is absolutely the first-hand genuine process version of which the modern example recently specified and
accomplished by the scholars as researchers, and students as subjects dramatically investigating writers' conscious and unconscious behaviours is a true duplicate. Quite expectedly, writers whether under the spell of models or self-thought automated inmformally and unitentionally underwent those unclaimed processes in creating their supposedly finished written products. It can be insistingly claimed here that no writer whether successful or unsuccessful, whether experienced or inexperienced can be found ignoring those constitutive, jumbled, scrambled, unorderly driven process phases although they might have been provided with some prespecified masterly models to be exquisitely imitated.

In sum here is a viewpoint which can be directly forwarded to confidently claim that writers involutarily follow the unorderly, unending, whirling, retrospective, interwoven process cycles of writing but a rich didactic resource as such though passively harnessed by all writers without exception, seriously suffers from the absence of guiding, illuminating and propagating instructive canons. Such a recognition is one of the major research aspects that this study committedly investigates. Ironically, a remarkable school of enthusiastic professional scholars innocently or obstinately disregarded exploring the potentialities trapped in the practitioners' writing behaviours, to develop the appropriate methodology required to generatively enable more student-writers in accomplishing their objectives. Quite contrary while invariably and
incessantly involved in the craft, they developed a technique aiming honestly to revolutionize the art, but severed detaching the learners from their true nature, checked their fluent-involvement in the natural easy flowing unpredicted processes of writing. The technique was supposed to be a scholastic initiative gesture proposing the simulation of unprecedented models. To constructively assist the student writers, they were advised to follow a linear route and gradually master the skill of writing, making the most of those physical resources say mainly models of masters' writings made available with them to meet the demands of the situations. Those seemingly hopeful resources are nothing but those supposedly perfect models which every student enthusiastically aspires to capture, were arduously selected and preserved to serve as appropriate raw material to realize and implement the modelling procedure. Though doubtful, hopefully expected novice writers by starting inquisitively those flawless specimens can be defrustrated in their responsible hard attempts in acquiring the precalculated level surely advanced educated craftsmanship they have been longing for or dreaming of to be readily granted to them.

Also, precedent to tackling the historical detailings and particulars, bits and fractions of the modelling drive tendency in writing, a definition worthy to be mentioned, worked out by Brookes and Grandy (1990:22) according to which the term jargon modelling product can be made edibly meaningful is essentially
required. To accommodate such an intent, Brookes and Grundy meet the ends when they mention that “a product is the end result of our labours and has about it an air of finality and completeness”. They went on asserting that “The product of another person when it serves as an example for the writer is; of course, referred to as model”, though finding it difficult to tell when a piece of writing has become an unchangeable, final product. The parallel writing model (White, 1988:5) product-modelling writing mechanism can be psychologically investigated to approach findings indicating how models are practically treated as rich learning resources.

Such an approach abides to observational learning which is usually stimulated with a modelled event perhaps a real-life model doing something, a verbal or a symbolic model or a combination of both. Four processes can be plainly inferred and observed intervening between the presentation of the model and the appearance of the modelled behaviour in the case of process writing or finished product in model based product oriented type of writing. First, the observer must pay attention, second the observer must represent the observed behaviour finished product cognitively store it, and perhaps rehearse it, third, if the observer has the required capabilities, he/she reproduces and refines the observed behaviour or finished product; and fourth, given appropriate motivational conditions, the anticipated reinforcement, the observer performs the learned behaviour.
Almost parallel to Brookes and Grundy (1990) White (1988:6) sees the focus right from start on the product, which is, of course someone else's writing “typically requiring detailed analytical work” bringing about “advance diagnosis of writing problems”. Thus promoting learning mimicking rather than writing inititively and uncritically by emphasizing accuracy rather than fluency.

Whereas Pica (1986:6) introduces a “models approach” with the aim of exposing the writing approaches teachers adopt in capacitating student writers to invigorate and flourish their writing abilities, thus pushing them forward. Pica’s “models approach” informs teachers about the possibility of providing within the students' reach collection of accurate, error-free “written sentences, paragraphs and essays of capable writers” as exemplars worthy to be accurately replicated in order to ultimately produce a duplicate parallel text using their own information (White, 1988:6).

Nunan (1991:86-8) did his best describing a writing class devoted to “sentence formation and grammar exercises” so as to comply with the belief that students, in the first instance, master language at the level of sentences to count on them to be capable of writing “coherent paragraph”. To help his readers realize what he means, Nunan (1991) refers to learners “engaged in imitating copying and transforming models of correct language”. He
manifests modelling as a "text-level written equivalent of the practice of providing learners with formulaic oral language at an early stage of development". In short such an academic stance pioneered in teaching writing by model observation can be interpreted as "learning by imitating appropriate written sentences which can be cohesively and coherently repeated to produce the ultimate goal, a unified paragraph", what Zamel (1987) considers to be the product of "classes which are still based on mechanistic product oriented exercises and drills".

On the whole, the product oriented approaches focussed on the produced - the written text - and often asked such questions as "what does the writer write?". The belief was that if model texts written by competent writers were identified they were exposed to students-writers worthy enough to be read and they would by osmosis, imbibe all the qualities of good writing and become good writers themselves. Unfortunately almost all student-writers could not practically benefit from this approach and they continued to write unsuccessfully as they had been used to do before hand.

In general as spotted in Atkinson and Ramanathan (1995: 552) the model based product oriented approach is elaborated as a traditional mode of writing instruction where a student is presented to a text that serves as a model to be imitated, something that is done deductively and seems to be only following a pattern - a kind of fill-in-the-slot pattern depending strictly on a pre-fabricated rhetorical structure.
But Raimes (1983) introduces a paragraph pattern approach along which student-writers are provided with the opportunity of copying paragraphs, analyzing the form of model paragraphs and imitating model-passages. While the student-writer aims at mastering the writing skill through model imitation, they will be as well invited to unscramble the scrambled sentences into a coherent cohesive paragraph. They may be involved in distinguishing general and specific sentences or possibly, they may bring some modifications to the paragraph by adding or deleting some sentences. Most usually the student-writers spend adequate amount of time evolving the most appropriate topic to cap or sometimes though rarely, even to bottom up the paragraph with. As a whole, such tendency indicates that in different cultures student-writers manipulate various possibilities in building and ordering their communicative intentions to be mutually comprehensively received and entertained. In responding to modelling requirements student-writers are required to see, analyze and practice the particular features of a piece of writing despite their appropriacy in organizing their ideas, the best of everything in L, writing.

Although Pica (1986:9) chooses specimens of imperfect models of student-writers, rather than zooming the error-free samples of native speaker in her interactional approach to writing instruction, some other scholars unanimously in consensus embarked on researching dextrously modelling or "prose
modelling" (Stolarek: 1994) considering imitation of successful writers as a valid, practical and reliable means of helping student-writers evolve better writing capacities in $L_1$ or $L_2$ (Watson, 1982: 5).

Similarly, some other scholars argued too, in favour of abiding to imitating superior models (Stolarek, 1994: 154). She refers to such an advocacy as "a valid pedagogical method" with the utilization of which "the defining characteristics of a model text" that is "a text which is seen as being exemplary of its kind" are determined. Certainly, of course, complying with such an instructional policy and tutorial guidance, methodical techniques can be devised to facilitate transferring and documenting the features explored and specified in the mother-model version to meet some specific objectives in the product supposed to be created in reference to a previously created, finished product.

When in 1970's an interest in passages of connected discourse emerged to dominate the writing-task arena, the subservient role of written language was profoundly challenged and rejected. (Raimes, 1991: 408). Consequently, sentence drills—fills, institutions, transformations, completions as well were violently reacted to and were eventually ignored as topics comprising the language teaching curriculum. This expectedly happened to trainings in writing stressed the application of grammatical rules and the manipulation of given sentences (Raimes, 1991).
Kaplans' (1987:4) "doodles article" displays the linearity of English language developmental attitude in adopting paragraphic pattern if compared to the unit found in other languages and cultures. As such a pedagogy embracing "compensatory exercises" were introduced to make up for the traditional ones. They were specifically designed to have student-writers trained in "recognizing and using topic sentences, examples and illustrations". The proposed exercises were intentionally devised to facilitate imitating paragraphs or essays creating a piece of writing through a previously well developed outline, providing slotted or clipped paragraphs to be completed specifying the structural details of the paragraph into topics, major or minor supports as well as wrapping up curtain lines beside reordering the jumbled paragraphs into unscrambled ones enjoying the privilege of providing unity and coherence as rhetorical properties. On the whole, such a pedagogy which requires elaborate preliminary outlining provides models to analyze and imitate, and insists on teaching writing systematically and prescriptively (Zamel, 1983).

The product centered traditional paradigm (Connor, 1987) is recognized to be stressing expository writing and giving momentum to stylistics. Having considered writing to be linear, she maintains that the writing process is determined by writers before they start to write.
To support Connor, Reid (1984a) in comparing her writing habits with her husband's, nominates herself rather than being a brainstormer "a radical outliner" who is addicted to counting steps of forcing ideas into an outline. She keeps up to Connor's (1987) product specification whereby she asserts mentioning her approach to writing to be distinguished "as radically linear", for she actually undergoes a very long "backburning" period during which she keeps busy thinking writing nothing but making notes with clear indentation and trees displaying proportional harmony and balanced organization rather than reflecting potential concern. She adds, once having come up with a preliminary outline, most irrelevant material will be clipped and detected, and by then she will be provided with the golden opportunity of "constructing meaning" rather than "discovering" it! She concludes expounding on her writing habits to include "a short revision process" to experience, another incubation period mainly devoted to "editing concerns".

Once a writer is labelled as a committed outliner; writing to comply with preconceived thoughts is arranged in trimmed cannons, she can no longer adjust herself to the newly emerged invention strategies: freewriting, stream of consciousness brainstorming. Such dry-bone mechanistic commitment deprives the student-writers from exercising utmost desired flexibility benefiting their innate rights in modifying and developing ideas.
and perspectives. (Sommer 1980). Outlining as a prescriptive policy due to the restriction and stiffness it lays on minds and pens of student-writers spoils the generative inventiveness and devours the creativity reserve ready to be harnessed to enhance productivity. Quite readily it can be inferred that a product oriented technique as such leads to a lot of counter productive outcomes. It directly offers deteriorating the individual writing strategies; specifically, student-writers productivity in generating ideas and arranging material. Unlike successful writers such unskilled students do not cherish the required awareness about their writing strategies. Such strategies may vary due to the constraints of the task-assignment, audience, and availability of material.

Looking closely into the case, White (1988) distinguishes the tradition of language teaching which undoubtedly, of course, teaching writing is not excluded as to be preoccupied with predictables, assessing education to be infected with predicted outcomes rather than "expecting the unexpected" (Murray: 1989). The traditional appraisal of teaching writing can reflect and disclose the aforementioned stance view. Writing was seen to be language focused, assigned "a subservient role" and accounted inferior compared to the spoken language. Correctness was emphasized to reinforce language which has been already dealt within spoken form. Student-writers were trained model adherents copying both of language and text. The teacher and the text book
were the sources of language from which the models were derived to meet the student-writers' prescribed outlined demands.

When controlled composition was found unsatisfactory, current traditional rhetoric was nominated as the qualified candidate to fill out the emergent gap between controlled and free writing (Silva, 1990:13, Raimes, 1991:409). Current traditional rhetoric is considered a recent development honed from the amalgamation of the basic principles of current traditional paradigm from native speaker composition instruction with Kaplan's theory of contrastive rhetoric. Kaplan (1967:5) defines the term rhetorics as "the method of organizing syntactic units into larger patterns, suggesting that ESL writers" employ a rhetoric and a sequence of thought which violates the expectation of the native reader" (Kaplan 1966:4). Richard Young (1978) calls the traditional mentioned above as current traditional too. He argues that, its practitioner's emphasis and pedagogic techniques were all determined by certain tacit but shared assumptions concerning the nature of the composing process. Chief among these was the romantic conviction that the creative aspects of the process are mysterious, inscrutable and hence unteachable; what can be taught and discussed are the lesser matters of style, organization and usage.

Kaplan (1967) introduces two varieties of classroom procedures associated with such a view. First, he attracts the
student-writers' attention to form according to which they are asked to "choose among alternative sentences within the context and a given paragraph, a longer discourse". But the other choice involves student-writers' in reading and analyzing a model and then accordingly applying the structural knowledge gained to a parallel piece of original writing. In addition student-writers may be stimulated to practice complex tasks as listing and grouping relevant facts, deriving topics and supporting sentences from these facts; hence, designing an outline to be turned into a composition. Current traditional rhetoric views writing, in the sense, as that of arranging, or fitting sentences and paragraphs into "prescribed patterns". As a point of fact, student-writers in learning to write acquire a kind of skill which helps them to proficiently identify, internalize and execute the patterns in question. "The writer fills in a preexisting form with provided or self-generated content" (Silva, 1990:14).

Currently, model-based form oriented approach to writing is multifarious in interpretation and manifestation, consequently; it varies enormously in evoking plethora of realizations in scholars and practitioners.

Obviously, model, in general can be roughly categorized into tightly controlled and completely free; from that requires little actual writing and no composition as in close type and blank filling exercise, to a kind of an assignment in case of responding to
which, students are required to write on a chosen topic an extended assay. In meeting such need the focus is on structural aspects on the model-rhetorical organization or its communicative function (Watson, 1982).

The models also can be classified as these sorted out on authentic terms or some developed to fulfil a special objective in writing by means of which student-writers attend to their specified purposes. To help student-writers produce a fully creative, imaginative, written product, which can be instrumentally actualized when they virtually enjoy having a high standard of capacity in writing thus; authentic models are said to be relevant tools leading to sophisticated type of writing. But since student-writers at different academic stages possess unequal level of skill besides their individual contrasts, it is advisable to give them the chance of exposure to specifically developed written models to meet their expectation though abiding to such a proposal which may be accompanied with artificiality and false reassurance in gearing to qualified devised models. In doing so, student-writers are not overburdened beyond their estimated capacities. Moreover, implementing modelling as a technique in teaching writing can be put forth in the craft as a facilitative experience, rather than as a frustrating debilitating one.

White (1988) goes further beyond that exploiting the model rubric to have two model oriented approaches delineated. The first version is language focused, whereas the second one has been
given a rhetorical label. The latter won the term rhetorical due to crucial stress on "the organization of rhetorical patterns and the cohesive ties accompanied with a series of exercises, assigning the students with adding connectors or combining the existing sentences". However in both routs similar model procedures are adopted to meet committedly the predetermined predictable objectives. The overall governing procedure to be monitored conforms to such linear stage process:

**Study the model, Manipulate elements,**

**Produce a parallel text.**

If the instruction given is responded to, then by fulfilling the predestinated requirements, the details can be felt to have been oriented with these activities. The text in access will be analyzed and studied industriously for features of form, content and organization. Linguistic and rhetorical patterns will be utilized as input to provide the instrumental motivation most essential for student-writers to undergo a parallel task which expectedly by manipulating thin knowledge should enable writing the expected desired product.

The treatment of modelling cannot be exclusively sighted as a single technique: dictating to initiate a better product, but it can be found as multiply diverse in the area of teaching writing. Flower and Hayes (1981) instead of alluding to a product model
introduced a stage process model "which can be taken as a bridge/link in a more revolutionary methodology to approach the craft of training student-writers if compared to rhetorical applications. Their stage process model is in sharp marked contrast with writing as a set of distinctive thinking process writers usually "organize or orchestrate during the act of writing". They define them as linear series of stages, separated in time, and characterized by gradual development of the written product. Accordingly Flower and Hayes (1981) adopt the technique of modelling for quite a different purpose. The best examples stage models which can be exemplified are Gordon Rohman's (1965). The prewrite/write/Rewrite model and James Brittons' et al (1975), the Conception/Incubation/Production/model.

Although the prewriting stage helped in proving the teaching of composition by calling attention to planning and discovery as legitimate parts of the writing, it could not recognize those basic thinking processes which unit planning and revision. Actually the sharp distinctions stage models make between the operation of planning, writing and revising may seriously distort how these activities work. Because the stage models take the final product as their reference point, they offer inadequate account of the more intimate, moment by moment intellectual process of composing. In a stage model, the major units of analysis are stages of completion which reflect the growth of a written product. They are organized in a linear sequence or structure.
As it has been mentioned before modelling can be found somehow glued in someway to the scholastic tradition of ancient Greece. Sophists, in the 5th Century B.C., since they were teachers of rhetoric, the art of public debate, carefully and diligently studied the speeches of the masters and counted the various elements in such speeches. They, then advised their students to use the same number of sentences, words and syllables in their own language, modelling their utterances on those of the masters. The meaning of a speech was of little interest to rhetoricians, they were interested in the linguistic form. They recommended prescribing the use of rounded sentences, in which phrases and clauses of successive sentences are of equal length, right down to the last syllable. In fact Sophists tried to subject everything to measurement; Music, Geometry, Astronomy and even Language (Dineen, 1967:73) "They did not merely theorize about what constituted a successful rhetorical composition but observed men in action who were acknowledged masters of the art". They analyzed the speeches of the masters in terms of a certain number of units and then instructed their students to construct speeches of similar units in similar arrangements. Besides, Sophists were radically empirical, to the extent that Euripides asks Plato's servant to bring scales, rulers and circles so that he can render an objective, and not just an emotional evaluation. Modelling, therefore, due to empirical tendencies created reaction similar to that of "humanistic distaste in modern times for the empirical tendencies of linguistics" (Dineen, 1967:74).
The model-based tradition of composition goes back a long way. For centuries boys learned to write Latin by imitating the flowing style of Cicero or the tense within epigrams of Seneca. In turn, English writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries tried to reproduce in their vernacular the style used in school both in Britain and the U.S.A. induced the works of those very celebrated writers and their more confident successors. People felt that they now know who the best writers were in English too and that there was no sure guide to good writing other than careful study and imitation of their products. Thus refinement of the notion of imitation, continues yet in many composition texts intended for American College students and is particularly strong in second and foreign language teaching.
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