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CHAPTER ONE
Product to Process

There should be some kind of convincing justification for any type of resolution, judgement, adoption, starts and shifts which may at times occur in unforeseen due course in anyone's individualistic or collective experience. Whirling winds and shifting sands are unavoidable; they take place at least once in everyone's life despite our committed tolerance and enduring resistance. Recently, no longer than a decade back, a major paradigm shift has been practically witnessed in the area of writing. Research and composition theory gave up to profound turnover. The emphasis has constructively got shifted from product to process. (Connor, 1987) (Zamel 1983) (Raimes 1991): from composition to composing.

The motives behind this turnover and takeover need to be spotted and identified. One veritable speculation says that it rests deep in the nature of an unproductive writing syllabus dominating the craft. Such a curriculum based on product-modelling standards can be held responsible for creating the calamity of propagating an unlearning theory; a theory unfulfilling community's expectations, disabling rather than enabling student-writers. Such a predicament is plainly referred to as an infertile, barren
pedagogy that prefers focusing on preliminary outlining, that provides models to be analytically reviewed and accurately imitated, and that violently stressed teaching writing systematically and prescriptively.

To everyone's surprise, it has been bitterly discussed that past blind insistence on production of writing samples is quite unfortunately seen as being nothing but merely blank exercises in prescribing linguistic forms and cramming rules of usage and does nothing to help student-writers learn to master the skill for some purpose (Freedman and Pringle, 1980).

Obviously, product or form (finished writing) oriented type of teaching or learning writing complies obediently with the authority of compulsive institutions to dictate thought and behaviour, for in the traditional writing, class composition is taught, for better or worse, as a form of regulated thought and behaviour, a matter of conformity to established standards for the use of language, as though drifted by ends determining the means. In other words, the preconceived form and purpose of a particular type of a sentence, paragraph or essay determines the organizational strategy and procedure a student-writer should keep track of so as to eventually lead to the production of a type of writing intentionally matching the simulated or transferred particulars of a chosen model.

In any case, there is almost exclusive concern with the qualities of finished writing, with little or no attention at all to the writing process or at least evaluation of work in progress.
Actually exclusive concern with the qualities of finished writing reinforces ignorance about the struggles writers heavily shoulder in the writing process as private, solitary endeavour. The radical opponents of traditional teaching methods do maintain that concerns with form and correctness impose unnecessary constraints upon written expression, especially in the early stages of the writing process. Hence, it can be firmly and boldly promulgated here that form and correctness are absolutely irrelevant if the writer has nothing of substance to proclaim: no genuine reason for writing, no genuine voice, no genuine audience, and therefore no reason to care whether the writing is clear, orderly and correct or not.

In classes dominated by modelled products, negative criticism, editorial marginalia, the frustration of dedicated teachers, besides the alienation of students can be visibly detected and noticed. The reasons behind such a chaos can be explicitly reviewed with dissatisfied scholars researching the task failure. White (1988) refers it to those models nominated for mimickry. They are found to be "too long and too remote from student (writers') own writing problems". Moreover, the traditional sequence of activities: Read-Analyze-Write, involves the questionable assumption that advance diagnosis of writing problems promotes learning. Such detailed analytical work encourages student-writers "to see form as a model into which content is somehow poured resulting mindless copies of a particular organizational plan or style".
Flower and Hayes (1977) showed their dissatisfaction with a procedure considering modelling as a problem-solving technique justifying themselves in adopting such a stance by asserting that "...we help our students analyze the product, but we leave the process of writing up to inspiration". Eschoiaz (1980) sees model based as to be "stultifying and inhibiting rather than empowering and liberating".

Chastain (1988:252) thinks the classical traditional approach in teaching writing created in students an unproductive and inappropriate orientation about composition due to reason stated below:

a) the feedback students received centered on incorrect forms.

b) students inclined to writing caring for grammar rather than the message they wished to convey, all writing was directed to teacher, and little interest or importance was attached to the content that was written (Atwell 1984).

c) teachers led students to believe that there exists a perfect model to emulate.

Pica (1986) blames the models approach to have overloaded the fact that student-writers in a second language are also language learners, and therefore skills for manipulating grammatical markers organizing paragraphs and combining sentences are not learned at
once, through imitating written models. Rather, these skills must be discovered slowly, through the learners’ active testing of hypothesis about how the rules and patterns in the new language function to communicate meaning. She thinks models approach, by insisting on accuracy, denies the learners’ access to error production as a strategy for testing hypothesis about rules and constructions. In fact it makes little sense to pinpoint errors on first papers since they undergo substantial changes once they have been responded to (Sommer 1982). “Furthermore a premature focus on correctness and usage gives student-writers the impression that language form, rather than how it functions, is what it is important and may discourage them from making further serious attempts to communicate (Zamel 1983). Thus student will be deprived of enjoying the chances of developing” capacity for making sense, for negotiating meaning for finding expression, for undergoing new experience (Widdowson, 1981:212).

In the classroom and through the evaluation of finished writing, then; the composition teacher is responsible for impressing forms, standards, and procedures upon the minds and the pens of student-writers who presumably have ideas and information at their disposal, but would otherwise present this ‘content’ in all sort of irrational, erroneous and distorted ways. Students consciously or unconsciously following such a procedure
in writing or better say conducted as such by teachers' feedback - often unhelpful or misleading because of its being incomprehensible, superimposed on product adequately matured and worked out to be handed over to be corrected and graded. The students are regretfully deprived of the benefit of being led by anyone through the process of generating ideas, organizing them into a coherent sequence and eventually putting them on paper. What has been scheduled for instruction in composition has been, in effect, evaluation of raw products (Donovan and McClelland, 1980). Ironically, in product-based approach to writing, attention is intensively focused on blaming and praising the writers.

At the foundation of such an Orthodox method, among all its possible varieties, all unanimously infer an almost exclusive concern with writing as a finished product, with the varieties of form, logic and purpose - alongwith standards of correctness-that these finished products should represent.

Concurrently, the finished product should be clear, concise, orderly, and correct; in utmost commitment to and in accordance with rules and standards of good English. Inevitably, on the basis of a set of formal expectations, the teacher evaluates and corrects a written product when it is announced finished. Student-writers, of course, should gradually master the forms, standards and procedures that govern the rational uses of language and make
the "content" of writing presentable, as the product of an educated mind.

There has been a lot of intensive precision (research - studies) the findings of which disapprove the presentation of models in the composition classrooms due to their failure in securing the amount of success expected to reap in teaching and learning the skill of writing. On the other hand, scholars rarely investigated its merits and privileges in student-writers' writing abilities. Honestly, it can be hardly denied that mere exposure to models, though superior in quality, to be replicated as masterly copied duplicates can ever foster the perfunctory writer (Britton, 1978:14) or better say the reactive writer. (Graves, 1975:236) to blow into the frozen, limpid skills of writing warmth of existence unleashing some type of competitive products surpassing others', if compared, heads and shoulders. Being realist, model based approach is not vigorous enough to make wonders and work miracles, if it is processed detached from other undetected unharnessed productive potentialities humanbeings are virtually predisposed with. Unluckily, a time commences when a mindless common adversity unjustifiably creeps into an aggressive position against a tradition of experience to ignorantly render it barely fruitless and harmful. In later 70s' and early 80s' modelling or prose modelling preferably in its traditonal sense imitating the superior models (Stolarek, 1994:154) was bitterly criticized for its
frustration in sophisticating student-writers' writing demonstrations. The unpronounced lengthy era during which model approach doctorinated the untrained teachers who were recklessly busy in their unchallenged classes training their unmotivated students, did not let out of themselves some scholastic research to meditatively germinate elaborating on their mini-approach, unreconciled scientific or non-scientific underlying rationale. Unexpectedly, the technique was dogmatically and unquestionably followed without having its validity and reliability empirically examined, got transferred through oral or visual medium to the long hopelessly awaiting curious contemporary generation. To everyone's surprise recently due to a paradigm shift, readily an exodus to process writing, to a promised land though defined to be a mere fad (Zemelman and Daniels, 1988) all of a sudden has broken out. Supported by a plethora of vogue research devices the newly emerged process theory of writing won fightless popularity in the absence of a coignate's least mild resistance. Posterior to such a radical departure, the professionals in charge showed up with a fuzzy reaction not backed by the hard-boiled model-sympathetic experts. Actually they would have given up to whatever kind of a change had to happen.
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The whole modelling tradition in writing did not witness but quite little research on the effectiveness of using prose model in the composition classroom. Surprisingly, the instructors themselves who enthusiastically made use of prose modelling in their classrooms did not even question its suspended value; its unexplored identity. Though mere imitation can not be reasonably advisable in conducting or granting a constructive academic atmosphere within an educational program, but by abiding to every one's judgement, its being invariably, round the years, past and present a salient component of teachibility as well as learnibility. Hairston (1982) though biased towards "winds of change" believes in not giving up providing students with "models of excellence to imitate".

Needless to say, whether intentionally or unintentionally, a considerable amount of learning and even teaching occurs through the device of imitation. Such experience may take place even in the absence of a tangible, concrete model or in the presence of an implied abstract one. It can also happen perceiving in absentia an imagined or potential substitute replica. Some due to its being inferior if compared to other alternatives may radically suggest its
unnegotiated elimination as a sterile educational tool (element). Some dissenting voices too may imagine to themselves learning without imitation, but that may happen incomplete, fragile, impaired lacking genuine durability, suffering from inconsistency.

But despite uncritical thinking a trend of rhetoricians and composition theorists orthodoxically adopt product-modelling as "valid pedagogical method" (Stolarek, 1994:154); besides, "the use of model passages, usually extracts or paragraphs, is widespread in ESL writing texts at all levels and largely unquestioned by ESL teachers. The simplistic notion that people learn to speak a language mainly by imitation has been absolutely abandoned, yet it is still assumed that the study and imitation of a model, a sample of writing that is by definition successful is a valid means of helping students to learn to write in their first or second language " (Watson, 1982:5) Models, then, are indispensable resources which if justifiably exploited can contribute in a large scale to the fluent teaching of composition.

Obviously, stimulating models should not be ignored in favour of other emerging yet not well defined, not well experimented devices. Krashen (1978) visualizes models to work as inputs students can use, take in, utilize and incorporate in their own work. Models can contribute significantly to student-writer's own participation in the writing process. In doing so, both resource and support, both stimulus and guidance required help linguistic,
rhetorical awareness besides reassurance and cultural experience get optimistically crystalized.

There does not exist more than a single possibility of taking models of writing into consideration. The manipulation of model resources varies with myriad of interpretations provided to define what the skill of writing can be. Writing may be envisaged as the transference of lexical items and oral patterns which may unsatisfactorily result in a collection of sentences rather than discoursal texts as its products. But if the provision created is unconvincing, product-modelling can be monitored to encourage genuine compositions. The brainy rationale behind the choice of specific type of models is known to be characteristically loaded to impart theme or topic. Student-writers can be actively engaged in specific-writing tasks, as performing analysis as well as doing or discussing exercises to be hopeful in producing an effectively written composition, that can be in some sense distinguished to be their own work of creativity and experience, though provided by model-stimulus input or intake. Hence, a thrill of relaxation is rewarded; particularly when models are scrutinized to develop awareness to be serving various uses, when principles according to which modelling choices are exercised as raising consciousness regarding the mechanism that led to their constructions.

No matter to what extent research on modelling in writing composition demoted the significant role it plays in developing
student-writers' writing abilities. Whether calculated to be unproductive or anti-creative, it cannot be overlooked due to the fact that it is a fateful lubricant moderating the tight, friction and pressure exercised by the assigned writing curriculum of whatsoever nature it may be: form based or content based, writer based or reader based, communicative or prescriptive and even product or process. Some patient reverie into the case lets the merits to be unveiled. Luckily such a procedure known as product modelling boasts of virtues, if frankly displayed most ignorant adversities it ruthlessly confronts may be neutralized or deconstructed. Models provided that student-writer's intelligently exposed to the "lexical items", "structural patterns" and "Conventions", can readily shift them beyond sentence-level. By interacting with the real sense of modes of rhetorical organization, stylistic variation, communicative purpose and audience awareness can be systematically met. Authentic models rather than the artificially manufactured ones provide the practitioner with the once-in-a-life chance opportunity of being intimately introduced to the minor details of a culture in which all the customs, values, assumptions and attitudes towards the world delicately matched in congruence with the native speakers' schemata can be honestly and sincerely well imagined and realized.

Student-writers are advised by product-modelling proponents to improve their styles through classical imitation exercises and
since models familiarize them with never-been-seen-before complicated structural conventions and patterns; hence their creativities will be enhanced. It is said that creative imitation, if deliberately activated boosts student-writers originality. Admittedly, when student-writers are provided with stylistic options they will be infact freed to concentrate on invention. Besides expressive and pragmatic knowledge, a third kind of knowledge of models is considered essentially required to experience writing within the context of a single culture.

In a survey on the use of prose modelling in the composition classroom recently administered (Stolarek, 1994:155), it has been reported "of the seventy instructors from four universities who responded, 76% stated that they use prose modelling on a regular basis in their classes with the largest number of respondents believing modelling was most effective in giving students stylistic models for their writing and in teaching rhetorical modes".

No celebrated writer or expert in writing ever imagined a writing course without somehow the intervention of models in case of looking forward to furthest glorious achievements. Donald Murray (1968) used models as problem-solving resources related only to student-writers' writing processes, where they will be provided with the chances of discovering their own writing problems. If those problems are discovered then, the most
relevant models which can generously offer fair solutions can be influentially utilized. Escholas (1980) by focusing on the composing process of the student-writers rather than on that of the writer introduces models as an intervention technique for individual students who are experiencing difficulties in their writing, thus granting them timely aids so that a better sense of purpose, form and direction without stifling creativity can be cherished.

Though models, when they are utilized in process are demoted to undertake a secondary role, they can be desirably treated as "resource rather than ideal" (Watson, 1982:13).

Student-writers on exploring the models with each other or with the teaching, on critically comparing their successive draft products with that of superior hardened stuffs; then, they will be involuntarily involved in the process by the drifting spell of the unfamiliar model. That's why theorists who concentrate on the process rather than the product of writing often assimilate modelling into their methods as well (Stolarek, 1994:55). Fortunately, process oriented writing research suggests that models can be found most useful when they are fully integrated into the sequence of activities within the writing lesson (Watson, 1982:13).

Raimes (1978) exemplifies an integrated approach to the business of writing. Models are there but not in their traditional
place at the beginning of the unit. Students first focus on communicative and the linguistic and rhetorical features needed to realize this. Exposure to the model is deliberately delayed. Only when they have already embarked on the process of their own composition-producing a rough draft by group effort or pair work are they invited to read the model, for the sake of comparison rather than imitation.

In her scholastic research Stolarek (1994) mainly investigated the diverse responses expert and novice writers show when they are assigned to write in an unfamiliar prose form according to some instructions given beforehand. Besides those instructions some models of unfamiliar prose forms were made available with them to be authentically reproduced. The findings indicate that: novice writers who are given a model of an unfamiliar form to imitate respond in a manner which is more introspective and evaluative and far more similar to the responses of expert writers than do novice writers who are not given a model". Such a model imitation to support the findings of course indicate that when a student writer is confronted with an unfamiliar prose form, a knowledge of a higher level or abstract schemata can be certainly a relief in interacting with the model provided to let a reproduced product be imaginably realized.

Product modelling, now-a-days is masked in modern intentions to serve some optimistic constructive skill raising
objectives. They have been shrouded to adopt a newly directed function to accomplish its classical purposes: enabling learners to write. It has been discovered that feedback to students' writings in its traditional sense suffer seriously from a set of shortcomings. Such type of feedbacks were found to be inefficient in fulfilling the objectives for which they were given. Feedback was nothing but error detection and correction which inevitably hampers students taking academic writing to accomplish the required autonomy. Such students essentially need to be enabled to "accept responsibility for editing, correcting and proof reading their own texts" (Allwright 1988:109). Accordingly a new method of feedback termed reformulation, has been suggested to meet the aforementioned targets, mainly by liberating the academic students. Thus bestowing upon them the favour of being autonomous, well capacititated to develop their own criteria for judging the quality of writing.

Allwright (1988:109) defines "Reformulation" as an "attempt by a native writer to understand what a non-native writer is trying to say and then to rewrite it in a form more natural to the native writer". Infact it is "intended to a sympathetic reader's interpretation in an acceptable English, of the original writer's text". Following such a procedure in providing feedback the non-native student will be provided with a superior version of writing if compared to his to raise his consciousness about linguistic and
nonlinguistic characteristics of a successful text produced by a linguistically dependable native speaker. Those reformulated texts will be detected as approximate perfect models to infer the underlying priorities to be consciously or unconsciously incorporated in the later writing experimentations done to produce a more appropriate kind of a text.

Presently, product modelling is willingly found disguised to function effectively in providing prewriting activities, as well. Some techniques are urgently required to monitor best such a kind of significant subprocess. To spark students getting started is almost a drudgery struggle difficult to be persuasively supervised. Hence, modelling is one of the efficient techniques which can be purposefully manipulated to have the unstimulated thoughts wriggled. The extensive varieties of models available to meet different levels of wants and to fulfil various kinds of expectations can be comprehensively as well as exclusively exploited to generate adequate amount of ideas required to guarantee the production of a satisfactory text. Models can be topically identified and classified to respond immediately and positively to whatsoever type of exigency in writing may emerge. Those models utilized in provoking thoughts can be challenged in content rather than in form or can be supported by extending them. They can be taken as ideological models of thinking to argue for or against.

Most of the teaching methods, whether traditional or innovative, classical or modern, regressive or progressive
potentially or practically, voluntarily or involuntarily integrate modelling as a crucial component in its technical corpus so that of course some of the academic objectives for which they were created can be effectively found in curricular spectrum furnished within it. In real life situations people do not say humans or things are this and that so much as humans or things are like this and that. Models like theories can not be judged in terms of their accuracy so much as in terms of their usefulness.

Suggestopedia, in its foundation as teaching methodology purports "to describe how attentiveness is manipulated to optimize learning and recall (Richards and Rodgers, 1985:143). Its theory of learning incorporates infantalization as a model that of parent to child (Richards and Rodgers, 1985:143) in terms of which the older students recycle the minutes characterizing children in their self-reliance, sense of immediacy and instant responsiveness. The learners' role is to behave as childlike as possible yielding all authority to the teacher and some times assuming the names of native speakers of the foreign language student thus become suggestable. This type of modelling is a metaphor of a successful experience in super teaching and super learning.

The natural approach which has been developed to conform to naturalistic principles noticed in successful second language acquisition grounded in its underlying experience. Modelling is
best manifested in the light of acquisition/learning hypothesis where by acquisition is "the natural way, paralleling first language development in children" (Richards and Rodgers, 1985:131). Depending on the natural order hypothesis research documented that certain grammatical structures and morphemes are acquired before others in the first language acquisition of English, and a similar natural order is found in second language learning.

Curran (1955) formulated the Community Language Learning methodology to suppress anxiety, hostility, and conflict as major deterring factors against the currency of language learning. Community Language Learning draws on the counselling metaphor to redefine and rehabilitate the role of teachers (the counsellor) and learners (the clients) in the language classroom. It capitalizes mainly on the counselling metaphor from which learning and teaching behaviour can be predicted or inferred.

Asher (1967) in advocating a total physical response theory in language teaching parallels successful second language learning with that of the process of child’s language acquisition. He concludes that adults can learn a second language most fluently and properly by recapitulating the process by which children acquire a vernacular. Asher's view of child language acquisition is merely a true duplication of what learning psychologist, Arthur Jensen's seven stage model: a stimulus-response model of language acquisition, in describing children's
verbal development. Asher considers the parallel which exists between first language acquisition and second language learning provides the naturalistic setting model most required in the process of acquiring a second language rather than learning it.

A model, like a pattern or a blueprint is a representation of the way things are or of the way they can be or should be. Models can be very specific and concrete and are often included in or, derived form theories. For example, the model of language acquisition, in describing children's verbal development.

Here it can be concluded that models i.e. products, the same as the processes, inherently exercise their effective role in the achievements human beings accomplish and bring to existence. Accordingly the ignorance of one or another i.e. product as model and process as behaviour is far from considering the mobility and productivity as two urgent requirements of contemporary age. Rationally, possibilities made available by research and experience and intuition should be constructively harnessed to boost and promote the teaching and learning processed in writing classrooms. This certainly secure myriads of favourable consequences which is surely interpreted and directed to the welfare of every one; every living being.

Model of atomic structures, models of universe, and teaching and learning model, can be given as explicit examples human being regularly abide by as well. Human beings in general have models
that govern their views of the world and that guide their perceptions and their behaviour. Two such models underlie much of what psychologists think and believe about human beings. On the one hand, the mechanistic model reflects the belief it is useful to view humans as being very much like machines predictable and highly responsive to environmental influences which the product-modelling student-writer can be referred to in this category. On the other hand, the organismic model held that it is more useful to view humans as dynamic, that are more responsive to internal forces than to external stimulation. Those who are process-sympathetic may be treated belonging to the second category. In fact, here it can be inferred that both process and product student-writers cannot ignore the role models play to monitor their reactive or reflective behaviour.

The term model may refer to an actual person whose behaviour serves as a stimulus for an observer's response. The manifestation of such a case can be well realized in observing closely a successful student-writer in the act of writing. The processes he/she undergoes to come up with that of unexpected product can be documented by adopting some appropriate research devices. Models more often can be referred to as symbolic. These include such things as oral or written instructions, pictures, mental images, cartoon or film characters, religious figures as well as content and characters in books and television. Such models are probably more prevalent than real-
life models for student-writers in a technological society. This does not deny that peers, siblings and parents may serve as models, or well behaved teachers and students may be held up as exemplary models.

A developmental view of how children learn socially acceptable behaviour can be well answered by the most common concept as imitation, the process of copying the behaviour of others; the same as we do with successful writers and the same as we try not to do according to unsuccessful ones. Actually the writing behaviour of the unsuccessful writers can be avoided or better can be translated into meritorious ones. Accordingly in process writing there exists a practice of copying a model, but it is not a finished product, it is a series of sustained supporting activities cumulatively enhancing though being quantity oriented the quality of the texts produced. Learning through imitation which can be simply referred to as observational learning, involves acquiring new responses or modifying old ones as a result of seeing a model do something. According to Bandura (1969:18) the process involved in imitation is “one of the fundamental means by which new modes of behaviour are acquired and existing patterns are modified ...”. It is largely through the processes of social learning and imitation that fads (i.e. process writing) and expressions sweep in an area of academic interest.

Bandura's (1981, 1986) position regarding learning can be scholastically detected as in terms of which the indispensable role
imitation and modelling play can be evidently well justified. Bandura believes that much human learning is a function of observing the behaviour of others or of such symbolic models as fictional characters in books or television programs. He asserts that it is probably correct to assume that we learn to imitate by being reinforced for doing so, and that continued reinforcement maintains imitative behaviour. Hence, some aspects of imitation, or observational learning, can be explained in terms of apparent conditioning; a learning theory which explains how children learn by being positively reinforced as in achieving their purpose by getting food or negatively reinforced as in when the outcome of their actions are unpleasant or not rewarding.

Moreover, animals like people, appear to be susceptible to the effect of imitation. Among many that support such contention are that of Herbert and Harsh (1944), who demonstrated that cats can learn remarkably rapidly after watching other cats perform learning tasks. Some animals appear to imitate humans, too. When monkeys and chimpanzees are reared in human families they typically adopt many human behaviour (Kellogg, 1968). Unsurprisingly, people also imitate animals. People can be squirrelly, can act like mules, occasionally go ape. They may be called pigs or turkeys and yet sometimes may behave like an untamed ass. Thus imitation, modelling and copying are not only a human-specific character but wholly it is of species instinctive nature which should not be advisably suppressed.


