

RHETORIC, COMPOSITION AND PREACHING: WHAT HOMILETIC PEDAGOGY
CAN LEARN ABOUT IMITATIONM FROM COMPOSITION PEDAGOGIES

by

CALVIN FREDERICK PEARSON

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

MAY 2012

Copyright © by CALVIN F. PEARSON 2012

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to acknowledge that this project would not have been completed without the direct empowerment of God through His Son, who assigned me this task and I trust will use it to glorify Him. The patient work of my supervisor, Kevin Porter and the two readers, Tim Richardson and Kevin Gusfatson provided valuable guidance throughout the process. And, my wife, Jan was a constant source of encouragement and help.

April 17, 2012

ABSTRACT

RHETORIC, COMPOSITION AND PREACHING: WHAT HOMILETIC PEDAGOGY CAN LEARN ABOUT IMITATION FROM COMPOSITION PEDAGOGIES

Calvin F. Pearson, PhD

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2012

Supervising Professor: Kevin Porter

Across the centuries there have been thousands of books and articles written about preaching and writing. Homiletics and Composition Studies have this in common. A great difference comes when one looks for information about the teaching of these two closely related fields. Composition Studies has a great abundance of books, articles, journals available to the teacher of composition; Homiletics has only a dozen or so, and those when read yield very little practical guidance as to how to teach preaching. This project seeks to show how the pedagogy of composition can inform the pedagogy of homiletics. Through the study of how imitation has been used in the past and how it is being used currently to teach composition guidelines were established and used for the use of imitation in the homiletic classroom. An empirical study was conducted comparing the results of two classes. One was taught by incorporating imitation methodology which was gleaned from composition's use of imitation on and the other class taught without

this methodology. The class which was taught using a methodology gleaned from composition pedagogies showed higher levels of learning. While there is a great need for the pedagogy of homiletics to be explored, teachers of preaching can enhance their effectiveness by becoming familiar with and drawing from the wealth of information found in the pedagogies of composition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

ABSTRACT ... iv

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Orientation and Rationale..... 1

1.2 Imitation is part of life: Mimesis 6

1.3 Imitation is Uniquely Human.....14

1.4 Homileticians' Hesitation to use Composition Studies..... 15

1.5 Preaching Benefiting from Composition..... 20

1.6 Overview of the Project.....26

2. IMITATION PEDAGOGY PRIOR TO COMPOSITION STUDIES..... 29

2.1 Imitation Pedagogy in Antiquity: Advocated by Many and
Forbidden by None..... 30

2.2 Imitation Pedagogy in the Middle Ages: Assumed but Not Advocated ...47

2.3 Imitation Pedagogy in the Renaissance: From Hesitant use to Full
Acceptance..... 52

3. IMITATION PEDAGOGY IN COMPOSITION STUDIES 64

3.1 Use of Imitation Pedagogy in the Emerging Field of Composition
Studies, 1750 until 1940's: Decline to all but Disappearance.....65

3.2 The Contemporary use of Imitation in Composition Pedagogy76

3.2.1 Imitative Practices in Composition Studies.....78

3.2.2	Guidelines for the use of Pedagogical Imitation.....	103
3.2.3	The Benefits of the use of Pedagogical Imitation.....	107
4.	THE USE OF IMITATION IN A HOMILETICS CLASSROOM	116
4.1	Overview of the Imitative Intervention	117
4.1.1	Teaching Philosophy	117
4.1.2	Setting	118
4.1.3	Personnel.....	119
4.1.4	Method	119
4.1.5	Evaluation	121
4.1	Narrative of the Process.....	121
4.2.1	Pre-Session Survey.....	123
4.2.2	Teaching the Classes- Style.....	125
4.2.3	Teaching the Classes- Delivery.....	137
4.2.4	Post Teaching Survey	151
5.	REPORTING AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA FROM THE USE OF IMITATION.....	157
5.1	Demographics	158
5.2	Quantitative Likert Questions.....	160
5.3	Subjective Qualitative Questions.....	174
5.4	Concluding Informal Discussion by the Imitation Group.....	191
5.5	Summary of the Analysis of the Teaching Intervention	197
6.	SUMMARY AND EVALUATION.....	198

Appendix

A. REVIEW OF 25 COMPOSITION TEXTBOOKS	208
B. HANDOUTS FOR CLASS SESSIONS	217
C. SURVEY OF DATA AND TABULATION	229
REFERENCES	236
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION	265

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Orientation and Rationale

The journey to this project began with a phone call from the provost of a seminary, inquiring if I would be willing to teach homiletics after twenty-five years of pastoring. While I did have years of pastoral experience and a Doctorate of Ministry¹ with an emphasis on preaching, I lacked a PhD. The offer was still made but with the request that I pursue the research degree. I agreed and began teaching and looking for a PhD program that would complement the teaching of homiletics. Thus, I searched and found the PhD in Rhetoric² at a nearby major university. This seemed to be a heuristic program that would provide a broad foundation for preaching. I enrolled in my first class, *Theories of Argumentation*, assuming that various theories of argumentation would be studied. The class covered these, but it was filled with, and geared towards, graduate teaching assistants who had to take the class in order to teach second semester freshman composition. Since I had neither intention nor inclination to teach freshman composition, I was very close to dropping but decided to stay with it. My plan was to ignore the teaching of composition portions and focus upon the argumentation. I was amazed at what happened to me in the class. As the class discussed teaching methods for the

¹ A Doctorate of Ministry is an earned professional doctorate which is a practitioner degree rather than a research degree.

² After my first year it was announced that the PhD in Rhetoric was being discontinued and I was advised to transfer to the English department.

composition classes, it became evident that these methods of teaching composition could be used in the homiletic classroom. This connection was an unexplored field that could fill a void in homiletics education. Homiletics and composition have highly developed theories and philosophies, and a dialogue between the two could reap great insights, but the connection I observed was pedagogical. Much is written about what and how to preach, but there is great need for studies regarding the pedagogy of preaching. As I discovered the numerous resources in the discipline of teaching composition, I began to apply some of the ideas to my preaching classes and found that they seemed to work. However, this was based on very informal and subjective observations. A focused, formal study on how composition teaching methods could inform the teaching of homiletics was needed. Thus, the idea for this project was born. With the guidance of faculty and input from fellow students, I narrowed the study down to one particular kind of teaching method to serve as a test case.

Since the field of teaching composition is quite extensive, attention will focus on the methodology of imitation, which was a common pedagogical strategy in past eras when rhetoric, composition, and preaching were more closely aligned. I hope to contribute to the broad field of rhetoric, but more specifically to the field of homiletics, by validating the use of imitation methodology in homiletics education through a historical and philosophical study. Then based upon that foundation, I hope to propose, execute, and evaluate a specific pedagogical activity for homiletics that is grounded in the history of rhetorical education and patterned after current composition imitation pedagogy. The evaluation will include some speculations as to how homiletics might contribute to composition studies.

The shortage in resources and research in homiletical education merits attention. When I moved from being a practitioner of preaching for twenty years to the teacher of preaching, I began to search for resources. My first attempt yielded nothing. This caused me to doubt my research methods, and even after help from the research librarian, I found only five authors writing articles related to the pedagogy of homiletics: Davis, Demond, Hooke, Mckinzie and Nichols. Of these, only two address a strategy for teaching homiletics. Allen Demond (2002) makes a connection between teaching adults and teaching preaching but fails to develop or even comment on a pedagogical strategy. Ruthanna Hooke (2002) presents a suggestion to bring a specific experience from an acting class into a homiletics class. This was a helpful anecdotal suggestion but does not go beyond her personal experience. The other three articles are surveys of current practices. Two books which give hope for this area are *Learning Preaching*, D.M. Wardlaw, ed. (1989) and its companion *Teaching Preaching as Christian Practice* Thomas Long and Leonora Tisdale, eds. (2008) published in association with the Academy of Homiletics³. While helpful in discussing the content of a sermon, these books ignore teaching methods. The earlier book claims that preaching cannot be taught; it can only be learned. The later book clearly states that the earlier book was wrong in its theory and preaching must be taught as a “Christian practice.” Thus, material covering the actual teaching methods for homiletical education remains very scarce. When one considers that, according to the Barna Research Group, on a given Sunday morning 140

³ Professional organization for teachers of preaching in mainline denominational seminaries

million Americans are listening to a sermon, the need for effective homiletical education becomes apparent.⁴

In contrast to a very limited number of studies in homiletical education, there is a vast amount of information concerning composition education. One of the reasons for this is the number of students in composition classes. Sharon Crowley provides the informal figures that four million students are in a freshman composition class each semester. Her purpose is not to provide a precise number of bodies but rather to show the importance of giving attention to the study of composition pedagogy (1998, p. 1). Meanwhile there are only about six thousand students per semester who are taking a preaching class at theological institutions.⁵ It is easy to draw the conclusion from these figures that the study of composition pedagogies should receive an attention level commensurate with the number of students and teachers who daily engage in this discipline. Thus, there are numerous journals and hundreds of books devoted to the study of teaching composition.

Another reason for the lack of research in homiletic pedagogy is the type of professor who teaches preaching. Seldom is a person engaged in homiletical education as a life's pursuit. Often the preaching professor is engaged in other areas such as pastoring a church or teaching in another area of theological studies. Furthermore, there are only

⁴ www.adherents.com/re1_USA.html - 93k accessed 11/19/07

⁵ This too is an informal figure. According the Association of Theological Schools, there are 34,000 theological students in the U.S. Subtracting 30- 40 % of the students in theological education who are not in an MDiv program would leave 24,000. The MDiv is the standard degree that prepares students for a ministry that includes preaching. Assuming that most seminaries have roughly 6 hours of preaching in their standard 90 hour Master of Divinity curriculum, it would mean that two preaching classes would be taken during course of study. Thus, during the normal six semesters an MDiv student will be taking a preaching class during two of those six semesters. Roughly speaking, one third, perhaps to be on the conservative side, one fourth of those 24,000 or about 6,000 students each semester will take a preaching class. www.ats.edu/leadership_education/Papers2005Aleshire1.pdf - referenced 11/19/07

five seminaries that offer a PhD in preaching. These programs do not focus on the teaching of preaching but on preaching itself⁶. While it is obvious that more work needs to be done in the area of pedagogy of homiletics, I am proposing that an immediate resource that homiletics teachers can draw upon is the study of composition pedagogies.

Though there is not a one-to-one correspondence between preaching and composition, enough common ground exists for homiletic educators to directly benefit from composition educators. More work should be done in the field of how to teach preaching. Until that takes place, teachers of preaching can learn from teachers of composition. Studies in composition pedagogies can and should inform homiletical pedagogies because of the great amount of research in composition pedagogies and the great need in the related area of homiletics.

A specific composition teaching strategy needs to be selected in order to manage this study. This teaching methodology needs to be effective in teaching something that is common to composition and preaching. A way of narrowing the path is to look at past and current teaching methods for a common strategy that was used when homiletics and composition were more closely aligned. In the classical era, before composition was identified as a separate discipline or homiletics had a developed theory, imitation was a common and often used exercise for students of rhetoric. Quintilian devotes Chapter Two of Book Ten of his *Institutio oratoria* to the methodology of imitation. In that chapter, he justifies the use of imitation and comments on how it will improve style. Towards the end of the chapter he says that imitation should not be limited only to words and directs the

⁶ Princeton Theological Seminary, New Orleans Seminary, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary and Southern Baptist Seminary.

reader to use imitation to develop other areas (X. ii. 27). In thirty years as a student and a practitioner of preaching, I have noticed that in my own form of delivery⁷ and that of others, there is a tendency to take on some of the characteristics of the preachers to whom we frequently listen and those whom we admire. It is somewhat embarrassing to concede that for many years aspiring young preachers sounded like Billy Graham. When I listen to my own recorded sermons, it is easy to hear patterns of sentences, vocal inflections and facial expressions that I have picked up from other preachers. Imitation is an informal way that preachers develop their form of delivery. Since imitation was used to formally teach style in classical rhetorical education, and since it is informally a way of learning a form of delivering the sermon, this project will focus upon how the use of imitation in the teaching of composition can inform the teaching of homiletics with a specific attention on style and delivery.

There is great diversity in how people think about imitation. At times imitation refers to simplistic mimicry; it is also used to describe how life relates to reality. When one begins to think of imitation in broad terms, such as how people relate to their world, the topic of mimesis can provide insight.

1.2 Imitation is part of life: Mimesis

Mimesis is not equal to imitation, but when viewed from a philosophical perspective, the study of imitation and mimesis converge. This brief look at mimesis will show that imitation is not an isolated esoteric concept; rather all lives are filled with imitative experiences and practices.

⁷ In homiletic studies, delivery is the actual act of preaching the sermon.

Mimesis is a field of study that includes theater, art, literature, cultural studies and even theological studies. The English word is a transliteration of the Greek word *mimesis*. It is sometimes translated as imitation, but this translation does not give the broad scope of all that is included in this concept. The *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, which glosses an extensive lexicon of ancient Greek, defines the word *Mimeomai*: to mimic. It has other meanings: it can be used in the broader sense that art imitates life, it is a negative term when something is said to be unoriginal, and in ethics imitation of people can lead to goodness or evil (Michaelis, 1985, pp.594-596). When studying mimesis, one finds more than imitation or mimicking: it is an elementary student trying to make letters just like the teacher, it is the painting depicting a pastoral setting that is a representation of a hoped-for peaceful reality, it is a child pretending to be a teacher, it is a movie that shows us what it was like to live through the trials of the Civil War. Mimesis is part of the way that people live and learn.

In Matthew Potolsky's (2006) work on mimesis, he articulates a mercurial concept:

The word has been used to describe the imitative relationship between art and life, as well as the relationship between a master and a disciple, an artwork and its audience, and the material world and a rational order of ideas. Mimesis takes on different guises in different historical contexts, masquerading under a variety of related terms and translations: emulation, mimicry, dissimulation, doubling, theatricality, realism, identification, correspondence, depiction, verisimilitude, resemblance. No one translation, and no one interpretation, is sufficient to encompass its complexity and the tradition of commentary it has inspired. Nor can any one translation account for the range of attitudes mimesis evokes. Mimesis is always double, at once good and bad, natural and unnatural, necessary and dispensable. It is the sincerest form of flattery as well as the trade of pirates and plagiarists, the signal behavior is of great artists as well as apes, parrots and children. (p.1-2)

One would expect him to narrow this concept, but later in his book he affirms, “the definition of mimesis is remarkably flexible and changes greatly over time and across cultural contexts” (p. 50). Mimesis is not a precise area of study but rather a way of thinking about art, literature, government, human behavior, music, dance—the list could go on to cover many areas of our lives.

Merlin Donald (2005) helps articulate mimesis when he describes it as the broadest and highest form of reduplicative action. Mimicry is reduplication of an action without attention to or knowledge of its purpose. In contrast, mimesis is a reduplication giving attention to purpose and with an audience in mind (p. 286). For Donald, these fluid divisions form a scale, beginning with superficial copying (mimicry), moving to a more complex cognitive process requiring purpose and self-evaluation (imitation), and culminates in the copy having a purpose, which is understood in cultural context with social ramifications (mimesis). A child’s slicing a wooden stick through the air like a swashbuckling Robin Hood is mimicking. When the child does it for the purpose of play or self-satisfaction, it becomes imitation. When he wields this wooden sword in order to fit in with his playmates and be accepted by them, it becomes mimesis. Mimesis is part of life and the way that humans learn to be human. To articulate Donald’s categories, imitation is distinct from mimesis in that imitation is not for cultural acceptance or respect, rather it is for the more narrow purpose of learning a skill or mastering the content of a literary work.

In Erich Auerbach’s (1946) influential work simply entitled *Mimesis*, he demonstrates the mimetic relationship between literary works and life. He begins with the

Genesis story of Abraham's potential sacrifice of Isaac comparing and contrasting it to

Homer's Iliad:

Far from seeking like Homer, merely to make us forget our own reality for a few hours, it seeks to overcome our reality: we are to fit our own life into its word, feel ourselves to be elements in its structure of the universal history. (p.15)

As he walks through the history of literature, he links works written at roughly the same time in a contrast/comparison relationship. Other works he individually analyzes. Both are done in order to show how they are imitations of life. He links the arrest narrative from the life of Jesus to a Roman novel by Petronius and connects an obscure work by Ammianus Marcellinus with Augustine's *Confessions*. He examines Dante's *Inferno* as an example of that which appeals to man's inner life. He looks at various scenes from Shakespeare, Moliere, Cervantes, and Goethe, ending with an analysis of a scene from Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*. While he does not define mimesis specifically, he does make a comment on imitation in literature and art showing that life is always in flux:

Imitation of reality is imitation of the sensory experience of life on earth-among the most essential characteristics of which would seem to be its possessing a history, its changing and developing. Whatever degree of freedom the imitating artist may be granted in his work, he cannot be allowed to deprive reality of this characteristic, which is its very essence. (p.191)

His work shows that there is a mimetic relationship between reality and literature.

Mimesis is not only broad in its scope; it is also deep in its foundation. Western culture has spoken about a form of mimesis since ancient Hebrew and early Christian teaching. Certainly the Hebrew culture was not a Western culture, but its influence through the Old Testament and its influence upon Christianity had an impact upon Western thought. The Hebrews were commanded by God in the Torah to be holy for He is holy. Not that they were to be holy like God is holy, but they were to be holy because

God was holy. While this is not a command to imitate, there is a mimetic relationship between the holiness of the people of the holiness of God. This mimetic activity is more clearly stated in the New Testament. The apostle Paul writes that others were to imitate him as he imitates Christ. These commands and examples of imitation cannot mean that there is to be a one to one correspondence of every attribute. It would have been blasphemous for a son of Abraham to claim to be exactly like Jehovah. Nor did Paul mean that he perfectly imitated Christ. However, it is clear that some kind of behavior is to be imitated. Most likely it is moral character. From classical Hebrew and Christian thought the Western mind has a mimetic element.

One of the oldest understandings of art is to see art as a representation of reality or an imitation of reality. This way of thinking was articulated by Plato in his *Republic* and according to Potolsky is the foundation of western art theory (2006, p. 15). Plato's concept of an ideal existence with a physical representation of that ideal is mimetic. Even when art is seen not as representational but expressive there is still the mimetic element, for the artist is outwardly imitating the inward emotion or feeling.

In *Poetics*, Aristotle says that imitation⁸ is a painting that makes a man look more handsome and yet is still recognizable as the man:

As Tragedy is an imitation of personages better than the ordinary man, we in our way should follow the example of good portrait-painters, who reproduce the distinctive features of a man, and at the same time, without losing the likeness, make him handsomer than he is. (1454^b10)⁹

⁸ Aristotle uses the word *mimēomai* which is most often translated imitation. Malcomb Heath (1996) in his introduction to his translation of *Poetics* defends this translation saying that it is closest to Aristotle's concept. The word "representation" does not encompass the imitative aspects. Heath illustrates this with the example of a symbol on a map representing an airport. While it is a representation it would not fall under Aristotle's view of mimesis (p. xiii).

⁹ This is the Berlin number system which is used by R. McKeon in *The Basic Works of Aristotle* (1941).

He also states that imitation is not the exact recording of history; it is a poem about history. Aristotle uses the example of Homer's representation of the Trojan War not being an accurate historical record but an imitative interpretation. And then presenting the broader scope he says that mimesis is the representation of things as they were or are, as they are said or thought to be or have been, or as they ought to be (1460^b 9). For Aristotle mimesis is an intentional, interpretive, representation of reality with a sense of continuity with a model.

Richard McKeon (1936) attempted to re-establish imitation as a part of literary criticism by showing that it was an integral part of Plato's and Aristotle's thinking. He may or may not have succeeded in bringing imitation back into literary criticism, but he did show that imitation is foundational in thought for Plato and Aristotle. McKeon broadens the concept of mimeses even beyond art and literature when he takes the platonic concepts of imitation of the ideal to its logical conclusion when he states "if God is, the universe is an imitation" (McKeon, 1936, p. 9). Perhaps to say that our world is an imitation of a divine being is pushing the concept too far, but it does show that mimesis is not just a concept for artists making copies of reality but can be a part of how we explain the world.

Mimesis being a part of the western mind is seen in a work that was first produced in 1380 and is still being published today as *An Imitation of Christ*. This widely published work shows that mimesis affected the personal devotional life of Christians for hundreds of years. The mimesis that is called for in this work is in response to Christ's command to "follow" Him. The work was apparently a collaborative effort by the Brethren of Common Life and was translated from Dutch into Latin by Thomas A Kempis. There are

several dozen short chapters in which a characteristic of Christ is applied to daily life.

This imitation was not a surface mimicking or pretending but a striving to have the attitude and actions of Christ. The work begins:

He who follows Me, walks not in darkness," says the Lord. By these words of Christ we are advised to imitate His life and habits, if we wish to be truly enlightened and free from all blindness of heart. Let our chief effort, therefore, be to study the life of Jesus Christ. (1380/2002, p. 1)

The person of Christ being the model for imitation is not the focus of my using this example; rather I am attempting to show that imitation was part of the 14th Century community at all levels: written in Dutch for the common people and translated into Latin for the scholarly community. The concept of imitation was not just for priests and those in monastic orders, but the everyday person was also to be an imitator. The popularity of the work across centuries is an anecdotal example that mimesis is deeply rooted in our thinking.

Mimesis was part of western thought from Moses, through the Middle Ages, and up until the 1700s when the prevalence of mimesis began to decline. The Cartesian emphasis upon the individual began to prevail and the imitation of the “great” authors and artists began to be seen as stealing from them. It is interesting to note that the first copyright laws were passed during this era.¹⁰ Before copyright laws, a work of art, be it a sculpture or an essay, was seen as public property which others built upon and imitated. Not that they tried to present other’s work as their own, but there was a freedom to use a trusted work as a model without the fear or disgrace of being accused that one used a

¹⁰The British Copyright Act of 1709 was the first legislation to regulate the ownership of written material. Though it was passed in 1709 by Parliament it wasn’t fully tested until a case in 1774 and not functional as it is known today until the beginning of the twentieth century (MacQueen, Waelde, and Laurie.2007, p.35).

classic as a model. But this mimetic way of thinking began to lose its influence.

Descartes' emphasis upon the individual began the decline with William Blake later saying that genius cannot be imitated, but must be born. During this decline, other views were expressed that championed imitation such as those expressed by Alexander Pope and Samuel Johnson, but it was the voices of Descartes and Blake that won over the thinking.¹¹ With the coming of a more postmodern way of thinking, in which meaning is more important than truth, mimesis was challenged as a way of thinking. In *Aesthetics of Mimesis*, Stephen Halliwell (2002) states it this way:

In an age when talk of representation has become increasingly subject to both ideological and epistemological suspicion, mimesis is, for many philosophers and critics, little more than a broken column surviving from a long dilapidated classical edifice, a sadly obsolete relic of former certainties. (p.344)

Halliwell goes on to recount Roland Barthes' and Jacques Derrida's rejection of the representational aspect of art due to its apparent purpose of presenting truth and convincingly makes a case that mimesis as representation should be currently embraced because it was not striving to deal with the truth; rather it was focused upon meaning.¹²

Even though there are reservations about the practice of mimesis in formal education, perhaps because of its plagiaristic overtones, mimesis is still a part of how we think and it is easy to see it in everyday life. Based upon the common activity of make-believe, Kendall Walton seeks to develop a theory of how mimesis is tied to representational art. He says that our concept of make believe, which is a form of

¹¹ For a thorough review of the historical decline of mimesis see Potolsky's *Mimesis* (2006, pp. 59-70). Descartes' emphasis upon the individual began the decline with William Blake later saying that genius cannot be imitated, but must be born. During this decline, other views were expressed that championed imitation such as those expressed by Alexander Pope and Samuel Johnson, but it was the voices of Descartes and Blake that won over the thinking.

¹² See Halliwell's *The Aesthetics of Mimesis* (2002, pp.340-388) for a fuller account of this.

mimesis, is such an important part of children's games it would be surprising if we grew out of that mindset. He claims that we don't grow out of it, rather our interaction with representational art is an example that we still like to play make believe (Walton, 1990, p. 12). When a movie is watched, a play experienced, a painting studied, a novel read, we can step into this world of make believe, just as we did as a child. These works of art, which give us a sophisticated experience of make-believe, are a form of mimeses because we experience an imitation of life. While mimesis in its formal influence may have declined, it is still part of our lives.

This brief excursion into Mimesis is sufficient to show that the human mind is prone to imitate, and that much of our relating ideas to reality and objects to each other is bound up in the concept of imitation. Imitation is not just a teaching method; it is part of life.

1.3 Imitation is Uniquely Human

Imitation is not only a way in which our minds work, it is a uniquely human activity. Michael Tomasello (1999) makes the case that imitation is uniquely human based upon his research involving imitation in animals and humans. He is attempting to answer the question of how is it that humans developed so quickly and became so very different from the other apes who share 99 percent of the same genetic material. He begins with an evolutionary description that humans developed into their current advanced stage because they outcompeted other great apes. His answer is that social or cultural transmission is much faster than organic evolution. He asserts imitation plays a vital role in this accelerated social transmission of culture. He conducted experiments which compared the behavior of two-year-old children and chimpanzees. The two-year

old children would imitate even when their goals were not achieved whereas the chimpanzees acted on a purely goal accomplishing basis (p. 30). Thus, humans have a true imitation that is not directly related to results. Humans imitate primarily because they are copying other humans not primarily because the copied action helps them accomplish a goal. Another experiment which he cites has an adult turning on a light by bending over a switch panel and turning it on with his forehead. Fourteen-month-old children imitated this inefficient behavior even though it would have been easier to use their hands to touch the panel (p. 82). Tomasello combines these findings and other empirical studies in which he teaches novel verbs to preschoolers. He tells them that a ball is “dacked” and then sees how the child will use the verb. He discovered that children between two and four years of age will use it only in ways that they heard it used. They imitate the use of the word even though they do not experience achieving goals with its use (p. 145).

Susan Hurley (2004) summarizes the work of Tomasello and other anthropologists, psychologists and cognitive scientists, saying that animals may copy the actions but it is a trial and error learning rather than true imitation. Animals will abandon behavior that is copied if it does not achieve a goal whereas humans will continue to imitate a behavior even when it doesn't achieve a goal. The results of the continued imitation, even when goals are not achieved, do have effect, but it is not perceived or is delayed. An infant learning to speak may not experience immediate results, but the imitation is continued until sentences can be formed and goals achieved (p.166-69).

When I began thinking about using imitation in my homiletic classroom, it seemed like an innovative, experimental, even somewhat bizarre teaching method. I couldn't have been much further from the truth. Since imitation is embedded in our

literature, our minds, and even our daily activities, using it as a teaching method is tapping into something that is fundamentally and uniquely human.

1.4 Homiletics' Hesitation to use Composition Studies

The relationship of preaching to composition studies may come into question due to the warning in the New Testament that Christian preachers are not to use persuasive words in their preaching. When properly understood this is not a warning against rhetoric but rather an affirmation that the Christian faith rests on the good news of Jesus' life and work. Due to the close connection of rhetoric to composition it is important to briefly explore this relationship. If rhetoric is to be rejected by Christian preaching then the benefits of composition studies would also be questioned and perhaps rejected.

This relationship of preaching to rhetoric was an important issue for the early church. Are Christian preachers simply rhetors with a Christian topic? Or should Christians reject rhetoric as a device to persuade people apart from God's work?

The following passage from Paul's first letter to the Corinthians can be taken as a rejection of the influence of rhetoric upon preaching. If this is so, then the guidelines set by the New Testament will separate preaching from rhetoric. Thus, it bears close scrutiny.

And when I came to you, brethren, I did not come with superiority of speech or of wisdom, proclaiming to you the testimony of God. For, I determined to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ, and Him crucified. And I was with you in weakness and in fear and in much trembling. And my message and my preaching were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, that your faith should not rest on the wisdom of men, but on the power of God. (1 Corinthians 2:1-5, NAS)

The heart of the interpretive problem is the meaning of "in persuasive words of wisdom."

What exactly is the apostle rejecting as characteristic of his preaching? In *St. Paul's*

Theology of Rhetorical Style: an Examination of I Corinthians 2.1-5 in Light of First Century Greco-Roman Rhetorical Culture, Mike Bullmore (1995) points out that the word “demonstration” is a translation of the Greek word *apodeixis*, which was used both by Aristotle and Quintilian (p. 212-3). We must not imply that Paul was using the term as did Aristotle and certainly not as Quintilian who had not been born. However, we can at least say there are some common rhetorical terms being used, which implies that Paul was speaking about rhetoric. The audience to whom he wrote would have understood these rhetorical terms because the Isthmian games were held each year in Corinth which were accompanied by speeches. Rhetoric was not foreign to the Corinthians.

Bullmore takes the position that there was a specific “Corinthian” sophistic rhetoric which was characterized by empty oration presented for the purpose of persuasion through the use of style rather than content. Thus, Bullmore says that Paul wasn’t against rhetoric, but when he wrote “persuasive words of wisdom,” he was speaking against a specific kind of Corinthian rhetoric (p. 222). The difficulty with this view is the lack of evidence that a separate Corinthian rhetoric existed. Another problem is anachronistic. Rather than something from the first century C.E., what Bullmore is attributing to first century Corinthians sounds more like Platonic rejection of the sophists, which we heard in the Gorgias dialogue of the fifth century B.C.E.. Thus, I feel Bullmore is wrong in his identifying a specific kind of rhetoric; however, I do feel he is right in his assessment that a key in understanding this passage is the word “in.” He takes this preposition as describing the means by which Paul effectively proclaimed the message of Christ (p. 220). Bullmore believes that Paul did not reject the use of rhetoric, but rather he was clarifying that the Spirit’s power in the hearer was the source of the effectiveness

not the power of rhetoric. In Bullmore's interpretation, preaching can still have a beneficial relationship to rhetoric in general.

Another view is that of Duane Litfin (1994), who rejects the notion that the rhetoric which Paul was opposed to was a "sophistic rhetoric" which relied on style rather than content for persuasion. He says it wonderfully: "It is simply too facile to stereotype classical rhetoric in overly negative terms as a bag of oratorical tricks for manipulating an audience, or to trivialize it as little more than the technique of embellishment, bombast or purposeless prose" (p. 245). Litfin presents the concept that the rhetoricians of Paul's day felt free to adapt or change the content of their discourses according to the situation in which they spoke. This, to him, is the point of rhetoric that Paul rejected. An adapting of the message was unthinkable to the apostle, and thus, he spoke of not "coming in words of wisdom" or rhetoric. Litfin interprets Paul as not rejecting rhetoric in general, but rather rejecting the rhetoric that adapts the content. He bases this upon his summation that classical rhetoric was in essence the adapting of the speaker to the audience in order to accomplish a certain predetermined result (1994, p. 245). It seems that Litfin takes the concept of adaption to mean that the content of the message should be adapted to the audience in order to persuade them. This "persuasion at all costs," as Litfin summarizes would allow the rhetor to make substantial changes not only in his style but also in his content, even to the point of changing the meaning, in order to bring about persuasion. This is what, Litfin says, the apostle rejected. It strikes me that to say classical rhetoric is summarized by adaptation to the point of changing the meaning in order to persuade contradicts the point of rhetoric. Rhetors would adapt their content to some degree but if adapted too much it ceases to be persuasion. It is as if the audience doesn't change but the

content does. Certainly persuasion was a major part of rhetoric as seen in Aristotle's famous summary that "its [rhetoric] function is not to persuade, but to see the available means of persuasion in each case" (1.1.7). While the means of persuasion includes the adaptation of the content to some degree, if it is adapted too much it is no longer the persuasion of an audience. Litfin seems to be saying that Paul refused to use persuasive words or rhetoric because he would not change his content.

Perhaps Paul is rejecting the dependence upon rhetoric as the foundation for one's belief. The issue is not rhetorical skills, but relying upon them as what faith rests upon. It is the good news of Jesus' life, death and resurrection that faith must rest upon. The use of rhetoric is not wrong; in fact, it is unavoidable. Even the "simple" straightforward presentation of the gospel is rhetorical. Thucydides claims that he used this plain way of presenting history which was in contrast to both the poets who embellished and the logographers who were concerned with pleasing the ear. Claiming to simply present the truth seems strange to the modern ear when in the next few sentences Thucydides explains that he supplied speeches for historical characters that were not the actual words spoken, but could have been spoken (1.22). In *Hermeneutics Ancient and Modern*, Gerald Bruns (1992) points out that Thucydides was not so much striving to present truth but striving to present a story in such a way that it could be taken as the truth (p.48). Early Christians certainly wanted their message to be taken as truth as well so they presented it in such a way that it would be taken as the truth. When the Apostle Paul spoke on the Areopagus (Acts 17) he related the Christian message to the Athenians' experiences by referring to their altar to an unknown god. For Paul the foundation for the change in the

listener was the truth of the Gospel though he may use rhetoric to get that truth across to the listener.

Thus, Christian preaching, from its beginning stages, and rhetoric in general are not in opposition to each other. Both see rhetoric as a tool: for the rhetor it was a tool to bring about persuasion, for the Christian preacher it was a tool to present the truth. Thus, the close relationship of composition to rhetoric doesn't hinder the homiletician from learning from composition studies.

1.5 Preaching Benefiting from Composition

Homiletics and composition studies are normally seen as independent fields. Those who teach preaching seldom, if ever, teach composition classes, nor do composition instructors teach preaching classes. The educators in these two fields would not normally consult each other's notes or enter into dialogue to discuss teaching methods. But, despite their differences, composition and preaching may have guidelines and foundational theory in common. Both are concerned with the communication through words, most often composed by an individual for an audience¹³. Both emphasize the effective use of structures and figures of speech. Both preaching and composition are not technically dialogical though in both fields some would make a case that the audience response provides a form of dialogue¹⁴. These common threads perhaps point to a

¹³ There are occasions in which compositions and sermons are written collaboratively. Andrea Lunsford in her 1990, *Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspective on Collaborative Writing* is one of many who explore collaborative writing. Collaboration in preaching is not often done though some churches with multiple pastors will occasionally preach a "tag-team" sermon.

¹⁴ Howe's *Partners in Preaching: Clergy and Laity in Dialogue* (1967) is one example of seeing preaching as a dialogue, while an example of one who explores dialogue in composition is, William Covino in his *Forms of Wondering: A Dialogue on Writing, for Writers*, (1988).

common heritage which could give a logical and functional point of intersection for the pedagogies of these seemingly independent fields.

Admittedly, there are some areas of composition studies that are not applicable to homiletics with the most obvious being that the goal of a composition is the realm of reading and preaching isn't complete until the sermon is heard. Another is in the area of invention. In composition studies there is an emphasis upon originality of the topics; in contrast to this, the topic for sermons comes from a sacred text. Though the subjects of sermons are not the invention of the preacher, the preacher, just as the writer of an essay, should work diligently on arrangement and style.

There are also ideological differences that could be seen as a source of conflict. Christian preaching rests on the philosophical foundation that God exists and He has communicated to people. For this system, God is outside and beyond our human existence, yet we can enter into a relationship with Him, which in a broad sense is the subject of every sermon. This is in contrast to the world view of some composition teachers who consider absolutes and truth either unknowable or non-existent. For most homileticians who understandably would have a view in which God does exist and has communicated to this world, reading these compositionists who have a different world view could set up barriers that would prevent composition pedagogy from informing homiletical pedagogy. For example, if a homiletician read Paulo Freire (1971) and an American counterpart Ira Shor (1980), she might be prejudiced against their pedagogy due to their self-admitted Marxist world-view. However, when these compositionists present their pedagogical ideas of a student-centered class room in which students were not oppressed, there could be agreement with their methodology. It seems that the

difference lies not in a student-centered method of teaching, but in the reason for being student-centered. In postmodern thought, community and interaction through discourse in that community is of highest importance. If absolutes and truth may or may not exist, or if they do exist but they cannot be known, then dialogue and interaction are essential for they are known and experienced. In the Christian world view, God has established truth, and through community interaction the Christian community can better understand and find that truth. Community and dialogue are important in each world view. Another example is Patricia Bizzell's (1982/1994) belief that the task of the composition teacher is "not only to convey information but to transform students' whole world view" (p.75). This combined with her critical view of communities in which a revered authority is sufficient to validate arguments (Bizzell, 1984, p. 453) could cause a homiletician to reject her thought. This would be unfortunate for she has valuable insight into the composing process. The Christian teacher of preaching can embrace some methodologies of those with a potentially conflicting world view without necessarily embracing their ideology.

The question arises as to how much influence world view plays on methodology. C.H. Knoblauch and Lil Brannon (1984) advocate that the world view of the classical writers resulted in a rhetoric and composition that matched that ancient world view. If we use these classical methods, then we advocate that ancient world view. They see language as a human expression that needs to be encouraged rather than a system that is forced upon students (p. 92-93.) This is followed by specific suggestions for teachers of composition to respond to students' papers by affirming ideas rather than being overly critical of the mechanics of language. They show that ideology does affect methodology,

and methodology affects a world view. A homiletician reading their suggested responses to student papers would probably agree with the method, but with a different reason for using it. Knoblauch's and Brannon's view, that language is not an absolute system which is taught to a person but an organic process that resists a recipe approach, results in their methodology of affirming students' ideas rather than hammering at all the errors (p.80-81.) While teachers of preaching may disagree with their view of language, they hopefully would agree that students need to be affirmed, more than corrected. The reason for this affirmation could be grounded in the belief that God is full of mercy and love. Thus, homileticians can differ with them ideologically, but still benefit from their methodological suggestions. A world view will (and should) shape how we use suggestions from Knoblauch and Brannon or any theorist. In this case, a differing view of language that comes from a different world view doesn't prevent homiletical pedagogy from benefiting from composition pedagogy. The ideological differences between some composition teachers and teachers of homiletics must not be a barrier that prevents people with differing ideologies learning from each other.

In allowing composition studies to influence the pedagogy of homiletics the social constructionist influence must be given attention, due to the foundational level of the conflicting ideologies. Homiletics is the presentation of truth that already exists, whereas social constructionists view knowledge or truth (at least a functional form of truth) as being created through dialogue and discourse. This obviously results in their emphasizing community and discourse as a generative source. In homiletics there is a relatively new method of preparing sermons that is receiving more attention and illustrates how a social constructionist methodology might be beneficial and compatible to homiletics. This

method involves groups in the sermon preparation process: some groups have only preachers, others include members of congregations and others groups include members of the theological academic community. The method used by these groups is a collaborative effort to better understand what the Scriptures are saying and how to present those concepts to a congregation.¹⁵ The sermon is partially created through the dialogue and the discourse of the group. After the group work, each preacher builds upon the products of the group in creating the final form of the sermon. The generative element of this group can benefit from the constructionists' emphasis upon the generative product of a community. The difference is not in the process of generation but in the product that is being produced. For the social constructionists, discourse creates truth or knowledge; for homileticians, discourse creates a better understanding of truth and how to more effectively present the truth. While the ideologies are in conflict, the generative power of discourse is common to both.

Composition and preaching instructors struggle to teach many of the same concepts such as: clear presentation of thoughts through a proper use of words and grammar, a style that is appropriate to the context and writer, and the use of argumentation. These traditional concepts are associated with the dated approach, often called Current-tradition Composition or Formalism; however, some of the more contemporary approaches might find common ground with preaching as well. Expressing one's creativity in preaching has recently become more important to the preaching

¹⁵ Collaborative learning in composition studies has much to contribute toward collaborative sermon preparation. As a start, one might consult Kenneth Bruffee's (1984) "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind' ", his (1993) *Collaborative Learning*, and Karen Littleton's (2000) "Rethinking Collaborative Learning: An Overview."

theorist, thus the more expressive schools of composition can also be of help. The dialogical school of composition has a common ground with homiletics because relationships have always played an important role in preaching. First, the relationship of the preacher to God is often addressed in a primary position in preaching textbooks and forms the foundation for a preacher's ethos. Second, a proper relationship of the preacher to the congregation enables the preacher to identify with his hearers. Third, the relationship of the preacher to the Biblical text and the human authors of the text give the preacher a base of authority. These relationships in a sense are dialogical. There is an interaction between the preacher and these three: God, the congregation and the text. Thus, the dialogical and social elements of composition studies are areas of importance in preaching.

Another point of connection of homiletics and composition is the theology of Martin Buber (1937/1970). He advanced a theology of I–Thou, which emphasized the importance of genuine dialogue. His influence is seen both in Jewish and Christian theological circles and was felt through the later part of the last century, as seen in the 1970 edition of his, *I and Thou*. This relatively short work affected composition studies. In an article which challenged the Sartrean-based approach to responding to student papers, Glenn Matott suggests the Buber's dialogical approach produces better results.

For composition teachers, Buber's concepts mean, I think, that the teacher's expertise is not in relation to the *person* as creator, nor yet with the *process* of creation; rather, they point the way back to the traditional concern with the created *product*-but with a difference. When, in freedom, the student's creative instinct, operating through highly personal and inscrutable processes, has produced a created product, then the teacher *responds* to the product and thus to the creator. This response must be genuine. It need not-nor will it characteristically-reflect "unconditional positive regard," for the world aim of the response is to assist the creator in achieving ever greater command over the

medium through which the “instinct of origination” *and* “ the instinct of communion” are expressed. (p. 30)

The influence was also seen in two of the addresses by the Chairs of the CCC. Jane Peterson (1991) mentions Buber’s I-Thou concept as the means of generating a true community in the classroom (p. 31). In another CCC chair address, Miriam Chaplin (1988) quotes him in order to support the concept that writing involves both an individual and a group (p.58).¹⁶ This dialogical theology also affected preaching. A homiletician mentioned earlier in the chapter, Reuel Howe (1963), cautions the preacher to not approach the sermon as a monologue in which the preacher is insensitive to the congregation: “In monological communication the speaker is so preoccupied with himself that he loses touch with those to whom he is speaking” (p.33). The influence of Buber’s theology upon both composition studies and homiletics affirms the close connections of the two disciplines.

1.6 Overview of the Project

Since it seems that Homiletics can learn from and even borrow teaching methods from Composition Studies, the specific composition teaching method of imitation will be tested as to its effectiveness in a homiletics classroom. Broadly speaking, the flow of thought moves from theory, to practice, and then to analysis.

Chapter Two: Imitation Pedagogy Prior to Composition Studies

Imitation is often misunderstood. Some common phrases that come to mind are: cheap imitation, knock-off, or plagiarism. Although used for centuries as a teaching methodology, it is not held in high esteem today. This chapter describes the ebb and flow

¹⁶ Helen Ewald (1993, p.341) and Kevin Porter (2000, p. 587) also mention Buber’s influence upon composition.

of the acceptance and use of imitation pedagogy. This historical understanding of the changing attitudes towards imitation across history will provide a better foundation for understanding that attitudes, both negative and positive, towards imitation are not new. This tracing of the use of imitation begins with the use of imitation pedagogy in general and when possible focuses upon rhetorical education.

Chapter Three: Imitation Pedagogy in Composition Studies

An exact date for the emergence of composition as a separate discipline is dated around 1800-1900. The use of imitation in this emerging discipline, as well as the contemporary use, will be examined and analyzed, leading to a list of guidelines for effective use. The chapter will conclude by listing some possible benefits.

Chapter Four: The Use of Imitation in Homiletic Classroom

This chapter reports the plan for the implementation of the empirical element of the project, which tested the use of imitation teaching methodology, based upon composition pedagogies, in a two homiletic classrooms at Southwestern Seminary during the spring of 2008. For an evaluation tool, I used a survey with both objective quantitative type of questions and qualitative, open-ended questions. Two classes were involved in the study. One functioned as the control group and thus did not have the imitation teaching activity, while the other class had two sessions using imitation.

Chapter Five: Reporting and Analysis of the Data from the use of Imitation

This chapter presents the results and an analysis of the data from the surveys. My theory is that the students who will experience the imitation teaching plan will learn more than those who do not. This was proven to be true but not in an overwhelming way. The quantitative objective portion of the survey was inconclusive, while the qualitative

section shows clearly that imitation teaching methods in the homiletics classroom, which are based upon composition's use of imitation, are successful in more effectively teaching homiletics.

Chapter Six: Summary and Evaluation

Four areas will be articulated: contributions, weaknesses, applications and areas for further study. This is an expected outline for a concluding chapter, with the exception of applications. Since the focus of this project is to show how one field can learn from another, it only seems appropriate to delineate what was learned.

CHAPTER 2

IMITATION PEDAGOGY PRIOR TO COMPOSITION STUDIES

Since imitation is part of life and uniquely human, pedagogical imitation has been a part of the educational system from our earliest records. The ancient Greeks held up Homer as an example for students to follow; the Romans had an elaborate system of declamations in which students often copied a prescribed model. This system of declamation continued up to the 18th century in English schools for young men. In the history of imitative pedagogy, there is layer upon layer of theories and practices which are mixed together forming a soil in which imitation at times flourishes and at other times struggles to exist. At times, imitation is an intentional method, broadly practiced; other times it is barely noticeable. Whether overtly or covertly, intentional or unintentional, imitation has always been a part of the teaching discourse. A quick walk through this long history will reveal some important attitudes for us to remember as we consider how composition teachers use imitation and how homiletics teachers can learn from them.

Generally speaking composition teachers and scholars seem to think that imitation was an accepted teaching methodology before the modern era. In an article that traces the development of topics for composition assignments, Robert Connors (1986) makes the claim that up until 1800 or so, imitation was the default method of teaching discourse

(p.168).¹⁷ While imitation may have been the default teaching method, the use of imitation was at times neglected and even opposed. If imitation has been used across the ages with various degrees of success and failure, with acceptance and opposition, then it follows that there would be timeless lessons from which the contemporary users of imitation should benefit.

2.1 Imitation Pedagogy in Antiquity: Advocated by Many and Forbidden by None

Historical surveys of composition studies often begin with the forming of the discipline of rhetoric in ancient Greece. Since this project encompasses the discipline of homiletics which has its roots in ancient Judaism and early Christianity, this section will begin with these two closely related ancient religious traditions and then follow the more familiar path of the rhetoric of the Greeks and Romans, ending with Augustine.

From the Hebrew culture we will learn that following rules takes precedent when a model is not perceived to be available. From early Christian education, the opposite of this comes when the perfect model is seen to be in Jesus. From the Greeks and Romans we will see that most rhetors strongly advocated imitation, but some express hesitation. The use of pedagogical imitation in antiquity indicates that imitation should be used but with caution.

Imitation in Ancient Hebrew Education: Jewish culture has existed in various forms across three millennia. William Barclay (1974) makes a convincing case that the early and extensive emphasis upon education is one reason that the culture has been able

¹⁷ In *Personal Writing Assignments*, Robert Connors shows that up until about 1800 writing assignments were always about general topics and asked the students to express the thoughts of proven historical authorities. In essence all assignments were some form of a research paper. Students were to write about a well discussed topic such as “friendship” citing what others had already said about it. There was little concern to let the student express his or her own thoughts.

to maintain this identity for these many centuries. His study is based upon a thorough examination of the Old Testament and the Talmud as well as non-canonical Jewish Scripture (p. 11-48). In this culture, in which education was of high importance, there is a conspicuous absence of any record of imitation being used in formal education.

The lack of information about formal education in ancient Jewish culture creates difficulty in looking for the use of imitation or any teaching methodology. There is considerable debate regarding when a formal school emerged in the ancient Hebrew educational system. It seems that up until 70 C.E. education was handled in a family setting.¹⁸ If education was handled mainly by parents, then it is understandable that there would be little written record of teaching methods. Since no methodological sources exist, perhaps by examining the content of the teaching some light can be shed on the use of imitation in ancient Jewish education. Fortunately, the Torah and other Hebrew writings are well preserved and accessible for this study. A primary tool used to educate young men was the Jewish book of Proverbs which was addressed specifically to young men.¹⁹ The primary teaching method used here is observation. Frequently, as in the following example, the writer asks the young person to observe the ways of certain

¹⁸ Some would say the formal education began as early as 700 B.C.E. and others would say that it emerged at the same time the Roman system of formal education. Fletcher Swift (1919) in his *Education in Ancient Israel*, which is quoted by many other sources, articulates three periods in the development of the ancient Hebrew education system: (1) The *Pre-exilic period* (prior to 586 B.C.E.), in which there was no formal school and education was handled exclusively by the parents; (2) *Post exilic period* (prior to 70 C.E.), in which synagogue elementary schools were established, schools for scribes began to emerge and there was some evidence of limited higher education, although parents still had the major role supplemented by scribes; and (3) *Talmudic period* (prior to 550 C.E.), in which a complete educational system was established, including higher education, where parents still taught in the home but Rabbis became the major teachers (Swift, 1919, p. 6). James Crenshaw (1998) in a more recent study presents considerable opposition to the timetable for the emergence of a formal educational system, citing numerous studies, some of which place the beginning of formal education in Jewish culture as late as the seventh or eighth century (p. 4). However, he does affirm that the family was always the primary educator. Barclay's research into the Old Testament and Talmud strongly agrees with Swift's and Crenshaw's emphasis that the family was the primary place of education in Ancient Jewish culture.

¹⁹ For greater detail on the purpose of the book see Bruce K. Waltke, (2005) *The Book of Proverbs*.

people and learn from what they see: “At the window of my house I looked out through the lattice. I saw among the simple, I noticed the young men, a youth who lacked judgment. He was going down the street to her corner.” (Proverbs 7:6-8).²⁰ This method of teaching wisdom is repeated numerous times. There are also analogous observations from nature: “Go to the ant, you sluggard, consider its ways and be wise” (Proverbs 6:1). The bulk of the content of *Proverbs* is wise statements about life and recommendations for ways to apply that wisdom, but there is no command to imitate or even model the wise person. Perhaps it is assumed that the young person will in some way strive to be like the wise person and not the foolish person, but it is never specifically mentioned that the young person should “be like,” “model after,” or “imitate” the wise.²¹

In the Torah, which is the codification and exposition of religious and civil law, Israel is commanded to teach God’s commands to the children as part of daily life:

These commandments that I give you today are to be upon your hearts. Impress them upon your children. Talk about them when you sit at home, and when you walk along the road, when you lie down and when you get up. Tie them as symbols on your hands and bind them on your foreheads. Write them on the door posts of your houses and on your gates. (Deuteronomy 6:6-9)

To this day, Orthodox Jews still practice this command by writing portions of scripture and binding those to doorpost and even putting portions in small amulets. This practice along with the exhortation from the Jewish Psalter to “hide Scripture in ones heart” (Psalms 119:11) strongly implies that memorization was used as a teaching method in

²⁰ All Biblical reference will use the New American Standard Translation.

²¹ Another wisdom book, Ecclesiastes, presents a lengthy description of the search for meaning in life. The writer explores many areas of life and strives to experience every venue of pleasure and purpose concluding with a simple exhortation that is based upon his observations: “Fear God and keep His commandments” (Ecclesiastes 12:13). Throughout the book there is the theme that he is searching for wisdom and meaning in life, but imitation is never mentioned.

ancient Jewish culture. While imitation may result from memorization, imitation is not commanded either explicitly or implicitly.

In these canonical documents, as well as the non-canonical²², which governed ancient Jewish culture, there is no mention of or even an illusion to imitation as an educational method. If no teaching method was mentioned at all, then the absence of imitation would have no ramifications, but since the teaching methods of observation and memorization are prescribed, the absence of imitation is conspicuous. What this means is difficult to surmise, for absence does not mean a rejection of the method. It can at least be said that in the ancient Jewish culture as reflected in the Torah, wisdom literature, and non-canonical writing, imitation was not advocated either for formal or informal education. In his article on the Greek word *Mimeomai*, mentioned in the previous chapter, W. Michaelis (1973) summarizes the Old Testament concept of imitation: “On the whole the idea of imitation is foreign to the OT. In particular, there is no thought that we must imitate God” (p. 663). Nor, I would add, is there a directive to imitate other people.

For ancient Jewish culture, the primary way of learning how to live life is by following the laws of God rather than following the examples of others. Therefore, it is understandable that imitation was not articulated as a teaching method in ancient Jewish culture because following a human example is to follow a human and not God. This

²² The concept of imitation is briefly mentioned in the Jewish non-canonical books. In the Latin Vulgate a version of the word *imitor* is used in a negative sense in the non-canonical Book of Wisdom (15:9) to describe what god-less people do when they make an idol: they imitate a bronze-worker, and it is used in Esdras 15:48 to describe the sinful imitation by Asia of the sins of Babylon. In the Septuagint which is the Greek version of the Old Testament and other non-canonical Jewish writings, *mimesis* is used in the passage cited above (15:9) and in a more positive way to describe the temple as an imitation of the tent in heaven (9:8) and in an exhortation to imitate virtue (4:2). This last reference is not a command to imitate another person, but to imitate a personification of virtue, which is in essence a command to follow God’s principles and laws.

resistance to imitation may also be rooted in the Jewish view of man and their view of God's law. According to the Torah, there is no person who can keep all the law, and thus, it contains an elaborate description of a system of atonement for sins. This lack of a perfect keeper of the law is described by a seventh century B.C.E. Jewish prophet: "the heart is desperately wicked who can understand it" (Jeremiah 17:9.) In contrast, the law or Torah itself was perfect, for it came from God. This is articulated in numerous Old Testament passages, but most strikingly in the 119th Psalter, in which almost two hundred verses are extolling the perfect nature and power of God's law.

This cautious view of imitation is helpful to the contemporary user of imitation. When imitation is employed as a teaching method, the instructor must remember and explain to the students that there is no perfect model. Rules of preaching or composition are broken by even the best model. Having imperfect models can be encouraging to the students: the model and the students have something in common—they both make mistakes. This lack of formal use of imitation also gives the contemporary teacher a reminder that following rules can be an effective way of learning.

Imitation in Ancient Christian Education: Turning to the early Christian era, we see a significant difference in the attitude towards imitation than was expressed in the Old Testament. In the writings of the New Testament, imitation is not only mentioned but it is specifically commanded. Christians are urged to imitate individuals, groups and characteristics.²³ Jesus himself stated that when a student is fully trained, the student will

²³ Christians are commanded:

to imitate the apostle Paul "Therefore I exhort you, be imitators (*mimetai*) of me."
(1 Corinthians 4:16);

to imitate God "Therefore be imitators (*mimetai*) of God, as beloved children."
(Ephesians 5:1);

be like his teacher (Luke 6:40). These commands all contain the same Greek root word *mimesis* which links these commands to the Greek concept of imitation. This emphasis upon imitation has at least two possible sources: the new theology of Jesus of Nazareth being the perfect model of humanity and the Hellenistic influence in the first century Jewish culture out of which came Christianity.

This acceptance of imitation by the early Christians has its roots in the very commands and person of Jesus. He directed his disciples to “follow him.” This was not a direct use of the word imitation, but it implies a model. By the first century B.C.E. Hellenistic culture was strongly felt in Israel and provides us with a reasonable explanation of the rise of imitation in early Christianity. The Hellenistic culture was influenced by the Platonic concept of the “perfect” existing and the present world simply being a reflection or an inferior copy. The Christian belief that Jesus was the perfect human, combined with this Platonic influence, provided very fertile ground for imitation to flourish in early Christianity. In contrast to the ancient Hebrew setting, early Christianity clearly encouraged imitation as a process for learning to live in a Christian way because now, in Jesus, there was a worthy model to be copied. The lesson is easily carried across time: Imitation is dependent upon a good model.

to imitate both the apostles and God “You also became imitators (*mimetai*) of us and of the Lord. (1 Thessalonians 1:6);
to imitate the faith of other Christians, “... imitate (*mimeisthe*) their faith.” (Hebrews 13:7);
not to imitate evil, but good “Beloved, do not imitate (*mimou*) what is evil, but what is good.” (3 John 11);
and they are commended for imitating other churches “... you, brethren, became imitators (*mimetai*) of the churches of God.” (1 Thessalonians 2:14).

Imitation in Ancient Greek Education: Imitation pedagogy in ancient Greece seems to have been common place. Isocrates used it and advocated its use, while others, such as Plato, seem to have accepted its use but cautioned against using it too often. In pre-Socratic times, two factors created a favorable environment in which imitation could be accepted as a common pedagogy: the extensive use of Homer as an example and the Greek educational system.

Homer's writings were central to the education in pre-Socratic Greece. Homer's writings not only set examples of how to write but they also set examples of character. In his classic work *Education in Antiquity*, H.I. Marrou (1956) cites several later Greek authors who refer to the importance of Homer in the education of Greeks throughout antiquity and perhaps even through the twelfth century. While Homer left no specific pedagogy or even comments about education, a dominant theme of his writing was the exemplary hero. This theme implies an unwritten pedagogy which is at least compatible with a pedagogy of imitation. Marrou claims that there are "many testimonies to the fact that every cultivated Greek had a copy of Homer by his bedside" and sites Alexander the Great as an example (1956, p. 9). Thus, an early educational tool relied upon "example" as a primary pedagogical method. Imitation was also becoming part of the formal ancient Greek pedagogy as seen in their system of education. Ruth Webb in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (2001) presents in detail a system that the Greeks used based upon a description by Theon in his work entitled *Progymnasmata* (p. 289-292).²⁴ In this

²⁴ Malcolm Heath (2002/3, p. 129) gives evidence, based on manuscript fragments and the way in which Theon's *Progymnasmata* was used in the fifth century C.E., that it was written at that later date. He qualifies his view by saying it is not conclusive. If Heath's work is correct, it takes away what was thought to be an earlier description of Greek education. However, there are other sources, such as Marrou's work, that confirm the existence of the practice of *progymnasmata* but not in the detail that Theon gives.

standard methodology, students recited and copied portions of speeches from proven models. The early Greeks were accustomed to a thought process that formally included the concept of being like someone else. The contemporary students might not be as accustomed to a thought process of copying another, which gives instructors seeking to use imitation an extra challenge to overcome. Appropriate groundwork needs to be laid to help create an atmosphere in which students will be open to using imitation.

Plato's view of imitation pedagogy: Plato's view of imitation pedagogy comes to us through bits and pieces gleaned from his writings, for he has no formal description of how teaching should take place. A portion of Plato's writings that might express his view of imitation as a teaching method comes from *Phaedrus*. The character of Phaedrus has been enamored with a speech of Lysius and discusses it with Socrates. Socrates, then, uses Phaedrus' interest in this speech as an opportunity to teach Phaedrus about the art of speaking. His method of teaching is not to criticize the speech; instead he gives Phaedrus a better example. This setting up of a better example gives the impression that a certain amount of imitation is expected by Plato. More specifically he mentions imitation in the middle of the second major speech of Socrates. Here Plato uses the word *mimēomai* (imitation) in referring to the way a young man should follow his god. This is perhaps in line with his world view of the ideal existing and the world being a shadow or poor copy of the perfect. It could be reasoned that Plato saw the gods as a copy worthy of imitation.

A passage which presents a negative view of using imitation as a teaching method occurs towards the end of *Phaedrus*. Here Socrates advocates the importance of order and unity in a speech by quoting an epigram in which order doesn't seem important, implying that Lysius' speech lacks order and unity. Phaedrus responds

defensively and asks if Socrates is making fun of the speech, “And yet I think there were many things in it which would be useful examples to consider, though not exactly to imitate” (264E. Harold Fowler, trans.).²⁵ Plato was not opposed to Phaedrus considering the speech and learning from its example; he was opposed to Phaedrus imitating it. The speech was an inferior example unlike the gods which he earlier said to imitate. Plato does not specifically tell one to imitate in his dialogues. This apparent hesitancy to use imitation as a teaching method is reinforced in his comments regarding imitation in his *The Republic*.

In *The Republic* Plato is proposing his model society, based upon his view of reality which he illustrates with the famous cave example. For Plato, the ideal is the real and what we have in this world is an inferior copy or shadow of the “real” thing. He drives this point home in book ten of *The Republic* when he makes this statement regarding imitation: “Imitation is an inferior thing that consorts with another inferior thing to produce inferior offspring” (603b). He comments that a painter can imitate a couch when he creates a picture of one, but the painter may know nothing about a couch,

²⁵ There are at least three different translations of his reply and each seems to emphasize a slightly different view of imitation:

“It might furnish many other examples of what a man ought rather to avoid”
(Clark, 1957, p.166.)

“I think it has plenty of useful examples, provided one tries to emulate them as little as possible.” (Nehamas and Woodruff, 1995, p.62.)

“And yet I think there were many things in it which would be useful examples to consider, though not exactly to imitate.” (Harold Fowler, trans., p. 530.)

The key word in the translation is *mimetai* (imitation). Clark’s translation seems to put imitation and example under that same broad category saying that one should avoid examples from this speech, implying that Plato saw no difference between example and imitation. This does reflect Plato’s use of two different words: *example* and *imitation*. Nehamas and Woodruff are more specific in saying that one should emulate the examples from the speech as little as possible. Fowler’s translation maintains this difference between example and imitation. The latter two translations have Phaedrus considering the examples but not imitating them.

only what one looks like. The one who makes a couch is closer to knowing it but still he may not know what is done with the couch. Then, there is the one who truly knows a couch because of use and experience with it. He states that the painted imitation is thrice removed from the real object (600 ff.). Poets, he says, are like painters only producing a thrice removed imitation from the real thing. Thus, for him, this kind of imitation is inferior and doesn't need to be a part of his ideal society. Poetry is striving to mimic or imitate a feeling or experience. His opposition to imitation comes because he feels this kind of imitation is fruitless; it only stirs up desires, which should be controlled (605b). From this, it is clear that at a societal level, he is opposed to the imitation or re-creation of emotions and feelings. This opposition needs to be balanced with the earlier references in which he seems to allow for the imitating of gods and virtuous moral character of others (396d). When it comes to learning morals, Plato seems to allow imitation, but he does not appear to encourage its use as a pedagogical method. The contemporary application of this is that the teacher who uses imitation must remember that there are many who do not use it. Perhaps they, as Plato was, are fearful that the wrong things will be imitated.

Isocrates view of pedagogical imitation: Isocrates who trained rhetors as a contemporary of Plato presents a clearer and more positive view of imitation as a pedagogical method. In his encomium *Evagoras*, Isocrates mentions that those who want to be the best should imitate persons who have both good character and the skills necessary to speak well (section 75). Though the purpose of the work is to praise Evagoras, Isocrates makes this passing comment which seems to show his favorable stance towards imitation as a pedagogical methodology. In *Nicocles* a ruler of this name is giving various instructions regarding imitating those of a higher rank. He instructs

those of lower ranks not to envy those with higher ranks but to imitate them (section 60). The implication is that one would imitate their good character, for those that should be imitated are described as good men. However, imitation could also be more general to include activities and speech. In *Areopagiticus*, which is a speech written by Isocrates to encourage his audience through a difficult time, he concludes by calling for imitation of ancestors who protected Athens (section 84). In *Against the Sophist*, he instructs that the teacher must be a model of the forms that are being taught so that the student may imitate the teacher (section 17). While all these show his favorable view of imitation, the last passage is very clear in his encouragement of imitation as a pedagogical method. Isocrates was not opposed to principles, but it seems that he thought principles could be too ridged and relied more upon examples.²⁶ In contrast to Plato, Isocrates advocated and apparently used imitation as a teaching methodology.

Aristotle's view of Pedagogical Imitation: In his *Rhetoric*, he does not mention imitation, but he has an extended discussion of it in his *Sophistical Refutations*. It is quoted here in length for he clearly makes his point that imitation can produce a product, but it doesn't seem to teach the skill:

For the training given by the paid professors of contentious arguments was like the treatment of the matter by Gorgias. For they used to hand out speeches to be learned by heart, some rhetorical, others in the form of question and answer, each side supposing that their arguments on either side generally fall among them. And therefore the teaching they gave their pupils was ready but rough. For they used to suppose that they trained people by imparting to them not the art but its products, as though any one professing that he would impart a form of knowledge to

²⁶ Though there is no record of Isocrates writing a handbook of rhetoric principles, Terry Papillion makes a case that Isocrates' opposition to handbooks was not an opposition to rhetorical handbooks in general but to overly ridged handbooks. Papillion goes on to make the feasible case that Isocrates perhaps wrote or at least used rhetorical handbooks. These were not filled with ridged concepts, which would have been more like Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, rather Isocrates used handbooks with examples for students to follow, rather than principles to follow (Papillion, 1995, p.149-163).

obviate any pain in the feet, were then not to teach a man the art of shoe-making or the sources whence he can acquire anything of the kind, but were to present him with several kinds of shoes of all sorts: for he has helped him to meet his need, but has not imparted an art to him. Moreover, on the subject of Rhetoric there exists much that has been said long ago, whereas on the subject of reasoning we had nothing else of an earlier date to speak of at all, but were kept at work for a long time in experimental researches. (2007, Pickard. Trans. P. 34)

Here Aristotle is showing that the use of examples emphasizes the product rather than teaching the art. It would be arguing from silence to say that he is opposed to imitation or the use of examples, though he does seem opposed to examples and imitation being the only source of learning. His extensive work on rhetorical principles written in a systematic way clearly shows that in his mind the best way to teach was through the learning of principles. Should we steer away from imitation based upon Aristotle's apparent rejection of it? If all imitation produces is a product, as Aristotle says in this account, then the process emphasis in composition studies would support not using imitation. It should be remembered that Aristotle is not known for his teaching methodology, but rather for his systematization of rhetorical principles. He was not writing about teaching rhetoric, he was writing about rhetoric. Thus, his lack of support for imitation need not hinder the contemporary pedagogue from using it. Aristotle's lack of support is a valuable lesson for the contemporary teacher who wishes to use imitation. There is a distinction between the principles and an exercise using imitation. If a teacher uses imitation there should be some emphasis upon the principles as well.

In ancient Greece, there is a mixture of attitudes towards the use of imitation. Plato seemed to tolerate it, since it fit into his world view; Isocrates clearly advocated it; and Aristotle seems cautious of it. Even at this early stage, imitation as a teaching method

is accepted by some but others are hesitant about it. This use of imitation carries over into the pedagogy of Roman rhetoric where imitation is not only accepted, it is championed.

Imitation Pedagogy in Roman Antiquity: All three of the most prominent of the Roman rhetors, Cicero, *Ad Herennium's* author and Quintilian speak in depth about imitation as a methodology with Quintilian writing extensively about it. Based upon these three it seems that imitation was fully accepted and widely used as a methodology from Cicero to Quintilian.

Cicero and the Pedagogy of Imitation: In *De Oratore*, Cicero is describing a very gifted young orator who speaks too rapidly and has other faults common to young speakers. He describes how he advised the young orator to choose a master from whom to learn; hopefully, this model would be Crassus. The young man's improvement over the period of a year is described and Cicero concludes the section with "Assuredly Nature herself was leading him [the young orator] into the grand and glorious style of Crassus, but could never have made him proficient enough, had he not pressed forward on that same way by careful imitation . . . of Crassus" (II, xxi, 89). In the next section (II, xxii), Cicero gives his counsel regarding whom should be imitated. He highlights various Greek and Roman orators, highlighting Isocrates as the master of them all. He offers the direction that in learning from the "master," a student must be careful not to imitate everything but only the good things. In this same section, Cicero goes on to say that indiscriminate imitation is mindless copying, which is not learning. Imitation, for Cicero, should be selective of a model's strengths. In *Imitation and Evolution*, Elaine Fantham (1978) comments extensively on this section of *De Oratore* arguing that Cicero was showing that Roman rhetoric owed its development to the imitation of previous orators.

For her, Cicero was saying that just as Greeks developed their rhetoric through imitation of other Greek orators, so too, Roman rhetoric would develop as Roman rhetoric was imitated (p. 2). Cicero was not only advocating the use of imitation, he saw it as a key to improving rhetoric across the generations.

*Pedagogical Imitation in Rhetorica ad Herennium*²⁷: A very clear outline of rhetoric is given early in this work: the three types of speech, “Epideitic, Deliberative and Judicial” and the five canons of rhetoric, “Invention, Arrangement, Style, Memory and Delivery.” These categories are used by other Roman writers, but *ad Herennium* is the clearest articulation of them. The author goes on to state that these can be acquired by “Theory, Imitation and Practice” (Book I, II. 3). In a later section, imitation is further commented on when the author writes that teachers of eloquence should be models of eloquence. It would be foolish for a teacher to say that he could direct students to eloquence when he can’t seem to find it himself (IV, vi. 9). The author was giving guidelines for the teacher who it was assumed would be the model that was imitated. According to *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, imitation was a well-accepted and was a standard educational method.

Quintilian and the Pedagogy of Imitation: Quintilian wrote a book for the specific purpose of training orators. The title is very significant. He could have entitled it, “The Teaching of Rhetoric” or “On Oratory”, but his title *Institutio Oratoria* is best translated as “the instruction of an orator.” His goal is not just the passing on of rhetorical theory;

²⁷ The author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is unknown. For years it was thought that Cicero was its author, for there are similarities between Cicero’s works and the content of *ad Herennium*. Thus, it was attributed to him. However there is no clear evidence that Cicero wrote it. It is significant that Cicero is not the author for it gives an additional voice in Roman rhetoric.

his goal is to teach orators. He emphasizes imitation as a teaching method being used at the outset of a person's life, saying that the nurse of the infant must not be "ungrammatical" because she is an early model that the infant will imitate, even though the nurse is not technically a teacher (I, 4-5). He reaffirms the importance of a good model, even when the person is not a designated teacher, when he says that the *paedagogus*, who was a slave that functioned somewhat as a nanny, should speak well so that he could correct mistakes a nurse may have passed on to the child (I, 10-11). Throughout this work, he mentions various anecdotal uses of imitation and then articulates its use in detail in Book X, Chapter 2. There he begins with a broad principle that one sees imitation in all of life when he says, "And it is a universal rule of life that we should wish to copy what we approve in others" (X, 2.2). His foundation for the use of imitation is that everyone imitates others in some way. However, before he gives guidelines for using imitation, he qualifies that imitation has its limits and drawbacks.

Imitation alone cannot bring improvement beyond the model, for the "one who follows another must on necessity always be behind him" (X, 2.9). Not only will the craft as a whole never improve solely based upon imitation, but he seems to imply that imitation alone could hurt the progress of rhetoric. He states this by saying:

Again, whatever is like another object, must necessarily be inferior to the object of its imitation, just as the shadow is inferior to the substance, the portrait to the features which it portrays, and the acting of the player to the feelings which he endeavors to produce. (X, 2.10)

This has a hint of Platonism in it, but Quintilian seems to be speaking in a very pragmatic way; a duplicate is never as good as the original. This leads him to ask for caution in choosing whom and what to imitate. One must be selective not only about the models but

about the characteristics of those models. There is not a perfect model, thus only the good things from the best models are to be imitated. After presenting the limitations of imitation, he gives specific principles to be remembered as imitation is being used. It is unquestioned that Quintilian was a great advocate of using imitation as a pedagogical model.

Roman rhetoric during the era from Cicero to Quintilian saw a shifting of emphasis. Under the republic, rhetoric enjoyed a role of influence through senators and even citizens, but with the coming of the empire, rhetoric had to be content with training young people to be good citizens who spoke well. This shift caused the pedagogical aspects of rhetoric to be given more attention. During this emphasis upon the educational aspects of rhetoric, imitation flourished as a teaching methodology. All three of the major Roman rhetoricians advocate the use of imitation with Quintilian going even farther to suggest guidelines for its use. Each of these saw imitation as a way of connecting to previous generations and expanding the collective skills. Rather than an isolated teaching method, the present day teachers of composition and preaching can see imitation as a way to broaden the collective skills in their disciplines.

Augustine's Use of Imitation Pedagogy: While he doesn't spell out the use of imitation as a pedagogical method, he is not opposed to it. Early in Book IV of *De doctriana Christiana*, he comments on learning from the rules as opposed to learning from examples, "For those with acute and eager minds more readily learn eloquence by reading and hearing the eloquent than following the rules of eloquence" (Book IV, iii.4). This implies that an eager mind will learn best by imitating what he reads and hears. In the next paragraph he makes the comparison that children learn to speak by imitation,

thus one can learn eloquence in the same way. He goes on to say that one can be eloquent without knowing the rules; but he cannot be eloquent without reading and hearing eloquence. This leads one to believe that Augustine saw imitation as the best way to teach eloquence. Rules were good but not as important as good models. Later he specifically directs those wishing to speak well to imitate those with eloquence. “Indeed, he who wishes to speak not only wisely but also eloquently ... should more eagerly engage in ... imitating them...” (IV, v. 8).

Near the conclusion of his work, he presents a concept similar to the teaching of Isocrates, Cicero (whom he quotes often) and Quintilian when he says that the character of the speaker should also serve as an example for the student’s character (IV, xxix, 61-62). This is followed by a suggestion which, in the ears of modern preachers, sounds sinful and in the ears of teachers of composition, plagiaristic. Augustine tells his readers that if a person cannot come up with a good sermon on his own, he should memorize one already written. He justifies this by saying that the sermons belong to God and not to those who preach them. While he doesn’t comment on the pedagogical value of this imitative copying of a sermon, it would seem that the practice of imitating was quite accepted by Augustine.

In a biography of Augustine which has been in publication since 1967 and most recently in 2000, Peter Brown says that in *Doctrina Christiana*, Augustine by-passes the “most self-conscious element in late Roman education, the obsession with rules of eloquence” (1967, p. 267). While it might be debatable that late Roman rhetorical education was obsessed with rules, it is clear that Augustine does not give us a set of

rhetorical rules to follow. Brown's observation that Augustine by-passed rules in favor of examples gives further credence to Augustine's dependence upon imitation.

In many ways, Augustine advocates the use of imitation. He gives examples for the students to follow in a loose sense and suggests that some directly imitate a sermon that another has written. Imitation for Augustine was an integral part of his pedagogical thinking. This is an expression of his rhetorical training in the Roman system which relied heavily upon imitation as was seen most clearly in Quintilian's writings. Certainly, the contemporary teacher of preaching should heed the example of this respected and influential theologian and preacher.

Summary of the Use of Imitation in Antiquity: The use of imitation in antiquity is advocated by many and forbidden by none. The religious setting of ancient Hebrew culture did not mention it while Christianity encouraged it. The Greek educational system as well as the most noted teacher of rhetoric in antiquity, Isocrates, encouraged it. However, Aristotle does not mention it as an educational method and Plato seems to be suspicious of it. For the Romans, it was an integral part of their educational system and it is affirmed by Augustine. The practice of imitation as a teaching method in antiquity serves as a favorable example, but not a wholesale acceptance it. The use of imitation in antiquity advocates that it should be used, but with caution.

2.2 Imitation Pedagogy in the Middle Ages: Assumed but Not Advocated

Low Middle Ages: The low Middle Ages has only a few figures that say anything about imitation at all and even fewer that speak about the use of imitation in education. Boethius (480- 524) was mainly a philosopher who subordinated rhetoric to dialectic and saw rhetoric as a tool to be used, but not a generative discipline. Although it seems that

he was not familiar with Aristotle's *On Rhetoric*, his *Overview of the Structure of Rhetoric* follows the same general plan: principles without examples (Miller, Trans. 1973). He did not offer any comment on teaching methodology, for this, apparently, was far beyond his intention in writing this short description of rhetoric. His work is quite passive in that he does not suggest that these are rules to follow, only descriptions to be observed. Boethius is not advocating the use of imitation, for he gives descriptions rather than principles and offers no examples to follow. In his other notable work, *Topica Boetii*, he is more concerned with the relationship of rhetoric to dialectic but makes no mention of the use of imitation or any form of teaching methods (Murphy, 1974, p. 69). In the mid sixth century, Cassiodorus wrote *Institutiones Divinarum* in which he viewed rhetorical principles as discoveries of God's creation rather than the creations of man's thought.²⁸ In his preface, he tells his students that the writers of the past should be a guide for proper hermeneutics and even explicitly states that they are worthy of imitation:

In the first book we have presented teachers of the former ages who are always available and prepared to teach you, not so much by their speech as through your eyes. Therefore, learned brothers, wisely moderate your desires, and in imitation of those who desire to gain health of the body, learn what is to be read in proper order. (Cassiodorus, p. 1)

Wibaldus of Stavelot's *Letter to Manegold* (1149) spells out to a former student his philosophy of education. He begins with a foundation common to many writers of the Middle Ages—that the most important goal of education is the knowledge of God. All education should lead us to better know Him. This reinforces the concept that rhetorical

²⁸ This is very important considering the church's suspicion of "pagan" writers. In the introduction to *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*, Joseph Miller, Michael Prosser and Thomas Benson (1973) articulate a general characteristic of the Medieval era—the church's hostile suspicion of pagan writers. Cassiodorus viewed his principles like the laws of nature; therefore they could be more easily embraced when examples were presented from pagan authors (p. xiii).

principles are beyond culture and are given to us ultimately from God, thus there is no danger in learning from non-Christian sources. He goes on to clearly state his view that imitation is the best way to learn rhetoric:

If you see the examples of another, you are taught: if you listen to another, you are instructed: if you follow another, you are brought to perfection. And so, if you are moved by fame coming from eloquence, pick out someone to emulate, and let your spirit be gently touched by his eloquence. It is the unanimous opinion of the best speakers that there is a greater possibility of speaking more elegantly and fluently by imitating the eloquent than by following rules of rhetoric. (Miller, 1973, p.213)

These writers of the Low Middle ages generally support imitation but do not add any significant insight to the use of imitation in education. However, they are worthy of mentioning to show that imitation, as a pedagogical method, continued through this era.

The High Middle Ages: Around 1100, rhetoric began to develop in three distinct areas²⁹: *Ars dictaminis*, *Ars grammatica*, and *Ars praedicandi*. Three exemplary works will be examined as defined in James J. Murphy's *Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts*, (2001). Murphy chose these three because they "represent major streams of medieval thought about writing and speaking" (p. xxii.).

Ars dictaminis: Following the pattern of Alberic³⁰ (1087,) several books were written from roughly 1100-1400 which offered guidelines for the writing of letters. One

²⁹ In a festschrift honoring James J. Murphy, Martin Camargo (1995) concisely describes this division of rhetoric. "Rhetoric fragmented and then fused with several related disciplines more central to medieval life. Insofar as rhetoric was concerned with methods of discovery and proof it was swallowed up by dialectic: in so far as it was concerned with verbal ornament it was swallowed up by grammar and poetry: insofar as it was the culmination of the ideal citizen's training it was swallowed up by moral theology and homiletics." (p.83)

³⁰ In this first work to relate the principles of rhetoric to the emerging art of letter writing, imitation is encouraged, but it is only the imitation of structure. In *Flowers of Rhetoric* (1087) Alberic of Monte Cassino articulates guidelines and principles and gives examples, specifically saying that these examples can be imitated (III. 6). The imitation is not of the style of writing, rather he was suggesting that the

of these is the anonymous *Rationes dictandi* written in Bologna in 1135. The format of this work is to give the proper five part structure of a letter: salutation, securing of goodwill, narration, petition and the conclusion. These are defined and examples are given for each with the salutation receiving the most attention, having dozens of examples. This accepted structure is followed by discussion of more general guidelines for writing such as the flow of thought, with examples once again following. While there is no explicit reference to imitation, it is clear that the author intends his readers to copy his examples, for the author even gives blanks to be filled in by the student. The numerous examples given by the author could give evidence that imitation was an assumed method of learning. However, even with this specific reference to imitation, it would be in error to see this as a pedagogical strategy, for it seems that the purpose of imitating the form of the letter was to achieve standardization, rather than to improve the writer's ability to compose a letter.

Ars grammatical: Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria nova* (The New Poetics) was written about 1215 and was based upon the concepts in *Ad Herennium*, and it serves as an example of *Ars grammatica*. Marjorie Curry Woods (1991) who examined numerous Medieval commentaries on this work states that *Poetria nova* was the basic textbook of rhetorical composition for three centuries. This is indicated by the more than 200 copies of this work that have survived (p.56). Geoffrey presents general guidelines for what should characterize good poetry, but he seems to mean that these concepts apply to prose as well, for most of his examples are not poetry. He articulates various figures of speech

structure of the letters be imitated. Later he twice refers to examples, which continues this affirming view of this methodology, implying that they should be imitated (IV.5, VII .2).

and rhetorical devices, giving examples for each one that he identifies. The examples are quite varied, ranging from a vivid description of feminine beauty, to an excerpt from a sermon exalting the sacrificial death of Christ for the sins of the world (Murphy, 2001, p.51, 54). As he presents examples, there is little admonition to follow these examples. It seems he is presenting the examples not to be imitated but to further explain a principle. However, towards the end of his work, he exhorts his readers to apply themselves to knowing the art, practicing the art and then imitating examples:

Three things perfect the poem: art, by whose rule you should be governed, practice, which you should cultivate; your betters, whom you should imitate. Art makes artists sure, practice makes them quick, imitation makes them tasteful; all three combined produce those artists that are preeminent. (2001, Murphy, p. 94)

This is the only specific call to imitate in this influential work which may be an indication that as a teaching method, imitation was assumed or that it was not as prevalent as thought. In contrast to the examples of letters in the anonymous *Rationes dictandi* which were clearly to be copied, Geoffrey gives principles with examples which seem to be for understanding rather than copying. His work was a set of guidelines to follow, and apparently, the imitation he mentions in the above quote was to be of other works.

Ars praedicandi: Preaching had been for centuries a homily or loose commenting on a text, with little structure and form. Robert of Basevorn's *Forma praedicandi* (1322) is one of many preaching manuals produced in this later part of the Middle Ages which emphasized a new sermon form called the "university sermon" due to its popularity at universities. Basevorn presents fifty chapters covering who should preach, the nature of preaching, and historical examples. The heart of his work is "twenty-two ways of ornamenting a sermon" in which he explains what makes a good theme, where it should

come from, how it should be divided and other aspects of a sermon. For these twenty-two principles, he gives some examples but not consistently, and they seem to be more for explanation purposes rather than examples to imitate. He does not exhort his readers to imitate him or other preachers.

From these three examples of the emerging disciplines of rhetoric, the use of imitation as a teaching method was not discouraged, nor was it championed. The writers from the earlier Middle Ages seemed to allow for imitation and mentioned it in passing, but there is not the same treatment that Quintilian gave to the practice. Marjorie Woods (1993) states at the outset of her article *Some Techniques of Teaching Rhetorical Poetics in the Schools of Medieval Europe* that imitation was part of the daily routine in the latter Middle Ages (p.91); however the commentaries on *Poetria nova* upon which she bases her observations apparently do not mention imitation or give specific examples. It seems that imitation as a teaching method was used in the Middle Ages, but it is only briefly mentioned in the major rhetorical texts.

2.3 Imitation Pedagogy in the Renaissance: From Hesitant Use to Full Acceptance

During the Renaissance, rhetoric increased in importance due to its ability to help one climb the social ladder and due to its effectiveness in spreading or countering the message of the Protestant Reformation. In this era, in which the queen of the sciences seemed to rise in its importance, so did the use of imitation to teach it. However, the groundwork for the decline of imitation as a teaching method was being sown.

Early Renaissance: Petrarch, one of the earliest writer of the Renaissance, discusses in a letter written around 1350 how this learning eloquence can take place. He specifically mentions imitation but in a somewhat pejorative way. He uses the device of

an imaginary contrarian who says that virtue is learned through the imitation of exemplary deeds and seems to imply that eloquence does not teach virtue. Petrarch doesn't disagree that imitation can teach virtue but makes a strong case that eloquence is perhaps even more effective in teaching virtue:

How many people have we seen in our time who have not been affected at all by received models of correct speech, but who, as if awakened, have been suddenly converted from the most wicked course of life to the greatest modesty merely by the words spoken by others! (Petrarch in Rebhorn, 1479/2000, p. 16)

The contrarian claims that virtue is learned through imitation of exemplary models, but Petrarch says that virtue is learned through the impact of eloquence. For Petrarch, the effective teaching or eloquent exhortation to be virtuous is more effective than imitation. He doesn't reject imitation as teaching virtue, but he does minimize its use.

Rudolf Agricola greatly influenced many of the later Renaissance rhetors through his 1479 publication of *De inventione dialectica libri tres* (Three Books Concerning Dialectical Invention) in which he seeks to present proper use of dialectic in speeches. Agricola articulates his purpose of teaching rhetoric at the beginning of the second chapter of Book Two:

Our purpose in this book is to teach the use of the places, that is—to say the same thing more plainly—to explain how to develop that verbal skill called dialectic. It seems to us that we can do this most agreeably if we show what material is, what tools it uses, and how it goes about handling things. (Rebhorn, 2000, p. 47)

In this work, there are very few examples, and these are only presented for explanation purposes, not examples for the student to follow. It could be argued that since he makes the separation of style or eloquence from invention and arrangement, which Ramus was later to make even more distinct, he has little need for examples. His purpose is to only teach the use of dialectic in speech not to teach style or delivery. Since style and delivery

are the elements of rhetoric that are often taught by example, it is not surprising that he does not advocate the use of imitation. His goal is to explore the use of dialectic in composing speech.³¹

Walter Ong (1974) in his seminal work on Peter Ramus shows how Ramus was greatly influenced by Agricola. Agricola seems to be silent on imitation. Ramus does mention it, but only slightly. Ong quotes Ramus, “a boy should learn by imitating classical writers especially Cicero” (p. 177). Ong goes on to say that Ramus also taught that learning can take place through the deducing of principles and applying those principles to practice. This relying upon the deduction which leads to practice, may be the reason he mentions imitation so briefly. Deducing principles and applying them leaves out the need to follow an example. Other insight into Ramus’ use and view of imitation comes through one of his critics. One such critic, Jacques Charpentier, pointed out that Ramus’ desire—that students should imitate a master—has had a major problem; after Ramus is through criticizing the masters there is no one left to imitate (Ong, 1974, p. 222). Ramus emphasized following principles rather than the following of a person who was flawed in the practice of those principles.

So at the outset of the Renaissance, three of the major writers who influenced rhetoric did not explicitly encourage the use of imitation and their philosophies seem to discourage it use. In the early years of the Renaissance, one can see the causal relationship between methodology and philosophy. The philosophy that emphasizes the loci and principles is not prone to the use of imitation, for imitation is by definition a copy of another’s work, not the following of rules.

³¹ Thomas M. Conley (1994) provides a good summary and analysis of Agricola, pp. 124-128.

Renaissance, Reformation Related Writers: There are major figures during this time of the Renaissance that one would hope speak to pedagogical imitation, such as Luther and Calvin, but they seem to remain silent on the issue. They were not seeking to be like those before them; they were separating from traditional ecclesiological structures and theological ideas. This understandably would give them a great hesitation to suggest that one learn from imitating those from whom they are trying to separate. Whatever the motivation, some of the loudest voices of this era seem to be silent on imitation.

Another clear voice of the Renaissance is Erasmus, who affirms the use of imitation as a teaching methodology in many places. In section three of his *De Ratione Studii* (On the Right Method of Instruction,) he parts from the earlier Renaissance emphasis upon rules when he states that learning language comes not from learning rules but by copying what is heard. The improvement of language then comes from practicing language and reading of good literature. He states:

For it is not by learning rules that we acquire the power of speaking a language, but by daily intercourse with those accustomed to express themselves with exactness and refinement, and by the copious reading of the best authors.
(Erasmus, 1511/2009. Sec.3)

While this is not an explicit reference to imitation, it does reveal his rejection of rules and principles being the primary teaching method. He not only rejected this sole dependence upon rules, he also rejected the other end of the spectrum that was expressed by those who copied Cicero as the sole example to follow. Erasmus later addresses the issue of only copying Cicero, in his *The Ciceronian*, by saying that Cicero advocated not slavishly following another's example, so to be like Cicero is to not be too much like

Cicero.³² Later in this work, he specifically states that he welcomes imitation as a teaching method (*The Ciceronian* in Rummel, ed. 2003, p. 133). In an article which defends the sixteenth-century humanist's claim that their educational product was ethical as well as grammatical, Edward Erdmann (1993) reports that, in the *Education of the Christina Prince*, Erasmus had a four step process for students to follow when they copied another's work. This imitation exercise ended with reflection upon what they had copied in order to discover any example that may be applicable to morality (p.4). In her commentary on Erasmus work, *A Time for Peace, the Ecclesiastes*, Judith Wozniak (1996) says that Erasmus did not advocate imitation for imitation sake, nor for the emulation of a certain model, but for the purpose of the learning that takes place when a model is used (p.115). He had in mind the ultimate purpose of the imitator becoming a better communicator, in ways unique to that person.

As part of Phillip Melanchthon's 1523 work, *Declamationes*, which was a general work on rhetoric, he presents the importance of the study of speech and expands into a discussion of the methods of learning good speech. Ultimately, Melanchthon all but commands his readers that they must imitate good models of rhetoric. Being a preacher and fond of illustrations, he begins with a metaphor of a student being "tanned" by good speech. Just as a person is tanned by being in sun, a student is influenced when he is exposed to a good model. He intensifies his view of the importance of models saying that

³² Two letters written in 1512/1513 which were published later as pamphlets express the two sides of the controversy. These were translated and published by Izora Scott (1910). The first written by Gianfrancesco Pico advocates that imitation should take place but it should be of many models rather than one. He argues that one cannot exactly imitate another, but one must cultivate that which God allows to shine upon us. This light comes from many sources and Pico specifically advocates the imitation of all good writers. (Scott, 1910. p.6) The response from Pietro Bembo expresses the side of those who Erasmus later called Cicerorians. Bembo simply says that only the best should be imitated and Cicero is the best (Scott, p.8-18).

through examples a young mind learns about, “ the power of words, the structure of orations, and the figures of speech needed to explain their thoughts” (Melanchthon in Rebhorn, 2000. p. 103). He then clearly states that imitation helps in the teaching of the art of speech and it helps teach the other arts as well. He mentions some of the classical models, such as Homer, Vergil and Cicero, strongly concluding with “unless you are deposed to imitate them you must completely despair of ever being able to speak and judge things correctly” (Rebhorn, 2000. p. 104). Melanchthon is clearly an advocate of imitation and reinforces this methodology by appealing to the model of the ancients who used imitation in their elementary schools. His greatest affirmation of imitation methodology is his admission that he, himself, practices imitating the ancients.

Emerging Rhetorical Educators: While the Reformation was taking place in northern Europe of which Melanchthon was a part, another influence on the culture of Europe was beginning to grow throughout the continent. As the middle class began to develop and the means of education was available to more and more people, rhetoric was seen as an important tool to help one climb the social and economic ladder. The following writers are representative of this increasing emphasis upon rhetoric and give a broader, non-religious, cultural sense to the use of imitation.

Though its influence is not felt today, Baldesar Castiglione’s *The Book of the Courtier* (1528) was very influential in the 16th century and across the following two centuries. This influence is marked by over 150 editions of work published after the death of its author. In the introduction to his 2002 edition of the Charles Singleton translation, Daniel Javitch (2002) points out that imitation was central to Castiglione’s understanding of learning (p. ix). The importance of imitation as a teaching method is seen often in the

book: he implies that one learns to use arms through imitation (p. 31), writing is best learning through imitation (p. 37), and language is improved by following excellent examples (p.46). Yet one must not think that imitation, as Castiglione advocates it, is a mechanical process that produces actions that are unnatural to the person. This goes against Castiglione's concept of all skillful actions and speech seeming to flow without effort or as Castiglione refers to it, "sprezzatura." Imitation was an often used means to an end.

Leonard Cox published *The Arte and Crafte of Rhetoryke* (cica 1530), which is perhaps the earliest text written in English about rhetoric. He presents a sequenced teaching method which includes some form of imitation at each step. Ian Michael (1987) in his study of the teaching of English during this era, describes Cox's plan: 1- Analysis of a model, 2- Memorize illustrations of a theme, 3- Imitate a model, 4- Write an original, 5- Compare the original to a model, and 6- Memorize the model (p.271). In his pedagogy, the student did not need to learn principles, rather one learned what to do through the models.

Thomas Wilson published *The Arte of Rhetorique* in 1560 which was the first book written in English to approach rhetoric within the framework of the traditional five canons. In the section in which he answers how eloquence is taught, he gives a threefold answer: practice, wisdom and imitation. He expands upon how imitation should be used saying that we should "deicate our minds wholly" to follow good models in their "fashion aswell their speache and gesuturyng as their wit or endtiyng" (Wilson, 1560/1982. p. 592). It sounds as if Wilson is calling for an exact imitation, but he goes on to say that if one will imitate, he will take on some of the "colour" of the model. For Wilson, imitation

is a process for letting students learn from examples, not a process of teaching students to be like the example.

Johann Sturm was a key figure in the educational culture of southern Germany during the 16th century. As a rhetorician, he does not have the recognition of Ramus or Melanchthon, but the merit of this closer examination lies in the detailed record of his teaching methodology as revealed in his letters on pedagogy written for the schools that he administrated. In an article devoted to this important German educator, Pierre Mesnard (1966) summarizes Sturm's educational philosophy: The impregnation of principles was accomplished by a series of exercises beginning with memorization and culminating in imitation (Mesnard, 1966, p. 210). This use of imitation was not a servile exercise attempting to re-produce a classic author. Barbara Tinsley (1989) quotes a 1549 edition of a letter written by Sturm in response to a question regarding a course of study designed to complete education at home rather than at a school. After suggesting that many of the classics be studied and imitated, Sturm adds:

Imitation ought to be free, not servile. It is our wish that an imitator should not always follow in the footsteps of another, but should whenever possible and he is decently able, outrun the one ahead. (Tinsley, 1989, p.33)

For Sturm, imitation was the means to impregnate the student with the knowledge of the classics. A contemporary of Sturm was Roger Ascham, whose identification of types of imitation was mentioned earlier in this chapter. In his *The Schoolmaster*, published posthumously (1571) Ascham discusses a similar sequence of imitative exercises: 1- Translation, 2- Paraphrase, 3- Metaphrase: prose into verse and verse into prose, 4- Epitome: distilling of works into a more concise form, 5- Imitation, and 6- Declamation (Ascham, 1570/1934, p. 150). However, his purpose for these exercises was

different from Strum. The end of these exercises should teach the student the principles and rules that a student sees in a model (Ascham, 1570/1934, p. 182). The end of imitation for Ascham was the imitation not of an author or his work but the imitation of the rules or principles used by the example.

While Francis Bacon did not speak directly to the use of imitation, his influence affected its use. His emphasis upon investigation, experimentation and careful observation helped create an environment that discouraged imitation. If learning was based upon discovering from observation rather than learning from the past as the scholastics had earlier emphasized, then to imitate the past is to hinder the discovery of the new. Bacon does not decry imitation specifically in his major works, but there is an implied rejection of it in his shorter essays. In his essay, *Dissimulation and Simulation* (1625), he speaks against a person pretending or simulating to be something he is not. Dissimulation is preferred because it is original and not the copying of another (Bacon in Vickers, 1625/1996, pp.249-351). While not using the word imitation, he is clearly opposed to it in the sense that a person copies another in order to deceive. This is not necessarily a rejection of the use of imitation in an educational setting; however, Bacon does not think it necessary to articulate that pedagogical exception. He describes his ideal culture of learning in his essay, *The New Atlantis*, which was just that, new. It was not a copy of what had been or even an improvement upon an old system. In his description of his ideal kingdom in which scientific and philosophical knowledge produced an exemplary world, the only imitation was for the purpose of study. In his world, which to his contemporaries must have seemed like what we would call science fiction, he described vast houses in which nature was imitated in order to study it more thoroughly: the events of the sky such

as meteors, snow and rain were recreated, sounds of animals were reproduced, and even the flights of birds were simulated for the purpose of observation (Bacon in Vickers, 1624/1996. pp. 381). Bacon's only positive mention of imitation was to recreate nature so as to study it. His emphasis upon present observation and analysis as primary, and placing the past tradition as secondary, set the stage for a later decline in the use of imitation.

At roughly the same time Bacon was writing, a Jesuit rhetorical educator and political figure advanced a system of rhetorical education which was in contrast to Bacon's apparent de-emphasizing the imitation of the classics. Nicolas Caussin (1580-1651) wrote *De eloquentia* in which he extensively used examples and guidelines for imitation (Conley, 1990. p. 182-183). This is in line with the Jesuit traditional approach to knowledge and education which relies upon the Church for authority. This was in contrast to Bacon's and other Protestants' departure from the authority of human traditions. Following closely to Caussin was another advocate of imitation, Charles Rollin. He published his *Traite des Etudes* in 1726 and it was translated into German, Italian, Russian and English seeing at least 27 editions.³³ Rollin presented rhetorical principles, followed by numerous examples, and he states, in several places, that example is a better way of teaching than presenting a principle (Rollin, 1726/1769. p. 36, 80, 348). He explicitly gives instructions as to how to use imitation when he instructs his readers to imitate the "turn" of an essay as well as the content (p.170). So, while Bacon was laying a

³³ Conley presents a convincing case that Rollin had more influence in the eighteenth century than Vico who is perhaps better known in today's academic community. The number of editions and breadth of publication is an indication of this influence (Conley, 1990. P. 201).

philosophical foundation that discouraged imitation, others such as Caussin and Rollin were using it in their educational systems.

In *A Discourse on Elocution and the English Language* (1759,) Thomas Sheridan described his goal as the study of the English language so that the professions that most often used the language would “acquit themselves properly on such occasions and be able to deliver their sentiments with propriety and grace” (Sheridan. 1759/1969, p.4). Sheridan reasons that if written language has guidelines, spoken language will as well. These guidelines, he says, are enforced by example (Sheridan, 1759/1969, p. 36). This inclination towards imitation is seen in his later and more popular work, *A Course of Lectures on Elocution* (1762). He first mentions imitation in a negative way, saying that bad habits can be learned by imitating the wrong models. But he encourages his readers that if they speak authentically “from their hearts,” they will avoid this negative imitation (Sheridan, 1762/1968, p.54, 124-125). Later, he clearly advocates the use of imitation when he expresses his assumption that imitation will be used to teach proper and clear speech just as it is used to teach other arts. He rhetorically asks, “Can anyone be taught to sing, or to dance without the aid of masters and patterns for imitation?” (Sheridan, 1762/1968, p. 124). Towards the end of this work, he begins to present ideas as to how proper speech can be propagated. One suggestion is that universities should employ masters of elocution who will teach the rules and “afford in themselves patterns for imitation” (p. 197). He also suggests that proper speech in the pulpits would advance elocution. Apparently he believes that people will hear the proper way of speaking in the church and be apt to imitate it in conversation (p. 209). Sheridan was not seeking to reduce speech to a stylized performance; rather he was striving to improve the use of

spoken English. Since the spoken word relies so much upon tone, pace, gesture and expression, it necessitates examples to imitate as Sheridan suggested.

John Ward published a textbook in 1759 which is a fitting capstone to this Renaissance era because in contrast to most textbooks and rhetorical handbooks of this era, it provides details of his teaching philosophies and methods. While imitation may have been assumed to be a major teaching method, few writers thought it necessary to describe the practice. Ward does so. In *A System of Oratory* (1759,) he states that more is learned through example than by precept and goes on to defend the use of imitation to those who object (p. 396). This defense is followed by a discussion of who, what and how to imitate (p.416).

Imitation increased in importance during the Renaissance: Petrarch's (1350) lack of attention grew into Ward's (1759) presenting extensive guidelines for its use. One would think that since imitation grew, it would be a major influence for years to come, but towards the end of this era, groundwork was laid for its decline. Bacon's and Locke's epistemologies which emphasized empirical authority, the Protestant distrust towards human traditions and the rise of the elocutionary movement set the stage for the decline of imitation. The elocutionary emphasis of Sheridan later became caricatured as overly stylized and inauthentic as demonstrated by Gilbert Austin's *Chironomia* (1806) in which guidelines for gesturing are prescribed even to the placement of fingers. This gave the emerging Scottish common-sense rhetoric a target to attack. Not only do they reject the overly codified non-verbal aspects of rhetoric, they also ignore the primary tool to teach them, imitation.

CHAPTER 3

IMITATION PEDAGOGY IN COMPOSITION STUDIES

A trend towards composition studies emerging as a separate discipline of study began, perhaps, as early as 1500, as exemplified in the English Grammar school. This trend turned into a set way of thinking sometime during the late 1800s or early 1900s, when composition studies became its own field, distinct from the more inclusive field of rhetoric. This is not to say that composition studies were severed from rhetoric; however, composition is beginning to emerge as its own discipline and not just a part of rhetoric.

Robert Connors (1997) dates the foundation for this division as early as the mid 1800's: "My claim . . . is that there is a new rhetorical tradition that arose in the United States during the nineteenth century to try to inform an ever increasing demand for literacy skills for the professional and managerial class" (p. 4). Stephen North (1987) dates the beginning of composition studies in the 1960s. In *The Making of Knowledge in Composition*, he states that in the past twenty years composition has become a field (p.3). Martin Nystrand, Stuart Greene and Jefferey Weimelt (1993) agree with North when they say that composition studies began to emerge around 1960 (p. 267). The dating of when Composition achieved the recognition as a self standing discipline is debated, but there is no question that it was emerging as a discipline during the modern era, from mid 1700s to the mid 1900s. As Composition emerged, the use of imitation was doing just the opposite—it seemed to be going into hiding.

3.1 Use of Imitation Pedagogy in the Emerging Field of Composition Studies, 1750 until 1940's: Decline to all but Disappearance

In the early 1700, imitation was firmly in place as a teaching methodology, but during the later part of that century, imitation began a gradual but steady decrease in its dominance as the primary teaching method. A note is in order regarding the scope of material being examined as to the use of imitation in the teaching of composition. Up until the nineteenth century, there were relatively few textbooks and those that did exist had a scarcity of teaching methods, if any at all. Thus, the study of the use of pedagogical imitation demanded a wider view of the literature. In the nineteenth century, there was an increasing number of textbooks being published which were devoted to rhetoric. In his examination of the relationship of textbooks to the evolution of the discipline of composition, Robert Connors states that a great force that shaped the developing field of composition pedagogy was the textbook. He shows that prior to the late eighteenth hundreds, books used for the teaching of rhetoric only listed principles with little or no pedagogy (1986,p.178). Since the number of textbooks increased and more attention was given to pedagogy, focused attention will begin with books on rhetoric in general and then shift to representative textbooks.

Campbell, Blair and Whately: The three dominate rhetors who influenced the late 1700s and much of the following century were Hugh Blair, George Campbell and Richard Whately. In *Writing Instruction in the 19th Century*, James Berlin (1984) details how these three were so dominate that most of the rhetorical textbooks of the 1800s were imitations of their work (p. 35-41). In the introduction to a compilation of Blair's, Campbell's, and Whately's works, James L. Golden and Edward P.J. Corbett (1990) state

that the general approach of these three influential rhetors was to evaluate the classical writers rather than accept them as unexamined authorities (p.12). This was a departure from the predominate view, caricatured by the Ciceronians, that the classics were unquestioned examples. This new critical examination of the classic writers led to the analysis of all writers both past and present, which tends to discourage imitation. It seems inconstant to imitate a work that is being criticized. These three rhetors each spoke about imitation. Campbell does not mention it directly and only refers to it by inference in his discussion of resemblance. Blair still affirms its use, though with caution and Whately suggests that the only thing to imitate is authenticity to one's own style.

Campbell's striving to establish a scientific basis for rhetorical theory and purpose in writing does not lend itself to the use of imitation. He strives for original thinking and is not trying to imitate or even emulate previous rhetorical theory. This is not to say that he does not benefit from other writers, but he does not place them as the final authority for his views. He refers to them as aiding his work (1776/1988, p. lxvii). Thus, his approach to rhetoric mitigates the use of imitation. His purpose is not to write a textbook or give a guideline for teaching rhetoric, rather he is setting forth principles (1776/1988, p. lxvii). He is not giving a guide for educational theory, so it is not surprising that he doesn't mention imitation.³⁴ In *Lectures on Systematic Theology and Pulpit Eloquence*

³⁴ Campbell does venture into the concept of imitation when he speaks about resemblance. Resemblance has a wide meaning for Campbell. In an article which shows the varied meanings of Campbell's use of the word resemblance, Arthur Walzer (2000) articulates four different meanings: (1) actual resemblance as in a painting—words create a mental picture of an object or idea, (2) a metaphorical resemblance of a word to an idea—words create a relationship to another idea (3) citing Hume's influence on Campbell, resemblance as an association within a person's mind of ideas and experiences—words create an resemblance with experiences, and lastly, also because of Hume's influence, (4) resemblance can refer to the impact of words or the affect of the word—words create an affect because of resemblance (p.340ff). So, for Campbell, the orator's task is like a painter's task. The orator through vivacity re-creates an idea or experience, which in-

(1832/2010), published posthumously, Campbell devotes a chapter to acquiring the art of pulpit eloquence. In this intentionally practical book, one would expect him to suggest ways for the reader to learn eloquence, but he only gives the principles with no reference to activities to practice or ways to put the principles into practice. It would seem that if he would ever encourage imitation it would be in this book, but he does not mention imitation nor even alludes to it (p.93ff.). Campbell is not concerned with teaching methods, so to say he rejected imitation would be too strong a statement. However, in his major writings, he does not advocate its use.

In Hugh Blair's introduction to *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belle Lettres* (1783), he emphasizes the use of a principle as a standard for speakers rather than a current fashion of speaking. The current fashion, he says, may be "corrupt" and not follow an accepted principle (Blair in Golden and Corbett, 1783/1990, p.33). It follows that if he encourages the evaluation of a current fashion, then imitation of that fashion would be discouraged unless the fashion conforms to the principles. If imitation takes place, it must be of a worthy model. This is later confirmed when he lists the means of improvement as "character and disposition, a fund of knowledge, application and industry, the right choice of models, and exercise" (p.134). Under the right choice of models, he encourages the imitation of these models but limits its practice by saying that there should not be

turn creates a resemblance in the hearers. This resemblance can be a simple association with an object or a metaphorical exercise leading to recalling of experiences and impacts of those experiences. Or the content of what a speaker is saying so resembles or perhaps imitates an experience that it generates vivacity in the hearers. The vivacity may produce resemblance or resemblance may produce vivacity. Campbell's tertiary mentioning of imitation is in regards to how rhetoric works. The orator is to create in the minds of the listener something that resembles or imitates their experiences. Campbell is not referring to a teaching method but only to how rhetoric works. Though he does not venture into how this principle of rhetoric might affect teaching, it follows that if this resemblance works for rhetoric in general, perhaps it could work for teaching.

slavish imitation because it depresses originality. He does not advocate the exact copying from a model because in the next paragraph he affirms that more than one model should be used and that principles should be applied to evaluate what should or should not be imitated. He goes on to caution that imitating the written work of a model does not transfer to spoken word, for there are great differences between good written style and good oral style (p.134). Blair seems to allow for some form of imitation as a teaching method, but he falls short of advocating it.

Richard Whately in *Elements of Rhetoric* (1828) is often cited for his work on argumentation. He does not mention imitation other than in the area of delivery. In contrast to the elocutionary movement, which was at its height during the early 1800s, he emphasized that each person should develop his own natural delivery. Thus, when he mentions imitation, it is only to explain that a person should imitate another's plan for natural delivery. The speaker "adopts the plan" of natural delivery from the model. The student does not adopt the speaker's delivery but rather the speaker's plan, which is to be natural (Whately in Golden and Corbett, 1783/1990, p.385). The student should strive to be himself, just as the speaker is being himself. Later, he mentions imitation in a very negative light in referring to how people read publically: "And even men of good sense and good taste, often acquire, through undesigned and unconscious imitation, an absurd style of reading those passages which they have been from infancy accustomed to hear ill-read by others" (p. 386). For Whately, all that was to be imitated was authenticity.

Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Rhetorical/Composition Educators: In his *The Teaching of English from the Sixteenth Century to 1870*, Ian Michael (1987) affirms that imitation was the dominant teaching method up until the 1700s (p.142, 281). He

summarizes the widespread use of imitation by listing common textbook practices which are all imitative: direct imitation, varying the structure of sentences, paraphrasing, and transposing the order of thoughts and elliptical completions. Each of these relies upon a model which the student uses to complete the exercise. The intended result is not an exact copy but a hopeful by-product of the student incorporating the style of the model into his own style (p.279).

Michael (1987) gives several examples of educators who advocate the use of imitation during the early to mid-eighteenth century: Henry Felton (1713) cautioned against strict imitation of one example but acknowledged that using many models results in those masters “gracing” the student with improved style, an anonymous author in 1750 recommended Swift as the best example to imitate, David Williams (1774) recommends Shakespeare and then the student’s favorite author (Michael, 1987, p.280-1). In *Eighteenth-Century Rhetors*, Michael Moran (1994) examines John Lawson who published his lectures on oratory in 1758. Moran shows that Lawson viewed imitation as being of highest importance. He quotes Lawson, “All progress in the arts, including eloquence, comes not from the innovation of an isolated genius but from the imitation of earlier writers” (p. 144).

As popular as imitation pedagogy seems to be in the seventeenth century and into most of the eighteenth, its popularity seems to stop toward the end of the eighteenth. Ian Michael (1987) plainly states that imitation as a teaching method was dropped by the 1800s (p.280). This is a bit overstated for it was still used in a small way, but it clearly stopped being the major and dominate teaching method. So why did it stop? Michael doesn’t venture much into analysis as to why; he is simply describing what took place. In

part, it was due to the growing epistemological shift towards the empirical, which was seen in Bacon and Locke, and is demonstrated by George Campbell's method of teaching principles.

Nineteenth Century Rhetorical/Composition Educators: The first author whom Ian Michael cites in his list of teachers of English is Richard Parker who was published in several disciplines. He published his first English textbook in 1832, *Progressive Exercises in English Composition*, which was directed at the level identified in our era as High School. He revised this several times and it saw several editions published. Parker's book contains very specific guidelines even to the point of instructions specifically addressed to the teachers. This was unlike any other textbook of that era and unlike anything written for years to come, not only because of the suggested teaching methods, but because he is also holding on to imitation as a teaching method. Many of his exercises have the elements of imitation though he never directly leads the student to imitate the model. Parker (1832/1837) has them perform several exercises: rearrange sentences, (p.10), paraphrase sentences and phrases (p.29) and fill in blanks in an incomplete outline (p.37). This is a clear use of imitation. In the college level edition of Parker's work entitled *Aids to Composition*, first published in 1844, the subtitle reveals his attitude toward imitation; a portion of it reads, "Specimens and examples of school and college exercises." In this expanded work, he adds many more categories of composition even covering obituaries and goes into more detail in the area of syntax, grammar and sentence structure. The exercises are similar but there is even more emphasis upon following an example. He briefly presents a principle followed by an example. The instructions for the exercise portion almost always begins with, "In a similar manner the

learner may write . . .” (p.3ff). This phrase is followed by the exercise of that chapter, such as, “In a similar manner the learner may write a descriptive paragraph.” He leaves open how similar the students’ work is to be, but it is clear that imitation is a primary pedagogical tool. Just to clarify, he is not aiming to create students who practice servile copying, for he affirms in his preface the importance of students developing their own styles (p.iii).

Later in the nineteenth century, George Quackenbos textbooks went through several publications and editions just as Parker’s did. Though not as specific as Parker, in his 1873 edition of *First Lessons in Composition*, he relies on forms of imitation. He gives exercises such as in changing a sentence from the interrogative to the declarative and transposing the order of words (p.87- 90). In each of his more than fifty chapters, he explains or at least states a principle, suggests an exercise and then gives an example, which by implication the student is to model. In his teaching of style, he has the students make exact copies of some of the examples for the purpose of thoroughly analyzing the model’s style (p.105). In these two influential textbooks published in the mid 1800s, the practice of imitation as a teaching method was still being used. This seems to be the last holdout in using imitation, for textbooks of the next era do not suggest its use in any form.

The late nineteenth century textbooks are well represented by four dominate textbooks: Adam Hill’s *Principles of Rhetoric*, 1878; John Genung’s *Practical Elements of Rhetoric*, 1886; Barrett Wendell’s *English Composition* 1891 and Fred Scott’s and Joseph Denney’s *Paragraph-Writing*, 1909. In articles regarding the textbooks of this era, Robert Connors (1986, p. 187) cites the first three as the most important texts and John

Brereton (1995, p.321) adds the fourth to the list. Connors and Brereton both cite the number of editions and the number of colleges that used these texts to substantiate their importance.

Adam Hill wrote *The Principles of Rhetoric* (1878/1895) and taught English Composition at Harvard for several decades. In this book which went through twenty-one revisions and editions in twenty years, he articulated and listed principles of grammar and sentence structure and other common syntactical guidelines; however, he did not suggest any exercises. This very popular textbook, which only listed principles and gave very few examples and no exercises, produced students who knew the rules of writing, but that seems to be all. Hill later complained that Harvard's English composition program under his leadership made the students into slavish devotees of form and rules (Adams, 1993, p. 23). His textbook reveals that exercises were not emphasized much less imitation.

Another professor of Harvard that produced a well-used textbook was Barrett Wendell. His *English Composition* (1891) went through fifteen editions, had the same format as Hill's book and suffered the same results of students knowing the rules but not being able to use them well (Adams, 1993, p. 24).

John Genung's *Practical Elements of Rhetoric* (1887) is similar to Hill's work, having extensive principles and a few examples but no exercises. The subtitle title, *with Illustrative Examples*, gives indication that some form of imitation will be practiced and perhaps encouraged, but in the introduction, he makes it clear that the illustrative examples are not intended for practice. He expresses his view of the pedagogy when he says that the purpose is to teach by principles, rather than the student learning by experience:

The question therefore is, whether the writer will learn without rules, by blundering experience, or take what the approved procedure of others has found to be best. Nor can the answer be doubtful. The true way is to submit to rhetorical laws and methods; and though these may be in the beginning be obtrusive and tyrannical, by diligent practice they will become second nature. (p. 6)

In 1900, this was followed by an expansion of this work and though written for the purpose of a handbook, *The Working Principles of Rhetoric*, (1900) had no assignments, and only a few examples. Apparently, Genung was no advocate of imitation as a teaching method.

Early Twenty Century Composition Educators: Two English Professors, Fred Newton Scott and Joseph Villiers Denney, taught at the University of Michigan and Ohio State, respectively. Their *Paragraph-Writing*, 1893 is divided into two major sections: principles with numerous examples fill 185 pages and the last 150 pages have the assignments. The assignments direct the student to work with a text such as: analyzing the examples, rearranging the order of statements into a logical order, completing ellipsis exercises (sentences or words left out of paragraphs that must be supplied by the student), and re-writing of paragraphs that need correction. While imitation may take place because of the scrutinizing of the models, there is no direct use of imitation.

A hopeful exception to apparent aversion to the use of imitation was Frances Berkeley who earned a PhD (1912) and taught at the University of Wisconsin. In 1910, before she received her PhD she published, *A College Course in Writing from Models*. It should not go without note that her textbook was published before she completed her PhD. Perhaps she was more involved in the teaching of freshman English and closer to the process that students needed to advance in their composition skills. She seems to advocate the use of imitation, saying that students don't learn to write by learning the

rules of composition; rather they learn by “absorption and imitation” (1910/1995, p. 384).

In a subsequent publication, *Freshman English*, 1914 written with her husband Karl Young, (published under her married name) there are numerous exercises using analysis and observation, and suggested prompts for practice; but none using imitation.

Apparently the absorption of writing skills would take place as a by-product. This husband and wife team comes closer to using imitation but still fails to specifically use it in their suggested assignments.

In the study of textbooks mentioned earlier, Robert Connors (1986) states that little was added to textbooks that was novel from 1900 to after 1940. They were basically all very similar: principles followed by examples and sometimes exercises were given (p. 189). This is consistent with the next and last textbook to be mentioned which was written by Harry Robbins and Roscoe Parker in 1935. As others authors of textbooks, they were also English professors, Robbins at Bucknell University and Parker at the University of Tennessee. In their *Advanced Exposition* their pedagogy is clearly stated in the preface: “They (the authors) believe the only way to learn to write is to write” (1935, p.v). They were writing to fill the need to improve writing skills in the heterogeneous setting of the modern university. Seeking to enable each student to put research into a readable formats, they list principles followed by examples and then suggest exercises which are entitled “Analysis and Practice.” The exercises ask questions regarding the examples and then ask the student to create sentence, paragraphs, etc., that put into practice the principle of the chapter. Under the chapter “Expository Reproduction,” they mention “Summary, Précis, Translation and Paraphrase” which are then explained and followed by examples (pp.66-70). While this practice could have an imitative tone,

Robbins and Parker have analysis as the purpose. The teaching method is not imitation in the sense that the student will learn to be like the model, rather it is for the purpose of more deeply understanding the content. These forms of exposition are being taught through the approach: Principle, Example, Analysis and Practice.

The modern era from about 1750 to the 1950 saw the development of a strategic textbook, but imitation does not seem to be a significant part of that strategy. The early books, before 1825, generally had principles but few examples and no suggested exercises such as Blair, Campbell and Whately's publications on rhetoric. In the mid 1800s, as textbooks became more important due to the increasing numbers of colleges and proportionally decreasing numbers of English professors, the principles were listed and examples were added. This set pattern became almost catechetical in the approach: principles followed by examples. The late 1800s into the twentieth century saw numerous textbooks being published with principles, examples and an increasing number of suggested exercises. The general trend of textbook development saw the earlier editions emphasizing principles, then examples were added and finally suggested exercises. As textbooks focused increasing attention to teaching methods, imitation is scarcely mentioned. Though given some attention as a means of learning, it was never codified in the textbooks.

In an article about the changes in subjects of writing assignments, Robert Connors (1987) shows that there was a shift from objective generalized topics to very personal topics. His examination is of the general trend in the subjects that were given to students around which they would create their essays or speeches. Prior to the late 1800s suggested subjects such as Friendship or Loyalty were a repeated standard, which

prompts imitation. In an effort to individualize and personalize composition assignments, these general subjects became “a description of my friend” or “how I display my loyalty.” This shift towards the individual away from the model is typified in Connors quoting of a textbook written by David Hill in 1878, “Do not go to Homer for a sunrise when you can see one every morning” (Connors, 1987, p.174).

In the modern era, imitation as the primary teaching methodology saw a continued decline with more emphasis being put on principles, analysis and examples. Individual and original creation took the place of the classics as models to be imitated. As the great influx of students was about to flood into the colleges of the post war United States, the attitude toward, and the practice of, imitation seems to be ebbing. It seems that imitation will have an uphill battle in the contemporary setting.

3.2 The Contemporary use of Imitation in Composition Pedagogy

Changes in the demographics of colleges and, more broadly, in linguistic theory created a context in which imitation could come back into use. In this more fertile field, contemporary writers began to use and write about the use of imitation to teach composition. Building on the foundation of the rich history of its use in many areas of education, its use in composition education will take center stage. This section will move from a broad perspective of the elements necessary for pedagogical imitation to take place, to a specific description of how imitation is used in composition pedagogy.

During the 1950s, several major factors greatly influenced the teaching of composition. Following WWII, large numbers of military personnel returned to civilian life, and due to the GI bill and the 1958 National Defense Education Act making it financially possible, many of these went to college. In 1949, the College Composition

and Communication organization was founded which gave composition instructors a professional and academic organization for the exchange of ideas. The type of student that was coming to college was also shifting. Previously, college education was only for a small percentage of the population, but now it was becoming common to attend college. Many of these new students were the first of their families to ever attend college. The increase in numbers of students and the decrease in educational heritage helped fuel an examination of the traditional way of teaching writing. New concepts began to emerge. According to composition historian Robert Connors, composition studies began to be greatly influenced by books such as McCrimmon's (1950) *Writing with a Purpose* in which the purpose of a discourse governed all that was written in it. The standard of the five paragraph theme which followed rules of eloquence began to be replaced with guidelines based upon the presumed pragmatism that a writer should predict what purposes would be achieved by a discourse (Connor, 1997, p. 103). This was just one example of numerous new ways of approaching composition pedagogy that began to be introduced in the middle of the last century.

Another dynamic effecting composition studies was the shift in linguistic theory. A pure behaviorist school of thought based upon B.F. Skinner's work in which language was a behavior learned through trial and error began to be replaced by Noam Chomsky's linguistic theories which demonstrated that behaviorist's theories could not account for what happens in language. Language was not just a predictable response to stimuli: people created new thoughts and meanings in unpredictable and very complex patterns.³⁵

³⁵ Miles Myers (1983) has a good summary of these two schools of thought in his *Approaches to Teaching Composition*. p. 3-11.

This shift called for a greater creativity in the teaching of composition. If language was a response to stimuli, then teaching would give the right stimuli and good writing would result, but since language was far more complex than the behaviorist theorized, the teaching of composition became far more complex. Because of the increasing number of students, the change in the background of these students, and the ideological shifts, new pedagogical theories could emerge, including those related to the use of imitation.

3.2.1 Imitative Practices in Composition Studies

Based upon a review of various journal articles, representative composition textbooks and short trade magazines, all of which refer to some practice of imitation, the following kinds of imitative exercises have been identified: (1) Copying word-for word: the exact imitation of sentences and paragraphs with no changes, (2) Copying the form and structure: the imitation of the structure of a paragraph or sentence with changes in subjects, (3) Copying the process: imitation of the process that a model uses, (4) Copying of principles: reading of models and articulating strengths and weakness, (5) Copying of an image: the reading of models without formal analysis. These categories will provide a structure by which numerous practices can be presented in a somewhat organized method rather than a random listing. For each of the five categories mentioned above, there will be a description of the practice, a presentation of examples of the use presented, and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses.

3.2.1.1 Copying word-for-word

Description: An often cited experience from the life of Malcolm X is his making a hand written copy of a dictionary. This type of exercise seems to fit in an elementary school rather than in a college classroom and yet for Malcolm X, who was the same age

as many college students when he made his copy, the results were very beneficial. While no one advocates such an extreme form of imitation, there are those, though not many, who direct students to make hand-written, word-for-word copies of a model.

The process simply involves the student making an exact copy of a model. The length and complexity of the model must be appropriate to the level at which the students are working. In transferring this to a homiletics classroom, a first year preaching student would not do well at making an exact copy of a sermon from John Calvin or St. Augustine. Edward J. Corbett's (1965/1971) guidelines, more specifically cited below, calls for hand-written copy. He claims that the process is hindered when students make a copy on a typewriter, claiming that the process is too fast and too mechanical. The same concept could well apply to the computer. The purpose of the paper and pencil work is not to make a hand written copy but to help students make the copy at such a rate and with such care that the content of the model is at least noticed and perhaps even analyzed as the copy is being made. A student could make a hand written copy in the same mechanical way that Corbett thinks will happen via a keyboard copy. The issue is not the method of making the copy rather; instead, it is what happens in the student while making the copy. The point of making the word-for-word copy is the student's interaction with the model.

Examples: Winston Weathers and Otis Winchester, (1969) who both taught composition at the University of Tulsa, published a book devoted to imitation, *Copy and Compose*. After a brief introduction in which they site examples of well-known writers who praise imitation, they give sixty-five sentences as model sentences followed by twenty-eight model paragraphs. The student is instructed to copy the model, word-for-

word (p.3). After the initial copy, the model is analyzed, followed by the student attempting to compose a similar sentence or paragraph using the model as a guide.

Weathers and Winchester state their purpose and philosophy in the afternote:

Hopefully, as you practice the art of imitation, you will acquire not only new skill in your writing, but you will also acquire a vocabulary to use in your discussion of composition and style, and you will become more alert to some of the things that constitute good prose. As you emulate model sentences and paragraphs by the best of writers, you will penetrate more and more into the inner workings or rhetoric and style, and you will acquire a greater capacity for stylistic analysis and understanding. With this understanding, inevitably, a more knowledgeable and confident performance on your part will result. (p.140)

Weathers and Winchester assume that the student can identify various forms of style and rhetoric. Some students might need to be helped in making the analysis. Perhaps the actual process of making a copy is to familiarize the student with the model at a level on which analysis can take place.

Edward P.J. Corbett in his much quoted work of 1965/1971 *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* gives specific guidelines for the imitation process. After citing Malcolm X, Benjamin Franklin, and Somerset Maugham as testimonies of the value of imitation, he gives five guidelines for imitating the models: (1) a maximum of twenty minutes per session, (2) copy with a pen or pencil, (3) vary the models, (4) read the entire passage first and again after transcribing, (5) copy slowly and accurately (p.510). These guidelines are then followed by dozens of paragraphs from well-known works such as the Bible and well-known authors such as Hemingway, Defoe, Faulkner, and James Baldwin, who serve as models to be imitated. Following these model paragraphs are model sentences. The student is to copy the sentence and then write a similar sentence. He gives numerous model sentences and model imitations. Thus, he gives not only a model to

imitate, he gives an example of his imitation so that the student can imitate his imitation. His goal is that imitation exercises will “cut the student loose from his models, equipped with the competence and resources to go it on his own.” (1971, p.538) As Weathers and Winchester moved beyond the copying word-for-word, so too, Corbett has the student advance to creating similar sentences and then even to create completely original sentences.

In *The Art of Fiction*, designed to help writers improve their ability to write fiction, John Gardner (1983/1991) briefly mentions imitation. He suggests that one can learn to write fiction by copying the structure that an author uses and by copying line-by-line from a model (p. 142.) He does not present any further information as to how this should be done. It seems that he assumes when this line-for-line copy is made that the student will notice what the model is doing and how it is done, and then emulate it.

The example of Malcolm X making his own hand written copy of a dictionary shows that this elementary step can be beneficial. After copying a page of the dictionary, he examined and read aloud his own written copy. It was an act which gave him a sense of ownership of the model. “I woke up the next morning, thinking about those words—immensely proud to realize that not only had I written so much at one time, but I’d written words that I never knew were in the world” (Malcolm X, 1965, p. 173). It was a dictionary, but it was his personal copy of that dictionary. Making an exact copy is a way of de-mystifying the model and facilitating some initial identification between the student and the model. Another important and often overlooked element to the success of imitation-as-teaching tool for Malcolm X is his attitude toward the process. This exercising in imitating the dictionary takes place after he has undergone a transformation

of his will. Just prior to his willingness to copy the dictionary was his conscious act of becoming willing to pray. He describes being under the teaching of Elijah Muhammad who directed him to pray. Malcolm writes that it took him a full week to get himself to the point of bending his knees and submitting himself to prayer (p. 171). This act of submission is not an extraneous element in the success of his imitative self-education. Before his submission to pray, it is doubtful that he would have submitted to learning something from a white man's book, but in submitting, he humbled himself, which is necessary for imitation to work. The point is not that this was a religious experience, rather it highlights that the student must submit to the model. The extreme would be to submit so much that individuality is erased. That level of submission to the point of losing one's own identity can destroy learning, but a student must be at least humble enough to learn from the model. Malcolm X was willing to learn from the model that he was imitating.

Analysis: This seemingly too simplistic step in imitation has merit in that it can familiarize the student with the model, and it can give the student a sense of ownership of the model. Of course the student will know it is not her own work, but it will be a personal copy that the student made. All of these examples take the student to levels beyond the exact copying of a model to analysis and a new creation by the student, but they are unique in that they begin with this ancient method of word-for-word reproduction. Other types of imitation, which follow, do not have students take this first step of a seemingly elementary activity. This step of laboriously and tediously copying the text word-for-word will hopefully force the student to be familiar with the model and puts the model into the world of the student. The insistence that it be a hand-written copy

has some merit, but one wonders if our students who live in today's computer-flooded world would benefit by using a medium that is not their normal way of expressing themselves. By typing the model word-for-word into their own computers, the students perhaps will have a similar sense of familiarity and identification with the model, and they will have a document that can be easily manipulated for the purpose of analysis. One could change the order of a sentence and put in different words with relative ease and then go back to the original. The use of the computer would take the purpose of the copying to greater heights. More familiarity and ownership could occur because the students could work with the original more easily than with a hand-written copy. Personally, being one who struggles with mild dysgraphia, the act of hand copying something would have been so daunting that I would have never been able to see beyond the task of copying to the task of analyzing and learning from the model. The use of a computer to generate a personal copy is an important alternative that could be of great help in many situations.

Though this use of imitation seems to reduce the student to nothing more than an archaic copy machine, when coupled with a desire and submissive spirit to learn from a model, this type of exercise takes on purpose, which results in the copying being the first step in being familiar with and then learning from a master. The student must make the copy noticing how the model uses words differently from what the student would do. It is not a passive act for the purpose of making a copy, but rather an act in which students take the initiative to notice what the model is doing.

3.2.1.2 Copying the form and structure

Description: A large majority of those who advocate imitation fall into this category. This imitation is not copying word-for-word, which can degenerate into passive reproduction, rather it is an imitation of the structures in a model. Thus, the student's first task before imitation can take place is to discover and articulate the structure. This can be done for the student or by the student, but without this step, the structure cannot be imitated.

If the students are asked to analyze the model in order to discern the structure and style, the teacher must remember that this will demand a high level of skill and cognition. The cognitive process of analysis is near the top of the cognition levels according to Bloom's taxonomy and its more recent update.³⁶ This type of imitative exercise assumes that the lower levels of knowledge, understanding and applying have been covered in another class. If the teacher asks the students to analyze before they have the more basic concepts, he will be setting the student up for an assignment that will be beyond their abilities and thus ineffective. If the student does not have a basic understanding of the elements of good writing, it will be quite difficult to find it in a model. Reading a model very closely without the ability to understand what is being modeled will short circuit the analysis process. The instructor might wish to lead the student through an analysis insuring that these lower levels of cogitation are in place. Then, once the lower cogitation levels are in place, maximum learning can take place at the higher level of cognition,

³⁶ Blooms taxonomy was introduced in 1956 by Benjamin Bloom in which he identified levels of cognition that build upon each other and are progressively more demanding of a student. His work was updated by two of his students, Lorin Anderson and David Krathwohl in 2000. In both of the taxonomies, analysis is at the fourth level, being built upon the first three: knowledge, understanding/comprehension, and application. For a good summary of Bloom's work and the updated version see, Leslie Owen Wilson's *Beyond Bloom - A new Version of the Cognitive Taxonomy*, <http://www.uwsp.edu/education/lwilson/curric/newtaxonomy>. .

which is analysis. When the students must read the model closely enough to discern the structures that should be imitated, they are reinforcing the learning process numerous times. They must first read the model and then examine it closely making observations as to strengths and weaknesses, patterns and unexpected elements, and rhetorical devices. This process involves the students reading and re-reading the model numerous times, which by mere repetition might result in the student unknowingly imitating the model. Though unintentional imitation might occur, the purpose of this type of imitation is to use the structures of the model, while supplying different content. For example, the model may have introduced the essay with a startling statement; the student would begin his/her essay with a startling statement as well, though not the same one.

After the structure of a model is articulated either by or for the student, the student then creates a new work patterned after structures that are in the model. These structures may be at the paragraph level, the sentence level or even at the level of a phrase. The benefit to the student is increased because the structures must be recognized and understood well enough so that the structure can be duplicated.

Examples: Frank D'Angelo (1973) gives a thorough description of the process in which he used imitation in his composition classroom. It begins with a close reading and very thorough analysis of the model. This very extensive analysis included examining the number of words in a sentence, the kind of sentences, the specificity of verbs, and the use of adverbs and figures of speech. His analysis also included examining what was accomplished by the style of the model. Then, the student writes a version of the model essay using their own story but trying to follow the sentence structures, use of verbs, adverbs, and figures of speech. D'Angelo says that the outcome of these type of exercises

is that the student has more options from which to choose and thus can be more inventive. Imitation for D'Angelo is a method for improving invention. He shows the importance of becoming very familiar with the model through thorough analysis. If the student doesn't understand what a model is doing, then it is hard to imitate the model. It would seem that in some freshman composition classes, much time would have to be devoted to explaining the analysis. How many freshmen are familiar with asyndeton? If the class is familiar with basic grammar and figures of speech, D'Angelo's process seems very doable.

Donna Gorrell (1982) offers dozens of good model sentences, paragraphs, and letters, and she includes models which are purposely inferior and need to be changed. One of her exercises presents a model letter that is in the passive voice and asks students to re-write it, changing it to the active voice. The principle, of the active being better than passive, is not presented with the exercise. Her pedagogical philosophy is that we learn in this order: practice first and then the principle. Thus, the title of her book: *Copy/Write*. Her basis for this concept is the way in which children initially learn to speak. While it seems presumptuous to say that learning a language as a child is equal to an adult learning new writing skills, she offers us the important concept that a writing principle does not require a thorough understanding in order to be appreciated and used. In a children's acquisition of language, they do not begin with principles and rules: language is acquired through hearing and using. When copying a work the student may notice that the author moves quickly from one action to another. The student may or may not know that it is called asyndeton, but they can still copy it. At this point, after they have experienced writing, Gorrell would say, is the time to teach the principle.

The timing of when to introduce the principles into the teaching process divides Gorrell and D'Angelo, but what unifies them is their concern about when to use imitation. Michael Flanigan (1980) is also concerned with the timing of when imitation is introduced. He brings models into his classroom when the student encounters a certain problem in writing. Rather than using a model as an example of a final product, he uses models to show how a specific problem was solved. He is concerned that using a model which is analyzed and then copied is an artificial exercise. He advocates using models to solve a real problem that a student faces when writing. In this article, however, he does not present details as to how this would function in a freshman composition classroom.

Penelope Starkey (1974) describes how she uses imitation in her undergraduate literature classes in which she has the students writing a modern version of *Canterbury Tales* from the perspective of an observer of travelers at an airport. She found it very helpful in equipping students to appreciate what Chaucer was doing and how he was doing it, as well as improving the students writing abilities. Though she described, in detail, her use of Chaucer, she does not limit the model to Chaucer; she also used Petrarch, Dickens and others. She concluded her article with this observation: "The conscious journey through the voices of others hastens the discovery of one's own voice" (p. 437). Chet Meyer (1998), another compositionist who uses Chaucer as a model, has his students imagine that they are observing and then describing travelers who are on a journey to visit Elvis Presley's Graceland.

Maurice Hunt (1988) of Baylor University appeals to what he calls pre-romantic writers such as Baldassare Castiglione and the English educator Roger Ascham to bring imitation into the classroom. He calls for a very close imitation but changes the subject

matter. He suggests that “In imitating a complex sentence of a prose master, the student essentially observes at least the same kind, number and order of clauses and phrases while creating different content” (p.17).

Ken Roemer (1984) of my own institution, University of Texas at Arlington, used imitation of the voice of the writer to assist students in developing invention. Using N. Scott Momaday’s *The Way to Rainy Mountain*, in which the author uses three different story-telling voices to describe Kiowa stories and narratives that came from Momaday’s childhood memories and Kiowa legends, Roemer asks his students to imitate the various voices to recall events or settings from the students’ own experiences. He found that this exercise produced richer invention. By imitating Momaday, the students put themselves as one of three storytellers: (1) a distant storyteller of a legend (this is what happened), (2) as an observer of an event, whether mythical or real (this what is happened, let me describe it), or (3) as one reflecting on the event (this is my response to the event). This imitation of the different voices equipped the students to look at their memories from three different points of view. They experienced new ways of approaching a subject, thus improving their invention skills.

Ann Loux, (1987) uses imitation extensively in her classes at St. Mary’s College. She gives her students four poems, one by Emily Dickenson and the other three were imitations of Dickenson’s style. Students quickly could spot the imitation. She then asked why they were easy to spot—what where the differences (p. 467)? She points out that in order to imitate an author the student must master the model and very carefully study what that author does. This gives the student an intimate and personal knowledge of an author’s work, rather than just distant facts about he author’s writing. It forces a student

to closely study what the model writer is doing (471). Only then, after thorough analysis and familiarity of a model, does she ask the students to produce an imitation of the style and structure of the model.

In an act which he describes as pedagogical desperation, William Gruber (1977) experimented with imitation and found that it liberated his students to achieve individual freedom resulting in their compositions becoming intensely moving and personal (p.491). After his experimentation with imitation, he organized his composition classes around it. His process begins with a collaborative analysis of several different models. After the student has spent time “examining critically a variety of distinctive prose,” the imitation assignment begins (p. 497). The students rigidly follow the form, both at the paragraph level and sentence level, of a model, but they are free to choose any subject they want.

A version of this copying of form and structure is paraphrasing. In an article devoted to encouraging the use of paraphrasing, Phillip Arrington (1988) suggesting that Burke’s pentad be used to help articulate what aspects of the model are being paraphrased. It gives a grid to analyze both the model and the paraphrase so that the change can be more fully understood. He gives examples that show how one paraphrase can minimize the setting and the agent while maximizing the purpose. A one-sentence-paraphrase of a multiple sentence paragraph minimizes the setting by summarizing details in one phrase and minimizes the agent when the author is left to the parenthetical notation. Thus, the purpose of Burke’s pentad is being emphasized. In another paraphrase, numerous examples of the setting are added to the paraphrase, though not in the original, thus emphasizing Burke’s scene. Arrington gives an example of a teaching plan, in which the students are divided into work groups whose task it is to examine

various paraphrases of a model in order to articulate what was emphasized or minimized in the paraphrase. Then the groups are to paraphrase with a specific purpose in mind, such as paraphrasing a writer to highlight weaknesses or paraphrasing in order to support a certain point of view. The point that Arrington is making is that paraphrasing, when done through an analytical grid such as Burke's, gives the student a better understanding of what an author is doing and why. Though Arrington does not mention imitation specifically, it is easy to see how paraphrasing is a form of imitation.

Donna Hickey (1993) in *Developing a Written Voice* uses imitation in three different sections of her book, which is centered around developing one's own voice as a writer. It seems almost contradictory that she would use imitation to teach something that seems so individualistic as a writer's voice, but she uses it more than most. All three exercises (p. 111, 152, 172) ask for the planning and writing of essays using concepts of style, structure and voice that the student found in a model.

Analysis: The actual act of a student imitating the structure of a model has great merit but to accomplish that type of imitation, many other levels of learning must take place as part of the process. First the student must become familiar enough with the model to determine a pattern that indicates structure. The student is exposed to the text at a level that is far beyond reading for content: she must not only master the content, but go much deeper to discover the order of thought and rhetorical devices that the model uses. This analysis of a model can extend into the evaluation of the model's success at producing an affect in the audience. One can easily imagine a student reading and re-reading while looking for repetitions, sentence structures, theme sentences, contrastive structures, and other rhetorical elements. This rhetorical analysis will hopefully give the

student a greater appreciation for the author's skill as a writer and show the student how the skillful use of rhetoric can bring about persuasion or some other intended result.

Imitating structure while supplying one's own content affirms the creativity and value of students because their own experiences and ideas are the basis for their compositions. This affirmation of a student helps this exercise become something personal and can be very expressive. There are also the dialogical aspects of the intense interaction with the model which can almost be generative in the student. As the student examines and re-examines the model, it is as if the student and the model are having a conversation about what the model did and why. The answers of course are skewed because there is no responsive interaction from the model, but if the student will interact with the text, even this one-way dialogue can be beneficial.

The greatest weakness of this type of imitation lies in the students' ability, or lack of thereof, to analyze a text. If the instructor must analyze the model for the student, then the student's becoming familiar with the text is truncated and the benefits of that familiarity do not take place. However, if the students are unfamiliar with various grammatical and syntactical structures, this type of imitation can be used to teach those elements. The *Copy/Write* concepts of Gorrell seems to fit this pattern in that she first gives the model, asks student to copy it, and then gives a name to structure. A formalist way of thinking would gravitate to this type of teaching, while others such as the expressionist would prefer not to restrict the student to certain prescribed structures. The act of copying a structure and using one's own content can be used by different schools of thought, but it must be shaped to meet the teacher's philosophy. The formalist will look for standardized categories and have the student both learn the categories and

imitate them. The expressionist will minimize the structure of the model and use it as a tool to facilitate student expression. The social constructionists and those who emphasize dialogue will have the students immerse themselves in the model so that they can discover structures for themselves in a generative act and then use those structures as a means for expressing their own thoughts.

3.2.1.3 Copying the process

Description: Robert Connors (1997) in his history of Composition-Rhetoric uses the numerous editions of *Writing with a Purpose* by James McCrimmon to show the development of composition studies. The work first appeared in 1950 and went through seven editions, the last appearing in 1980. As this work was edited for the changing landscape of composition studies, more emphasis upon process was introduced in 1963 with the inclusion of three stages of writing: planning, writing and revising (Connors, 104-105). This emphasis upon process was so clearly articulated and forcefully suggested by Robert Zoellner (1969) in his article, *Talk-Write: A Behavioral Pedagogy for Composition*, that it merits this lengthy quotation.

It is even more important to see the enormous implications of modeling and vicarious reinforcement techniques for both present and future compositional pedagogies. Permit me to make my point in personal terms. During my own K-12 years, during my undergraduate years, and during the fifteen years that I myself have taught English composition, I have seen English instructors deliver lectures on rhetorical principles such as unity, coherence, and emphasis; I have seen them comment on the textbooks which develop such principles; I have seen them analyze textbook readings and student themes in terms of such principles; I have seen them hand out mimeographed materials of their own composing which illustrated such principles; and I have seen them bring everything to class from student newspaper editorials to “Peanuts” cartoons to inculcate such principles – but I have *never*, repeat *never*, seen a composition instructor, whether full professor or graduate student, walk into a composition classroom cold-turkey, with no preparation, ask the class for a specific theme-topic perhaps derived from a previous day’s discussion, and then – off the top of his head – actually compose

a paragraph which illustrates the rhetorical principles that are the current concern of the class. The skiing instructor actually skis for his students; the pianist actually plays for his; the teacher of dance can occasionally be caught dancing. We English teachers, generally speaking, are different: as far as the students in our composition classes can see, we are very good at talking about writing – but we never write.

In short, we never *model the scribal act*. And the reason we don't, of course, is that even though we are teaching a skill (or "art," if that is more palatable) we seem hooked on the idea of always coming to class "prepared." And this means that before we assert too roundly that today's students "can't write" and "don't know how to re-write," we had better examine the possibility that the reason they can't is that *they have never seen it done* – they have just seen it *talked about*, by "prepared" teachers. (p. 310-11)

With all the emphasis upon process in the pedagogy of writing, it is interesting that there are so few who follow Zoellner's advice to show students what writing is like by the teacher actually writing in the classroom. If we are to teach the process of writing, it follows that if one is to use imitation, then the process must be modeled. Immediately the problem arises as to a source for such models. How can a student imitate such a private and individual activity as writing? Because of this problematic element, there are few who use this method although the benefits of this type of imitation would merit much wider use.

Simply put, the student observes through watching the teacher as she writes in class and voices her inner thoughts and struggles. If the model begins by brainstorming ideas for a subject, writing down every thought as it comes, then the student does the same. If the model begins to evaluate these random thoughts, then the student does so as well. Since the imitation is tied to thought processes of a model, students cannot be expected to make an exact copy, as they did from a model essay. The essay can be

examined and re-read: thoughts cannot be. Though the thought process is much more complicated and dynamic, imitation can still take place.

Examples: Muriel Harris(1983) who was the director of the writing lab at Purdue suggested a practical application of Zoellner's advice. Though her modeling of the process is in a student conference setting, her basic approach in the classroom was the talk-write, or talking-while-writing, approach to help students be more aware of the process that they are using in composing. In striving to help a first year composition student who seemed to be helped little by the talk-write approach, she decided to model the process. This took place in a one-on-one conference session involving her expressing her own thoughts while she wrote. The student then imitates the process and all the while voicing the principles and process that he was trying to use. After three one-hour sessions there was improvement in the student's writing. The content improved as well as a decrease in time that it took to produce the improved work (p.77-78). She focused more on what was taking place in the student than on the product. The imitation was not of writing but of a person who was writing.

In a similar approach, Robert Brooke (1988) used an author rather than the teacher as a model. He describes a teacher, Janet Rich, with whom he worked. He met with her weekly to discuss her teaching process and the results in the students. She had had three major teaching methods: (1) Writing of essays in which students explored their own feelings and identities, (2) Reading of *A Bird in the House* by Margret Laurence, which was chosen because the novel "is of a person who uses writing to explore, present, and hopefully understand the complexity of life around her," (3) Class discussion both of their compositions and the novel (Brooke, p. 27). The discussions of the book were not

the typical English class topic of plot and character development; instead, Janet sought to lead the students to relate their own experiences to those of the author. Thus, they were reading a book that was, in a sense, modeling the type of writing that they were assigned. During the early part of the class, this correlation between the reading and writing was not emphasized, but toward the end of the class it was made explicit. The teacher's aim was to help students identify with the author as a writer. She sought to have students think through how the model author wrote about her experiences. According to Brooke, the teacher's use of Margret Laurence as a somewhat covert model offered an opportunity for the students to act as writers like Margret Laurence (p. 30). The students were not only able to identify with the model author; they were able to imitate her process of writing. They experienced a process of writing about their own lives, while examining a work in which the author was doing the same. Brooke further analyzed this process a step further, by including a report of the responses of the students to the use of a model. He presented the ends of the spectrum of student's responses: one very positive response in which the student took on a new identity from the model and wrote expressing very similar feelings, and the negative response of the student who rejected the whole process and complained that she only needed to develop writing skills to help her pass other classes. Most of the students fell in between these responses. The majority affirmed that they were transformed in a beneficial way by the use of model without it threatening their own identity (p. 35).

In the days before overhead projectors when blackboards were a thing on the wall and not a computer program, Richard Larsen (1978) wrote an essay in which he described imitating the process of writing to his freshman composition class. In front of

the class, he used three blackboards on which he composed an essay, describing as he wrote some of his thoughts and various decisions about writing that he was making as he was composing. The students wrote their own essays while he wrote his. He guided the choice of topics so that there was enough similarity to facilitate the imitation of his process. For example, he asked the students to write on the benefit of some sport. While he was writing on the benefits of long distance running, the students would pick some other sport. He then began his essay, explaining why he wrote the way he did, and encouraged the students to imitate his overall structure, inserting their own content and sentence structure. The imitation was of both his structure and of his process. The students were able to see his actual creation of an essay and hear some of the thinking processes he went through while writing. Larsen's composing in front of the class could certainly be approached with greater technical ease in today's techno-savvy world. Connecting a projector to a computer upon which the teacher would be composing could be accomplished with ease. The difficulty with imitating the processes is beginning writers will have significant differences from a seasoned instructor, not to mention the differences that personalities bring to the writing process. The advantage of imitating the instructor in this setting is that a student will see and experience how it is done at least by one model author.

Analysis: While it is difficult to accomplish this, it seems that it can be a very beneficial process. When a student sees a model going through a process, there is a picture of at least one standard for the student to use to measure if his process is like the model's process. The difficulty lies in how to make the process apparent to the student. Modeling an inner process is impossible, but there are outward expressions of the inner

workings which can be observed. These outward expressions, such as Muriel Harris's expressing her thoughts as she writes, gives the student a hint of what his own thought processes could be. The key in Brooke's example was the identification of the student with the model. Another benefit of this exercise in imitating a process is that the students began to identify themselves as writers. When they realized that they were doing what a writer did, they could see themselves as writers because they knew that they were writing. The model formed a standard of a process by which the students could measure themselves. This type of generative experience can be very helpful to the goals of a Social Constructionist view of composition. Imitating the process and embracing the writer's identity accomplishes the goal of shaping the writer.

In imitating the process of writing, a problem may arise when a beginning writer is trying to fit into the process demonstrated by a seasoned writer. The seasoned writer may quickly compose a complicated sentence with relative ease, while the beginner is much slower in constructing sentences. In some ways, this will always be a problem because the teacher must be more advanced than the student.

3.2.1.4 Copying of principles or elements of a model

Description: This form of imitation might be put outside of the category of imitation because it is a step removed from the actual imitation of a model. However, imitation does take place in the application of the principles that are demonstrated by the model. As with the imitation of the structure (the second type of imitation examined), a student reads and analyzes a work to discover what the author did. This demands a great deal of exposure to the text. For example, as the student reads and re-reads the model, she might discover that the author is weaving the main idea or thesis throughout the

discourse. The student is not only identifying the importance of a central unifying thought, she is having repeated exposures to how the author is writing. This repeated exposure will affect the way she expresses herself either directly or indirectly. The conscious act of imitation is to use the same principles that the student saw demonstrated by the model. This demands that the student not only be familiar with the model and but they must go on to understand what and how the model is achieving a purpose. Thus far, this is the same process as imitating the structure. However, this method of imitating differs because the student, after finding the principles, uses these principles to create her own work. Rather than using the same structure, the students take the principles gleaned from the model and use the same principle, but not the same structure. A student may observe that a writer creatively restates the main theme of an essay at the beginning and at the end. The principle that the student will hopefully imitate is that a clear idea should be mentioned enough so that the reader will follow the flow of thought. The student strives to have a clear idea in her writing, but not necessarily in the same structure as the model. The model may state the theme at the beginning and end; whereas the student may introduce the idea mid way through the essay and at the end. The principles are imitated not the structure. This conscious act of identifying and imitating principles hopefully results in an unconscious imitation of the model due to frequent exposure.

A genre that perhaps is not often thought of as imitation is parody. But, in order to have a parody, there must be a model and the parody must imitate that model to a certain degree, lest the connection to the original be lost. When a parody is assigned to a student, there is a type of imitation of a model that seems to fall under this category. The student must grasp what the model is doing in order imitate it in a satirical or humorous way.

Parody could be a separate category of imitation because of the different attitude in the agent towards a model and the specific product that is identified as a genre of literature. However, the basic element of this kind of imitation is a re-creation based upon rhetorical devices, content and structures used by a model. It is a humorous or satirical imitation that is free to change structure and content.

Examples: Based upon a desire to be consistent in pedagogy and theory, Mary Minock (1995) attempted to use imitation in her classroom in a way that was consistent with postmodern thought. In her class, the students thoroughly examine, analyze, and respond to a text using various methods. She begins by having them read a text seven times, each time is to be at a different time of day and in a different place. Then respond each time with a one page response. Another exercise is to take one sentence from the work and develop a one page expansion of the thought of the sentence. These writing experiences whether positive or negative are presented in class. She is attempting to lead the students to become very familiar with a text and familiar with the resistance and struggles that other students are having with a text. The individual writing of a response and the sharing of the commonality of the struggles is very important in the process of engaging the students in a text. Texts were embraced whether favorably or with resistance. The end result of this immersion in a text was that students in their final essays showed signs of imitating the texts which they so thoroughly examined. For her, imitation was a by-product of the students interacting and engaging a text (21). This indirect imitation for her is consistent with her postmodern thought: “The opportunity for students to pounce upon, tear up, deconstruct, besmirch, and –in the ultimate irony— imitate a text is a deferral of the usual agenda of meaning making, and in deference to

this undertaking and in order not to stop the process, I do not later explain that our interpretive acts simply constituted a game and the text finally means one thing or another” (24-25).

John Ruskiewicz (1979) and Don Bialostosky (1991) both advocate the use of parody as a form pedagogical imitation. Bialostosky mentions parody as a way to demystify models in a composition classroom, but he does not develop how that would take place. Ruskiewicz gives attention to different types of parody that have come out of his classroom. He mentions that he has seen eight different forms of parody. He begins to list these with the first being a close imitative parody which stays close to the content and form. He then describes variations of form content, trying to articulate these eight different forms of parody. While this division of eight forms of parody was confusing and difficult to follow, the point he was trying to make is that parody can be effectively used to help students analyze and master various forms. He claims that the students will learn more about themes, character and craft of literature than in a traditional term paper and the process of learning will be more interesting (Ruskiewicz, 1979, p.701).

Analysis: A major strength of this type of imitation is the student’s articulating of principles based upon the student’s analysis of the model. Without this step, the student’s writing is based upon principles or guidelines that a teacher might give them. This certainly is a valid and well used type of teaching method, but it is not imitation. As in the previous type of imitation, the student’s ability to analyze is an important factor that could hinder the process. If the student has little exposure to literary devices and types of sentence structure, then this process might not be effective. A teacher might begin by asking students to list the literary devices and syntactical elements, only to discover that

the first thing she must do is teach these concepts to the students. The familiarity that comes from reading and responding and perhaps creating a parody can help the student see these models are a level of writing they can achieve. If one can write a parody of a famous author, one can see that the model's writing is not some magical creation, but the creation of a person.

3.2.1.5 Copying of an image: the reading of models without formal analysis

Description: This could almost be called covert imitation. No conscious imitation is called for, but imitation will hopefully take place. If a student is reading good literature they will pick up on what is being done by the authors and will emulate the “good” writers. An indication of the popularity of this type of teaching is demonstrated by the constant publishing of books that contain examples of good writing.³⁷ What distinguishes this type of imitation from the previous one is the intentionality of the use of a model. In the previous section, there is a specific model that is analyzed with the intention of the student indirectly imitating the model. This category is more general. Having numerous good examples will give the students a sense of good writing. No specific imitation is called for by the teacher and is not even expected to happen unknowingly.

Examples: Paul Eschholz (1980) describes how his English department at the University of Vermont combined an emphasis upon writing as a process with the more traditional emphasis on product. Models are given to the students to read but no structured analysis is called for. As they read these models, Eschholz reports that “many students are surprised to discover that the qualities which characterize good writing are

³⁷ A brief survey of most any composition textbook reveals that many examples are used by most every author.

the very qualities that make them as readers want to read” (28-29). While imitation is not sought directly, they hope and assume that imitation will take place simply because of the reading. Eschholz does say that models are used in a more direct way, not in the classroom but in individual sessions, to show how writers solved various problems.

Barrett Mandel (1980), who taught at Rutgers and was the director of a writing center, seems to advocate a form of imitation that is like the first and most elementary form of imitation: the rote copying of models. He advocates this but with an important caveat that causes me to mention his concepts under this indirect form of imitation. The student should keep a copy book into which exact copies of parts of books and essays that are special to the student are recorded, but the student is not to consciously imitate these in her writing. He bases this upon theories that a true artist cannot tell you how they create- they just do it. If one tries to follow a pattern then it destroys the creativity or at least stunts it. Thus, he has the students reading and even copying model writers, but with no analysis or intentional imitation.

This type of imitation is implied in most composition textbooks. A review of twenty-five composition textbooks published after 2000 revealed the abundant use of examples.³⁸ While this is plain to anyone remotely acquainted with freshman composition textbooks, there is an implication that needs to be articulated. Obviously these authors expected that examples should serve as models, though few ever mentioned that students should imitate them. The two examples cited above, Eschholz and Mandel, in articles about pedagogy articulated that they expected the students to imitate in an indirect way.

³⁸ See Appendix to Chapter Four: Review of 25 Composition Textbooks.

Analysis: While imitation is not called for there is an expectation that it will take place. The result of teaching seems more in focus than the method of teaching. Good writing, which in some way imitates the numerous examples that are offered to the students, is the hopeful result of the teaching. Even though intentional imitation is not the goal, a form of imitation is hoped for, which validates that people are, as Aristotle said, imitative beings. This very loose form of imitation shows it is valued by most teachers, hence, the numerous examples that fill composition textbooks.

3.2.2 Guidelines for the use of Pedagogical Imitation

The goal of this project, which is to test the effectiveness of a composition teaching methodology in a homiletic classroom, demands that guidelines for its use be provided. These are gleaned from the research of historical and contemporary compositionists that was presented earlier in the chapter. These general guidelines are presented here in a form that will hopefully facilitate better use of this understated, yet effective, teaching method.

3.2.2.1 Students Must Identify with the Model

Early in the last century, Lev Semyonovich Vygotsky defined for educators what he called the “zone of proximal development.” It is the learning that takes place between what a student can do and what she cannot do, yet with help she can venture into the unlearned area. It is what is beyond students and yet, with help, within their grasp. He defined it in a 1933 lecture:

The zone of proximal development of the child is the distance between the level of his actual development, established with the help of problems independently solved, and the level of the child’s possible development, established with the help of problems and solved by the child under the guidance of adults or in

cooperation with his more intelligent partners. (Vygotsky in Van der Veer, 2007, P. 81)

When considering using imitation, a teacher must consider that some models are beyond this zone that Vygotsky identified. A freshman who has little skill in writing would be overwhelmed if the model was a complicated journal article filled with esoteric words and highly complex sentence structures. While an overly simple model would be within his current field of knowledge, it would provide nothing for him to reach towards. The zone begins at a level that the students can identify with and yet is challenging to them. Kenneth Burke's concepts that identification as a means of persuasion helps us articulate this. If there is some point at which a person can easily relate to a model, then the imitation of that model will follow more easily. For the homiletical classroom to choose preachers that the students have never heard about might work, but it is better to choose those who are good models and with whom the students will be familiar.

Another aspect of students being able to identify with a model is their level of competency. This affects the choice of the model as mentioned above, but it also affects the kind of imitation exercise that will be assigned. If the students are unfamiliar with basic grammatical and syntactical structures, then asking them to copy the grammar and structure of a model would be beyond their skill. If students are deficient in grammar, word-for-word copying might be used in conjunction with defining and describing the grammar of the model.

Identification does not mean that the model must be a person of like age and social class. The determining factor in the use imitation is that students must be able to identify with the struggles that the model has in the process. The model's struggles need

to be presented in some fashion so that the students see that there are common struggles in writing. If the teacher is the model, then the struggle can be voiced directly to the students. If it is an author who is not present in the classroom, then the struggle of the author must be presented in some fashion.

3.2.2.2 Analysis Should Accompany the Exercise of Imitation

Mindless copying of a model will produce only boredom and frustration in most students. Learning may take place but the student may not realize it, which robs them of the satisfaction of seeing personal growth. Analysis also insures that the correct things are being copied. All models have their flaws and if the student copies without analysis, there is a danger that the weaknesses will be copied.

The analysis of the model must take place though its timing can vary. It can be before the imitation takes place. A teacher presents a model, showing the strengths and weaknesses, various structures and use of words, followed by an assignment for the students to imitate these strengths that were identified in the model by the teacher. The analysis can take place during the imitation. This demands a higher level of skill in the student. The student is given a model to copy, and as the student is imitating, she is identifying various strengths and weakness in the model. This is a form of self discovery in the student and results in a high level of learning. Analysis can also follow the imitation. After students have attempted to imitate a model the teacher guides them through a discussion of the strengths and weakness of a model. Because the students have made their own copy of the model they are more familiar with the content and can more easily see it as exemplary.

3.2.2.3 Multiple Models Should be Available

There is always a fear that imitation will result in the cloning of students. This fear is easily displaced by using multiple models. When a student uses several different models she takes on characteristics from each of the models, to some degree. The drawing of strengths from several different sources has greater potential to produce a well-rounded student. The use of multiple models also gives the students a better chance of identifying with a model because there is greater chance that they will feel some affinity towards one specific model. If the student has a choice in the models that he is imitating, then he will have a greater degree of ownership. The teacher can present herself as one of the models. This demands that the teacher be secure in her writing because the analysis will reveal the flaws that are inevitable. This makes for an even more productive teaching moment when the instructor shows the student that he, even as a teacher still makes mistakes and has great room for improvement. The teacher as a model is also the best way to demonstrate the process of writing because the student can see the actual writing process. The multiple models can also include fellow students. This combined with the teacher as a model as well as recognized authors can produce a sense of community in the students not only with each other but with the teacher and other authors.

3.2.2.4 A Teachable Spirit Towards Imitation Must be Engendered

Human beings have the mixed tendencies to want to be unique and yet fit in with a group. We want to be apart but we want to have our own identity. This common desire pushes against the use of imitation. People want to be themselves. The teacher will need to spend some time validating and explaining that imitation is common to all people

and part of the way human nature functions. If students come to the imitation exercise with a attitude that is hostile, then it will not be successful. The teacher needs to affirm their suspicious about imitation short circuiting self expression and then show how imitation can help liberate. A teacher can best accomplish this through demonstrating their own learning by imitation. When the student hears of the teacher's own personal experience with the process of imitation, the student is more likely to be open to it. The teacher needs to share not only the positive sides of her experience, but also the struggle. Perhaps there was a resistance to using a model, or difficulty in knowing what parts of the model to use. This vulnerability gives the students a point of identification and affirms that their struggles are not unusual. In a sense, the teacher is giving them an attitude towards imitation, to imitate.

This positive attitude towards imitative exercises can also be engendered by the teacher demonstrating the assignment for the class. If it is a word-for-word copying then the teacher could do the assignment before class and then take the time in class to show, at least in part, how she would make another copy. If it is a parody, she could attempt to compose some of it in front of the class. The aim is to let the student see the teacher actually doing the exercise.

3.2.3 The Benefits of the use of Pedagogical Imitation

When we approach using imitation as a teaching method whether for composition or homiletics, the very word imitation generates a negative response. Thus, by listing some of the benefits, preconceived resistance to its use can be minimized.

The pejorative phrase “a cheap imitation” is often used because we think that the “real” thing is better and the imitation is of inferior quality or value. I once asked a

homiletics professor to name his favorite preacher. He answered that he had no favorite preacher, for to have a favorite preacher would mean that he might be overly influenced by that model and would not become the preacher that God wanted him to be. He didn't want to imitate another preacher, but he wanted to be the unique minister that God had in mind for him. In a different setting but with a similar objection to imitation, someone who values self-expression would say that imitation is to be avoided because a person should be himself and not an imitation of another.

These sample objections to the use of imitation demonstrate the need to articulate the benefits of imitation as a composition teaching methodology. In my research, I found no direct forbidding of imitation but when one looks at recent publications of composition textbooks, it seems that imitation is not used often in today's composition class. In an article which examines calls for the use of imitation, Frank Farmer and Phillip Arrington (1993) state this opposition to the use of imitation well when they say that as a teaching methodology for writing it is "tacitly rejected" (p. 12). Even the tacit rejection of imitation in the composition classroom could shed doubt on its use to teach homiletics. Thus, identifying the benefits of using imitation to teach composition will affirm its use to teach homiletics.

The following list of benefits of using imitation as a teaching method are not intended as an exhaustive list but rather as compilation of various views combined in a summary fashion to aid in a clear presentation. There is often a complementary objection to a benefit, or a negative for a positive. Thus, each benefit will be discussed with the opposing objection in mind.

3.2.3.1 Imitation Enhances Progress

Dale Sullivan (1989) in his article addressing the relationship of classical and modern attitudes towards imitation has articulated how our culture resists the idea of imitation. One objection he articulates is the myth of progress, which holds the new as being better than the old. This objection to imitation sees the reproduction of something that has already been written as greatly hindering the production of a new thing. How can people think outside the box if their creativity is restricted to creating another box? New things are greatly desired. In the sciences, it would be something like a new form of energy, or in the arts a new way of understanding Shakespeare. While the “new” is of great importance and must be sought, the priority of the new over the old is debated. Rabanus Maurus demonstrated the proper relationship between the old and the new when he selectively used the principles of classical rhetoric to inform his teaching of homiletics rather than uncritically teaching the traditional concepts from classical rhetoric (Murphy, 1974, p. 83). Maurus could be seen as embracing this myth of progress, but he exhibits a balanced approach: taking from the old, but not letting it be the sole authority. A contemporary example is Richard Weaver (1948/1984) who does not think that the new is always better than the old. He feels one needs to be striving to improve, but to think that the new is always required is to lapse into mere activity of creating something new (p. 51). While we must have respect for the past, it is not automatic that new is better.

If the purpose of imitation is to produce copies of early works, then I would join in this objection. However, the end product of pedagogical imitation is not the written copy of an essay; rather the product is a new skill that imitation hopes to produce in the

students for use in the future. The hesitation comes because the object and the subject are only in view, which is understandable because these are easier to measure. A copy of a model is a static item which can be examined, whereas the process is very dynamic and very difficult to examine. Thus, both the teacher and student tend to focus on the product. When the process of imitation is remembered, the focus can be on what happens in the person doing the imitation. This “hoped-for” learning can lead to creations by the students that exceed what is imitated. Quintilian tells his students that they should excel beyond the ones they imitate (*Institutio oratoria*, X. 2.10). Imitation is a means to the end of producing something “new” in the students. It is a teaching method designed to produce a skill in the students. And, these new skills will hopefully enhance progress, resulting in new creations.

3.2.3.2 Imitation Strengthens Creativity

How can the exercise of imitating a model strengthen creativity? It would seem that it would hinder it. This objection is echoed by composition pedagogy theorists. Frank D’Angelo (1973) laments that teachers see imitation and invention as mutually exclusive: imitation is seen as counterfeiting but invention is creative (p. 283). Penelope Starkey (1974) says that imitation was used for centuries but fell into “disrepute” because of the Romantic concern with originality (p.435). Robert Connors (2000) says in respect to creativity, imitation exercises were perceived as “actively insulting student writers.” Connors sites D’Angelo’s words that imitation is “servile copying” (p. 114). Imitation is perceived as being the opposite of creativity and individual expression.

This resistance is understandable if imitation is only a passive act. If imitation is only a mechanical re-creation of another’s work with no effect upon the copyists other

than the fatigue of work, then imitation is meaningless to the student. This objection assumes that the students will not engage their minds except to move their hands in response to the words their eyes are observing. However, imitation is an active process that demands the student observe what a writer does, internalize it, and then produce a work that is similar and yet different. Imitation is not mere copying word-for-word like a medieval monk mechanically copying a manuscript; it is copying for the purpose of improving one's own writing. D'Angelo (1973) says that imitation exists for the sake of variation (p. 283). Creativity and individualism are not lost in imitation when imitation is used to teach the development of skills. Imitation is part of a teaching process; it is not a means of production. Since it is logically impossible to produce an exact copy there must be a degree of creativity. Even the monks, while careful to copy word for word from an original, added their own creativity through illumination and marginalia. This benefit of increasing creativity should be highlighted for the student. What did the student copy very closely and where did the student vary from the model? How do the various copies that students make in a class differ from each other? Perhaps a teacher could have the students present their copies to the class and highlight the creativity of each student as expressed in differences in the copies.

3.2.3.3 Imitation Engages the Student

When imitation is used as a methodology, there is the danger of the student taking a passive role in learning. Michael Flanigan (1980) refers to this passive role with a metaphor of the mind soaking up knowledge like a sponge (p. 212). Imitation can be used in a manner that demands little of the student other than a reproduction of a model which does not engage the mind in an analytical manner. A sponge soaks up water and then

releases it without any effect upon the sponge. Based upon the work of research, psychologists Vygotsky, Sahakian and Piaget, and Flanigan expresses that learning must be active; that is, we learn by doing. Imitation can be done in such a way that the brain is engaged only as much as is needed to reproduce a copy of a model. If imitation is presented in this fashion, then there is the danger of a passive attitude towards learning.

If any methodology is presented in such a way that it demands only a passive response in the learner, it is ineffective. Imitation has the inherent danger of becoming mindless copying, but when used in the right way, at the right time, an exercise in imitation can greatly engage the mind and demand a high level of activity in the learner. Imitation becomes a benefit by directing students to let the imitation be the beginning point, not the end, of their work. Imitation works when the mind is engaged and the models are seen as exemplary solutions to problems that student writers encounter. When using imitation the instructor must guard against the worksheet mentality in which students merely reproduce the elements of a model without engaging their minds. Allow me to alter Flanigan's metaphor. When a sponge is envisioned as a living sea creature instead of a synthetic cleaning tool, the image can be helpful. A living sponge grows because it is actively gleaning nourishment from the water that passes through it.

3.2.3.4 Imitation Builds Community

In response to Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Patricia Bizzell (1979) presents the importance of the community in the shaping of and teaching of composition. This concept of the primacy of the community both epistemologically and pedagogically is reinforced in her *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness* (1994). Though she and others who emphasize the community, such as Stanley Fish

(1980), don't specifically attack imitation as a methodology, it is easy to extrapolate from their emphasis upon community that there are no truly authoritative models because the community is constantly influencing itself as to what the model should be. This objection to imitation while not articulated by this social constructionist type of thinking could be a factor in the resistance to its use. An imitation exercise could be seen as based upon some kind of platonic idealistic thinking. The aversion to this platonic concept, I believe, could result in the lack of support for using imitation. If students are expected to "copy" a model, then the platonic mindset of following an exemplary pattern is taught to the students. Bizzell makes a strong case that teachers can't help but teach their world view and it is best if they let the students know what their world view is, thus avoiding a hidden curriculum (1994, p.99). If one rejects a platonic world view, then it would seem that there would be an aversion to imitation. To ask students to imitate a static model or an "ideal text" is incongruous with the constant flux of the community influence on a model.

However, imitation enhances a sense of community when the models used for imitation are presented as co-laborers in the task of writing. As models are analyzed, it is important for the instructor to show the weaknesses as well as the strengths, thus showing that no one writer is independently perfect. The influence of writers upon each other can also be shown. An example would be to show how J. R.R. Tolkien influenced C. S. Lewis. Imitation's benefit is enhanced when the model is seen as being in the same community as the student. This benefit is enhanced by avoiding only one model. Remembering that we do function in a community can help the effectiveness of an imitation methodology. When an instructor presents multiple models, it is not just for the

sake of giving multiple examples; rather, it is also to show that these models are in community. Multiple models will also promote community because the students have the benefit of multiple authors with whom they can identify. Presenting only one authoritative example may undermine the student's sense of community if the student, for unknown reasons, doesn't identify with the author who is held up as a model. To ensure the proper influence of the community, models could even be drawn from the class and presented as part of the community of writers from which we model our own writing. Using imitation in this manner could give great affirmation to the students and reinforce the concept of community.

3.2.3.5 Imitation Can Reduce Resistance to Self-critique

When student labors over an essay, a high sense of ownership takes place so that the critique of the essay can be felt as personal. This is all the more apparent in the preaching classroom. After a student has labored with, prayed over, and delivered a sermon, she has some of the same feelings a mother has towards her newborn—how could anyone be critical of my baby? Even though the composition teacher or the homiletics instructor strives to be positive and affirming, there is still a resistance in each of us to criticism. Imitation has the potential to create a process in which this resistance can be greatly reduced. The resistance comes because what is being critiqued belongs to the student. When the student uses a model to create an essay, the critique is like a carom shot—it is bounced off of something other than the real target. Hans Ostrom (1998) presents this benefit of imitation based upon his experience in his classroom. He asked the students to write two or three page *micro stories* based upon the style presented in a model such as Italo Calvino's *Invisible Cities*. In this case, the students would use

Calvino's style and create their own invisible something: college, classroom, or car dealership. When the critique was given, the students were able to defer the feeling of their creations being attacked by viewing the criticism as being directed toward the style of the model. He saw that this use of imitation liberated the students: "Imitation—an idea that, at first or second glance, would seem the opposite of liberatory—gives to or leaves with the students considerable, appropriate power" (p.170).

CHAPTER 4

THE USE OF IMITATION IN A HOMILETICS CLASSROOM

The use of imitation in teaching composition has a deep historical precedent and numerous contemporary examples. On this foundation, an empirical element of this project was designed to test the thesis—composition teaching methods can be used in the homiletic classroom. Based upon the material presented in the previous chapters, I designed a teaching plan using imitative methodology for a homiletic class at the seminary at which I teach.³⁹ For evaluation, I used a survey with limited quantitative objective questions mixed with qualitative subjective questions. A broader quantitative study, which could include hundreds of students, would be helpful, but no system was available to conduct such a survey, thus this project focused on the response of twenty to thirty seminary students during the fall semester, 2008. Cindy Johaneck (2000), in her guide to research in composition studies, convincingly argues that qualitative stories by themselves do not paint a full picture, nor do quantitative surveys (p. 11-12). The anecdotal story of one teaching method helping one student can be inspiring, but that ignores the other factors that can be measured quantitatively. Responses to quantitative results, such as saying, “Fifty five percent of the class improved” ignore the individual stories that may have contributed to the success of a teacher’s efforts. Both are needed to give a better picture. Thus, an attempt was made to include both qualitative and

³⁹ The guidelines developed for the use of imitation in the previous chapters appear later in this chapter in the teaching plans.

quantitative forms of evaluation in this experiment using composition imitation teaching methods in a homiletical classroom. The surveys had quantitative questions using a Likert-type scale for response and gave an opportunity for narrative answers. A class discussion of the imitative intervention was conducted at the end of the semester.

4.1 Overview of the Imitative Intervention

4.1.1 Teaching Philosophy

My purpose in using imitation to teach delivery is based upon the philosophy that learning does not take place unless there is a degree of frustration in the student. Learning is the acquisition of new knowledge or a new skill. In the process of learning, there is a degree of frustration when the student can see that she does not have the skills or knowledge necessary to complete a task. Without knowledge of the new level, the student does not realize that more is expected of them. When they see a completed work of what they are trying to accomplish but realize they lack the knowledge and skills to accomplish a similar task, frustration results. This frustration is part of the process necessary to acquire new skills. As the students imitate the models, they will realize that their level of delivery skill is very different from the model's level. To some degree, there will be a unresolved frustration in the students. This frustration in the students is part of the purpose in using imitation. Hopefully, this will give the students an experiential awareness of a level of delivery necessary in preaching.

Another part of my teaching philosophy that affected the way I used imitation is seen in my requiring the students to present their imitation in class. This is part of my dialogical view which sees interaction as a valuable teaching tool. Though there was no direct discussion of the imitation, it became a shared experience as each student presented

to the class. As students observed each other, they would become even more aware of the model's delivery due to different traits being emphasized or left out. One student may have imitated a certain gesture, while another student who was imitating the same model may have overlooked that particular hand movement. The dialogical element is enhanced by the camaraderie created in the atmosphere of having to perform a difficult exercise.

4.1.2 Setting

This empirical element was conducted at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. The size of the institution and level of education are both significant to this study. The size of this school is significant because two sections of the same homiletics course were necessary to properly test the effect of imitation teaching methods. Many seminaries have only one section of the basic homiletics class per semester. Since at Southwestern, there are three or four sections of the same homiletics class offered each semester, the teaching intervention and the control group could be taught the same semester. Another factor was the educational level of the students in the homiletics class. The teaching of preaching varies greatly, from very informal studies offered to interested church members in a Sunday evening class, to formal seminary training. The level within seminaries is inconsistent. Some seminaries are not accredited and can vary greatly in the level of education offered. The models for composition teaching methods that are used in this study are at a university level, when transferred to a homiletics classroom, they would be more fairly tested if the level of education was similar. An accredited seminary such as Southwestern is a professional school that requires a bachelors' degree for admittance to the masters' programs. It is accredited by The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and by the Association of Theological Schools. The primary degree

in which most men and women who are preparing for ministry are enrolled is a 90 hour program requiring two foreign languages, theoretical and practical classes. It is rigorous, program which often takes four years to complete. University level composition teaching methods would find a somewhat equal level of education.

4.1.3 Personnel

The students involved in the study are in their second or third year of seminary and range in age from 24- to middle age. Because they are at a traditional Baptist seminary, they tend to be very conservative in the theology and in their view of education. They would tend to favor the more traditional teaching methods of lecture and tests which is the method that most professors favor. While a formal survey was not administered, my experience as a professor for nine years at this current institution, and six years at a similar seminary, allows me to make this informal observation. This project needed a homiletics professor who was familiar with composition pedagogy. Though I have not taught composition, I have fifteen hours of education classes, nine of which are focusing on composition education, and I have taught preaching for a total of fourteen years. It seemed that I was qualified to be the instructor for the empirical element.

4.1.4 Method

Two sections of an introductory preaching course, entitled Introduction to Expository Preaching, were involved in the study. One class functioned as the control group, thus, it did not have an imitation teaching activity, while the other class had two extra sessions using imitation exercises. The control group had two class sessions and the intervention class had four. The specific imitative teaching activity was administered in four 75 minute teaching sessions in which students were led through two imitation

exercises. The general flow of the teaching plan was to teach the principles first and then use an imitation exercise to reinforce the principles. The teaching objectives were to teach style and delivery. In homiletics, style is generally thought to include sentence structure and word choice that is appropriate to the sermon, the audience, and the preacher. Often people assume that style refers to a preacher's oral delivery. In academic homiletics, the area that includes voice, gestures, and movement is referred to as delivery. Delivery is the actual preaching of the sermon. In order to help ensure that the group which received the imitative intervention was only influenced by that intervention, I was a guest lecturer in both classes. It seemed that if I inserted the imitative teaching element into a semester long class which I taught, the results might be skewed by other factors such as an overall effectiveness or ineffectiveness of my teaching for the full semester. As a guest lecturer, the number of these factors, which I would bring, was reduced. Of course, there are many other factors that affect teaching effectiveness, but these were not tested nor were they commented on by the students.

The control class had one lecture for each topic using a traditional lecture type of teaching methodology. These same lectures were given in the intervention class with additional imitative exercises in an additional class. The first week in the intervention class focused on style, which was taught through lecture followed by a written imitation of the structure and syntax of a well respected preacher whose style and word choice are exemplary. This was not a word for word copying but an attempt to copy the sentence structure and the use of verbs and adjectives. The students used the model to write a 200 word sermon illustration. The second week the students mimicked the oral delivery of a preacher who has excellent delivery. They watched a video of the model, then using a

transcript of the sermon, they mimicked a three minute section of the sermon, striving to match words, timing, inflection, and gestures. After practicing on their own, they presented these three minute recreations in class.

4.1.5 Evaluation

At the beginning of the semester, students in both classes filled out a brief survey measuring their (1) understanding of homiletics in general, (2) their understanding of the importance of style and delivery, and (3) their self-perception of their level of competence in the areas of style and delivery. This established a standard by which to measure the effectiveness of each style of teaching. A second survey was administered to both classes at the end of the semester to measure the same areas. A comparison was made between the class that had the imitation element and the control class. On the second survey given to the intervention class, space was provided for the students to write a brief narrative about their education experience with imitation. And, a class discussion of the effectiveness and reaction to the imitative intervention was administered at the end of the semester to those who participated in the intervention class.

4.2 Narrative of the Process

The process began as a concept that was formalized through the normal processes of a prospectus being submitted and approved. The first action was to find two preaching classes to serve as subjects for the control group and the intervention group. At Southwestern, the beginning homiletics class, Introduction to Expository Preaching, is primarily the teaching of new concepts and skills to the students. The second year class, Advanced Expository Preaching, is primarily a preaching laboratory which is designed to give the students a controlled atmosphere in which to practice what they learned in the

first class. Since this advanced class was not primarily trying to teach new concepts as much as reinforce concepts from the first class, it seemed better to place the intervention in the introductory class. After establishing which two classes would be used for the intervention, permission from the administration, the professors and the students was obtained. The students signed an official release form which was approved by my institution's review board. These consent forms are on permanent file in my office. The review board also approved the surveys which were used.

Near the beginning of the fall semester 2008, the initial survey was given to each class. Introduction to Expository Preaching 3313A was the control group and 3313B the intervention class. The questions were designed to test the homiletical knowledge and skills of the students. The class which would receive the imitative intervention was asked an additional question regarding their attitude toward the use of imitation. There are two parts to the survey. The first part sought general information to compare the make-up of this class to the other class. The three general questions attempted to measure the amount of formal homiletical education, the level of experience and the intention or purpose for taking the homiletics class in relationship to the students' long range goals. The second part contained ten questions measuring the level of knowledge, as well as the normal practice of the students in the area of style and delivery. The additional question for 3313B regarding the student's attitude toward imitation was included because of the resistance that one notices in composition studies towards imitation. Would the same resistance towards imitation as a teaching method exist in preaching students? The following is the survey that was administered at the beginning of the class. Often material such as this is placed in an appendix. It is offered here because it is important to the flow

of thought; it is not supplementary information, but the heart of the chapter. This applies to the lesson plans as well.

4.2.1 Pre-Session Surveys

The two surveys were identical with the exception of an additional question (question 11) being added to the survey given to the imitative group (group B). Thus, only one survey is presented below with the understanding that separate surveys were given to the respective classes.

Pre-intervention Survey

General Information

A. How many preaching classes have you taken prior to this semester either formally or informally?

None One Two-three More than three

B. How many times have you preached prior to this class?

Never 1-5 times 5-20 times 20+ times

C. What do you see as your long range plan for ministry?

Pastor Assoc. pastor (youth, children, education, etc.)
 Missions Teach college or seminary Other

Style and Delivery

1. How often do you edit key sentences in a sermon (Main idea, opening and concluding sentences, transitions, applications, etc.)

(One or two edits) 1 2 3 4 5 (10+ edits)

2. Choosing the right words and structure for a key sentence in a sermon is as important as understanding the text.

- Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Disagree
3. Being clear in writing is easier or harder than being clear in speaking.
- Easier 1 2 3 4 5 Harder
4. The congregation to whom you are speaking should influence your word choice to what level:
- Greatly influence 1 2 3 4 5 Little influence
5. In selecting words for a sermon a preacher should, or should not, carefully choose words that touch a person's emotions.
- Should 1 2 3 4 5 Should not
6. The rate of speaking in a sermon should be slower or faster than the rate of normal conversation.
- Slower 1 2 3 4 5 Faster
7. Which generally carries the more weight, verbal or non verbal communication.
- Non verbal 1 2 3 4 5 Verbal
8. Good delivery is spontaneous and not planned.
- Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Disagree
9. A preacher's facial expressions reveal his/her feelings about the text.
- Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Disagree
10. How much attention should the preacher give to using his whole body to communicate the message of the text?
- Some attention 1 2 3 4 5 A great deal of attention
11. Please describe your initial attitudes towards the concept of imitation as a teaching method. (This question was only asked of the intervention class.)

4.2.2 Teaching the Classes-Style

The next step in the process was the actual teaching of the two sections. The control class met on Monday nights from 6:15- 8:45 and the intervention class met Tuesday and Thursday mornings from 9:25- 10:40. The control class was taught in a traditional lecture style with minimal interaction from the students. These same lectures were given to the intervention class with additional teaching using an imitative methodology. The lesson plans for the control class 3313A are presented followed by the lesson plans for the intervention class 3313B.

The intervention class lesson plan for the first session was identical to the lesson plan for the control class with the exception of an additional portion of the teaching plan, which introduced the concept of imitation and presented an assignment that prepared the students for the imitative methodology of the next class session. This additional portion of the teaching plan was added on to the end of the session. The fifteen additional minutes required for this portion was made possible by reducing the number of minutes for the lecture, for the analysis of the example and for the time for questions at the conclusion. The second class session for the intervention class builds upon the imitation that the students experienced in the homework assignment from the first session.

Teaching of Style to Group A (non imitative)

Style: Lesson Plan

Group A (no imitation exercise) Class 1

Purpose:

The purpose of this class is to improve the student's understanding of style and increase their ability and motivation to use the elements of good style in

preaching and give them ideas as to how to improve their style.

Goals:

1. The student will understand the importance of good style
2. The student will be able to list three elements of good style
3. The students will be motivated to improve his/her style in preaching

Objectives:

1. Students will discuss with other students a past experience in working on good style.
2. Students will listen to a lecture on style.
3. Students will write important points of the lecture in their own words on a handout provided
4. Students will observe how the professor edits an illustration to make it more effective.
5. Students will compare the unedited illustration with the edited one to observe improvements and articulate why it is an improvement.
6. Each Student will report to the class about at least one of their observations of improvement.

Outcomes:

1. The students will take more time to work on style in their sermon for class
2. The students will be more aware of good style in sermons
3. The student will realize the need to become a student of style

Teaching Plan:

1. Introduction (12 min)

Personal introduction of professor

Definition of Style

Introduction of the importance of good style

Read before and after examples of my own illustration

2. Small Group discussion (12- 15 minutes)

See handout #1 (see appendix to Chapter Four)

3. Lecture: (25-30 minutes)

See handout #2 (see appendix to Chapter Four)

4. Analysis of example(s) (15- 20 minutes)

Professor will use an example(s) of re-writing an illustration to show how to improve style. See handout #3 (see appendix to Chapter Four)

Using the guidelines for good style presented in the lecture, the Professor will begin pointing out the things that changed and then ask the class to find more. He will start with two examples hoping for class to provide more. If necessary, he can add more examples to help the class participate.

Examples of changes:

More use of active voice and present tense- “Kept climbing”

Use of more sensory words- slushy snow, sting,

More action verbs- raced

Stronger words- cabbage patch rather than garden,

Contrasting images-

other onlookers vs. the three teenage boys

rocket and cabbage patch

Use of direct quotes, “I guess he is a nut . . .”

5. If time permits a second example illustration will be analyzed. See handout #4

6. Conclusion (3- 11 minutes)

Use remaining time for questions, saving at least one minute for a final exhortation: we must work at improving our style because of the importance of communicating the message of the Bible effectively and the joy of being creative.

Teaching of Style to Group B (imitation group)

Style: Lesson Plan

Group B (imitation exercise) Class Session 1

Purpose:

The purpose of this class is to improve the student’s understanding of style and increase their ability and motivation to use the elements of good style in preaching and give them ideas as to how to improve their style.

Goals:

1. The student will understand the importance of good style
2. The student will be able to list three elements of good style
3. The students will be motivated to improve his/her style in preaching

Objectives:

1. Students will discuss with other students a past experience in working on good style.
2. Students will listen to a lecture on style.
3. Students will write important points of the lecture in their own words on a handout provided
4. Students will observe how the professor edits an illustration to make it more effective.
5. Students will compare the unedited illustration with the edited one to observe improvements and articulate why it is an improvement.
6. Each Student will report to the class about at least one of their observations of improvement.

Outcomes:

1. The students will take more time to work on style in their sermon for class
2. The students will be more aware of good style in sermons
3. The student will realize the need to become a student of style

Teaching Plan:

1. Introduction (12 min)

Personal introduction of professor

Definition of Style

Introduction of the importance of good style

Read before and after examples of my own illustration

2. Small Group discussion (12- 15 minutes)

See handout #1 (see appendix to Chapter Four)

3. Lecture: (25-30 minutes)

See handout #2 (see appendix to Chapter Four)

4. Analysis of example(s) (15- 20 minutes)

Professor will use an example(s) of re-writing an illustration to show how to improve style. See handout #3 (see appendix to Chapter Four)

Using the guidelines for good style presented in the lecture, the Professor will begin pointing out the things that changed, and then ask the class to find more. He will start with two examples hoping for class to provide more. If necessary, he can add more examples to help the class participate.

Examples of changes:

More use of active voice and present tense- “Kept climbing”

Use of more sensory words- slushy snow, sting,

More action verbs- raced

Stronger words- cabbage patch rather than garden,

Contrasting images-

other onlookers vs. the three teenage boys

rocket and cabbage patch

Use of direct quotes, “I guess he is a nut . . .

Additional Portion of First Session Lesson Plan for the Imitation Intervention Class

5. Instructions for imitation assignment (15minutes)

A. General instructions regarding imitation

What it is not- mindless copying

Imitation needs a creative mind

Process: Observe it, understand the principle, copy the principle

Similar to modeling-

This is an educational experience, not a way of life (plagiarism is wrong)

B. Demonstrate my experience

Close imitation- sentence for sentence

Loose imitation- principles and similar elements loosely followed

C. Assignment- Write down a story from your own life that illustrates something from your passage that you will preach. In the next class, you will be editing and then reading it to the class. Hopefully, you will be able to use this illustration when you preach. Don't worry about your classmates hearing the illustration before you actually preach the sermon. A good illustration is like a good song; it is good to hear it again. It can be something you experienced, or saw, or heard or read about. ***Do not get it from an illustration book or another sermon.*** Write a 200-300 word version of your illustration. Using one or all of the examples we looked at in class, try to imitate the example: verb tenses, descriptive words, etc.

Bring a hard copy that is tripled spaced- you will be editing it. You may want to bring your laptops (with batteries charged) to work on this.

But bring an extra hard copy in case of computer problems. Your grade is based upon your editing done in class and the use of good style in the final presentation.

D. Summary of assignment:

1. 200-300 word original illustration imitating the structure and syntax of your choice of example.
2. Informal format: just be sure your name is on it.
3. Two- tripled space hard copies
4. Due at beginning of class

Style: Lesson Plan

Group B (imitation exercise) Class Session 2

Purpose:

The purpose of this class is to improve the student's understanding of style and increase their ability, motivation and confidence in using the elements of good style in preaching.

Goals:

1. The students will experience improvement of their style.
2. The students will gain appreciation of the importance of good style.
3. The students will be motivated to improve his/her style in preaching.
4. The students will gain skills to improve their style.
5. The students will receive affirmation of their use of style.

Objectives:

1. Students will listen to a short review of the specific elements of style in the exemplary illustrations.
2. Students will receive suggestions from two other students as to how to improve the illustration they prepared for class.
3. Students will edit their illustrations based upon feedback from other students.
4. Students will read their revised illustrations for the class.
5. Students will identify and write down at least one positive element of style from each of the individual student presentations as well as other observations.
6. Students will hear specific affirmations from the professor and from class members after their presentation.
7. Students will hear specific ways to improve their illustrations.

Outcomes:

1. The students will see and hear the benefits of improved style.
2. The students will have more confidence in their ability to improve their own style.
3. The student will realize the need to become a student of style.

Teaching Plan:

1. Introduction (5 min)

Prayer

Zechariah 4:6- Source of help for good style

Good style- elements reviewed from last class

2. Students will divide into groups of two or three. They will read each others illustrations and offer affirmations and suggestions for improvement based upon the models that were given as well as their own personal knowledge of style. (15 minutes)
3. Students will edit their illustrations based upon comments from peers. (5 minutes)
4. Each student will read his/her illustration to the class (45 minutes)
 - a. As you listen to other students, jot down name of presenter and one positive observation and any other observations.
 - b. As you speak I will be filing out an evaluation sheet but if you see me writing don't worry it may well be a positive comment
5. During the presentation students will identify and write down at least one element of good style from each presentation.
6. After a third of the presentations are made the professor will point out elements of good style from class presentations as well as areas to improve. The professor will ask for volunteers from the class to make additional comments on each student. Then the second third of the class will present with comments following and the last third following that. (average of 3 min per student)⁴⁰
7. Conclusion (5 min) The professor will remind the students of their imitating a model as a starting point for improving their style and ask how that effected their editing of each other's work as well as their own work.

⁴⁰ This allowance for time was an oversight in the teaching plan for it did not allow enough time for all the students to present. More comments will follow in Chapter Five.

4.2.2.1 Commentary on the Use of Imitation to Teach Style

The following two sections are an attempt to show how the study from the previous chapters affected the imitative interventions. First is a general commentary that emerged in the interaction with the historical and philosophical background to the use of imitation. Following the influence of the general information is the influence of the specific guidelines presented in chapter.

Due to the resistance that one finds to the use of imitation, the first portion of the teaching was an attempt to facilitate a positive attitude towards imitation. The surveys which were filled out at the beginning of the semester revealed that six students had reservations about using imitation.⁴¹ As articulated earlier, much of the opposition to the use of imitation was due to a misunderstanding of imitation. Thus, in my teaching this portion, I first explained that imitation is not mindless copying; rather it is a creative re-creation based upon a model. This was followed by an attempt to challenge the students that it takes a special creative mind to be able to imitate. Hopefully, this motivated them to try this imitative exercise because I assume that they want to have creative minds. This was followed by a more explicit explanation of how I expected them to use imitation in the assignment. They were to closely observe the models presented in class, identify principles or devices that the author used, and then imitate that principle in their own illustrations. The danger of imitation being plagiaristic was cautioned against by saying that the principles and literary devices that an author uses are not owned by that author. The author's content and writing are personal property, but the literary devices and sentence structures which authors employ are public domain and always have been. If

⁴¹ Details of the results of the surveys are fully presented in the following chapter.

intentional direct copying takes place in an educational setting for the purpose of observation and learning, it is not plagiarism. But, one must be careful in close imitation to stay aware that an educational copy is being made and that it stays in the classroom where both student and teacher are conscious that an exact copy is being made. My opening comments included an articulation of the difference between making an exact copy and loosely imitating. The assignment was not to make an exact copy, but what I called a loose imitation in which principles and syntax were copied.

4.2.2.2 The Application of the Specific Guidelines to Teach *Style*

Students must be able to identify with a model. The models chosen were not model prose examples which one would find in a composition textbook; rather they were from well-known preachers, either from their sermons or from a collection of the illustrative portions of their sermons. Also, these preachers have a theology similar to the theology of our students. The points of identification for the students would be (1) the personal knowledge of the authors, (2) the sharing of a religious belief system and (3) the models are the exact product that the students are trying to produce—a sermon. Another point of identification is with me as a model. During the teaching, I presented my actual imitation of a model and showed how the process improved my original illustration. My revised illustration was an additional model for the students to emulate, and my demonstration of the process of imitating served as a model as to how they can imitate.

Analysis should accompany direct imitation. The students heard a lecture on the elements of good style followed by an analysis of three models. As I demonstrated the imitation exercise in the class, I was careful to point out the strengths of the model that I was imitating. At Southwestern, students take the Introduction to Preaching class only

after they have completed three hours of hermeneutics and nine hours of Greek, including syntax. These courses should give the students the skills to identify syntax, sentence structure, verb tenses, and other figures of speech in the models. They must also have an undergraduate bachelor's degree which assumes an elementary knowledge of composition. The combination of the undergraduate and seminary classes should prepare them to identify figures of speech, sentence structures, and other exemplary elements in the models.

There should be multiple models. Three different types of illustrations were offered: a well-known story of Helen Keller told in an effective manner, a news item told in a story format, and a recounting of a personal experience. While a variety of types was presented to the students, only two preachers were used. This area could have been more effective by providing three illustrations from three different preachers.

A teachable spirit towards imitation must be engendered. This was hopefully accomplished, in part, by the introductory words defining and defending imitation. More than this, I felt my telling the class of the transformation of my own attitude towards imitation after I actually experienced an imitative exercise was critical. In addition, the models chosen were written by well-known and effective preachers.

4.2.3 Teaching of Classes-Delivery

The complexity of the skill makes the teaching of effective sermon delivery a challenge to a homiletics instructor. The non-verbal areas of vocal production, proper use of gestures, facial expressions and movement are crucial to good communication and they are very complicated. It is somewhat like playing an instrument, with the instrument being one's own body and voice. While I feel that composition can provide guidelines in

the area, I have also borrowed from the teaching of music. Warren Haston (2007), who teaches music education at Georgia State, encourages the use of imitation to teach the complicated skills necessary to produce music via an instrument. He points out that students, if taught too much theory before they try to play, are so conscious of the theory that it prevents them from producing well. Knowing that they are making mistakes as they play brings about a lack of relaxation and breaks concentration, whereby more mistakes are made, which results in a downward spiral. He suggests that the students imitate an exemplary model before they have too much theory (p.28). He supports this with the theory that this mimics the way we learn a language. This pedagogy, based upon the learning of a language, is also the basis for the Suzuki method of teaching music. Augustus Brathwaite (1988), who teaches high school music students, gives an analysis of the Suzuki method which is helpful for our discussion. Brathwaite points out that the Suzuki method is helpful to a point. There comes a time when the student must abandon the method because it cannot teach sight reading and advance theory which are necessary to advance in levels of proficiency (p.45). The difficulty in applying this type of imitation-only method to composition or preaching lies in the difference between learning a language as an infant and learning to do something with that language as a teenager or adult. Though there are great and obvious differences between music education and homiletic education, they share the artistic performance aspect. Thus, the use of imitation in music education was helpful to the teaching of delivery.

The teaching of delivery, while linked to the performance in music, is perhaps, more closely linked to the skills necessary in composition because the preacher, unlike most musicians and more similar to a writer, presents his own material. If the preacher

was preaching a sermon that another wrote, the connection to composition would be less valid. Since preachers write/compose their own sermons, the principles of using imitation to teach composition can still give guidance for the use of imitation in the homiletical classroom.

Teaching of Delivery to Group A (non imitative)

Delivery: Lesson Plan

Group A (no imitation) Class 1

Purpose:

The purpose of this class is to show the students the importance of good delivery, to increase the students' understanding of delivery and to give them ideas and motivation as to how to improve their delivery.

Goals:

1. The student will understand the importance of good delivery.
2. The student will be aware of the elements of non-verbal communication in delivery.
3. The students will be motivated to improve his/her delivery in preaching.

Objectives:

1. Students will listen to a lecture on delivery.
2. Students will write important points of the lecture in their own words on a handout provided.
3. Students will observe how the professor illustrates the elements of good delivery.
4. Students will respond to subjective questions during the course of the lecture.

5. Students will participate in examples during lecture.
6. Students will observe good delivery via two video examples.
7. Students will observe the professor analyze the first examples.
8. Students will analyze the delivery of the second example.

Outcomes:

1. The students will make plans for purposeful movement in their sermon for class.
2. The students will be more aware of good delivery in sermons.
3. The student will realize the need to continually be improving in delivery.
4. Students will have a positive attitude toward developing good delivery.

Teaching Plan:

1. Introduction (5 min)

Review last class on style.

2. Lecture- elements of good delivery (30 minutes)

Students will be given a handout on which to write their own notes.

(see handout #5 appendix Chapter Four)

3. Examples of good delivery- (20 minutes)

Two examples of good delivery will be shown to the class. The elements of good delivery will be pointed out during the first video clip. The second will be shown and the class will be asked to identify elements of good delivery.

4. Lecture- How to develop good delivery (20 minutes)

The second part of the handout #5 will be used by the student to write their own notes.

Teaching Delivery to Group B. (imitation group)

Delivery: Lesson Plan

Group B (imitation group) Class 1

Purpose:

The purpose of this class is to show the students the importance of good delivery, to increase the students' understanding of delivery and to give them ideas and motivation as to how to improve their delivery.

Goals:

1. The student will understand the importance of good delivery.
2. The student will be aware of the elements of non-verbal communication in delivery.
3. The students will be motivated to improve his/her delivery in preaching.

Objectives:

1. Students will listen to a lecture on delivery.
2. Students will write important points of the lecture in their own words on a handout provided.
3. Students will observe how the professor illustrates the elements of good delivery.
4. Students will respond to subjective questions during the course of the lecture.
5. Students will participate in examples during lecture.

6. Students will observe good delivery via two video examples.
7. Students will observe the professor analyze the first examples.
8. Students will analyze the delivery of the second example.

Outcomes:

1. The students will make plans for purposeful movement in their sermon for class.
2. The students will be more aware of good delivery in sermons.
3. The student will realize the need to continually be improving in delivery.
4. Students will have a positive attitude toward developing good delivery.

Teaching Plan:

1. Introduction (5 min)

Review last class on style.

2. Lecture- elements of good delivery (20 minutes)

Students will be given a handout on which to write their own notes, see handout #5.

3. Examples of good delivery- (20 minutes)

Three examples of good delivery will be shown to the class. The elements of good delivery will be pointed out by the professor during the first video clip. The second video clip will be analyzed by the class and the professor and third clip will be shown and the class will be asked to identify elements of good delivery with the professor only functioning as a leader of the discussion.

4. Lecture- How to develop good delivery. (15 minutes)

The second part of handout #1 will be used by the student to write their own notes.

5. Instructions for imitation assignment (10 minutes)

- Imitation is a historic and natural way of learning
- my experience of imitating Jerry Vines
- your assignment

You will have the choice of three different preachers to imitate. Look at these on the DVD provided and then choose one to imitate. The goal is to expand your knowledge and skills in delivery by experiencing gestures, voice qualities, rates of speaking, etc. that you don't normally have in your own delivery. The goal is **not** to become a clone of this preacher but to learn from this preacher.

You might watch the video clip five or six times making notes on the transcript regarding pauses, movements, gestures, facial expressions and other elements of delivery. Look at the video repeated times and speak the words along with the speaker. You probably will have some fun with this. It is something like an impersonation, but remember this is hard work. Plan to spend two-three hours on this.

The objective is to sound and move just like the example but the goal is to improve your delivery. Remember this is a means to an end. You will be experiencing a kind of delivery that will show you that you can do things you didn't think you could do. *In the next class session, each student will present his imitation for the class.* You may read from the transcript during your class presentation.

6. Demonstration of the assignment. (5min)

The professor will demonstrate the assignment by imitating one of the models for the class.

Delivery: Lesson Plan

Group B (imitation group) Class 2

Purpose:

The purpose of this class is to improve the student's understanding of delivery and increase their ability, motivation and confidence in using the elements of good delivery in preaching.

Goals:

1. The students will experience improving their delivery.
2. The students will better understand the complexity of improving delivery.
3. The students will be motivated to improve his/her delivery.
4. The students will gain skills to improve their delivery.
5. The students will receive affirmation of their own delivery.

Objectives:

1. Students will listen to a short review of the elements of good delivery.
2. Students will present their imitation of an example of good delivery.
3. Students will identify and write down at least one positive element of delivery from each of the individual student presentations.
4. Students will hear specific affirmations from the professor and from class members after their presentation.
5. Students will participate in a discussion of the effect of the imitation assignment.

Outcomes:

1. The students will see and hear the benefits of improved delivery.
2. The students will have more confidence in their ability to improve their own delivery.
3. The student will realize the need to continually develop his/her delivery.

Teaching Plan:

1. Introduction (5 minutes)

Prayer

Modeling and imitation- proven method

Good delivery- elements reviewed from last class

2. Students will present their imitation of the examples. (30-40 minutes)
3. During the presentation, students will identify and write down at least one element of good delivery.
4. After all the presentations are complete; the professor will affirm at least one element of good delivery in each student. The professor will ask for volunteers to make additional positive comments on each student. (15-20 minutes)
5. Class Discussion- The professor will lead the class in a discussion of their learning experience using the following questions as a beginning point. (15-25 minutes)

What was the hardest part of the exercises?

What was the most stretching part?

How much difference was there between your normal delivery and the example?

Is there any element of delivery that you are now aware that you must work on? Which one(s)?

4.2.3.1 Commentary on the Use of Imitation to Teach Delivery

To teach style through the use of imitation to preaching students requires a personal effort in the student, but the process remains somewhat private. Fellow students and the instructor might be able to see similarities between a model and a student's product of imitating style, but the actual process of imitation was a private experience between the student and the model. Style is personal, but it is a step away from the person. They create the sentences and phrases from words and grammar, but since their creation can be read, good style can be separate from its creator. The ethos of an author plays an important role when it is read, but a well-crafted illustration can stand apart from its author. In contrast, delivery is not a private act. Delivery is closely tied to a preacher for it is the preacher's whole being that produces the delivery. It is very personal and closely linked to a specific preacher because it demands the use of very individualistic elements: facial expressions, gesturing, vocal production and the movement of the body. Delivery of a sermon cannot be separated from the preacher. So in moving to teach delivery with imitation, the general resistance to imitation which was highlighted in chapter two is heightened because it is so personal. With style, the imitating process was a private matter; in delivery, the process of imitation is public. This public display creates a very threatening situation for the student. Another threatening part is the lack of opportunity for corrections. The real-time process of imitation, done well or poorly, will be evident to all who watch. This very personal nature of delivery creates the need to ensure that there is a safe atmosphere in which the students can present their imitations.

In *Ancient Rhetoric for the Modern Student*, Edward P.J. Corbett (1971) suggests a fifteen to twenty minute time limit for the written imitation (p. 510). If a private exercise in imitation had a time limit it seemed that a time limit should govern this exercise. Another factor in the time limit was the amount of class time that would be consumed by each class member presenting. A three to four minute section of a model's sermon was decided upon because of time constraints in the class. To imitate a model for more than four minutes seemed to greatly increase the threatening elements of imitating the delivery of a sermon. Three to four minutes in front of a class trying to imitate another preacher, while short, seemed to be sufficient.

In moving back in history to reflect upon the practice of declamations which existed as a main part of rhetorical education from Roman education to the latter part of the nineteenth century, it seems that imitating a preacher would in some fashion resemble a declamation. More clearly, this imitative exercise is closely linked to recitations. These two ancient practices gave support to the use of imitation to teach delivery in a preaching class.

4.2.3.2 Application of Specific Guidelines to Teach Deliver:

Students must identify with the model: The identification was sought by the choice of models from highly respected preacher in students' theological culture. Also, three different styles were offered to allow for personal preferences which helped insure that the students could not only identify with the preacher, but also the preacher's style.

Considering the students' level of competency also helped with identification. The aim of the imitation exercise was to give them an experience that would stretch them. Most students are not accustomed to the higher level of expression needed to

communicate to a large audience. The models were chosen because of the great variety they had in vocal production and the effective use of their bodies, though these model preachers are not known for exaggerated vocal dynamics or gesturing. When one observes good delivery in the context of a sermon, it does not seem like elevated expression. But, when one who is inexperienced at preaching tries to imitate these models, it will seem like exaggeration though it is not. It is a way of showing students the great difference in their delivery and the delivery of the models. Another effort to insure that the level of expectation of imitation was not beyond their reach was to provide a word-for-word transcript of the portions of the sermons they were expected to imitate. It would have been very difficult to ask the students to memorize even three minutes of a sermon. Had it been an acting class this would have been possible, but these students are unaccustomed to memorization and quoting from memory in front of an audience. They would have been far more concerned about the memory work than the imitation work. To keep the imitation exercise at the level of the students' competency, they were allowed to read from the word-for-word transcript in their presentations.

An additional point of identification was that the models chosen were preachers who had preached in the chapel worship services at Southwestern. Though not guaranteed, there is likelihood that the students saw these sermons when they were delivered. Even if they missed chapel on those days, they knew that these models were part of the experience at Southwestern. Thus, they could identify with the models as part of their seminary experience. Two of the models were about sixty years old and the other was in his thirties. As will be seen in the next chapter, where the results are presented,

most of the students chose the younger of the models, perhaps because they could identify with him more easily due to their ages being closer.

Another point of identification is a shared theological belief system. In this belief system, there is a bond that comes because of the equality which results from the belief that forgiveness was granted to each person who believes. This at first may seem like an esoteric portion of a belief system, but it is an important part of this exercise. Students at Southwestern believe that they are on equal ground with all other Christians. Each sees that they are no better than another person because all are sinners and forgiven. There is no hierarchy. Thus, there is a point of identification between the students and the models which makes imitation easier.

Analysis should accompany direct imitation: In the teaching plan of the first session on delivery, three examples were shown and analyzed after a lecture on the elements of good delivery. The order of these is important because the analysis is better after clear elements are established. There was a strategic progression in the analysis of the preachers: the professor analyzed by himself, the class and the professor analyzed, and then the class analyzed without the professors direct input. This analysis could have been extended to a written assignment in which the student identified five to ten elements of good delivery in the model they chose to imitate. This would have reinforced the student's awareness of the strengths of the model that should be emulated in the student's delivery.

Multiple models should be available: Three different models were provided from which a student could choose. Since a video and transcript were necessary for the imitation to take place, the choice had to be limited. One plan was to allow the students to

choose their own model which would have added in their identification with the model. There were several reasons this route was not taken. The models the students may have chosen would perhaps not be good models of delivery. Another hindrance to letting the students find their own model is the obtaining of a video of a sermon and choosing a small enough portion to present in class. Another option would be to have a list from which they could choose. The problem would once again be finding a video and selecting a portion of suitable length for a class presentation. Finally, I decided to offer three different models thus allowing me to have video recording to give to the students as well as written transcripts to aid in their imitation. An attempt to use three different styles of delivery was made. One was more traditionally what is expected of a preacher in our denominational setting, another who is less traditional and more directive and one who excels in vocal production.

A Teachable spirit toward imitation must be engendered: A natural resistant spirit towards the imitation itself had to be overcome. This was done in several ways. First, the assignment was pass/fail. If they tried, they received full credit. There was also the professor's personal testimony about his improving his delivery through imitating one of the models. Last, an effort was made to create a fun atmosphere by treating the imitations as impersonations. While this somewhat light-hearted atmosphere may have distracted from taking it seriously, it prompted more imitation and appealed to a competitive spirit in the students.

Perhaps the most crucial part of engendering a good attitude was my own demonstration of imitating one of the models. When I, as the instructor, was willing to imitate a model and present that imitation to the students, it validated it as an educational

experience. I told the class of my fear of appearing foolish and exhorting the class that they could do a better job of imitating than I did. My displaying an attitude towards the exercise and articulating the process I went through and then actually doing the exercise in class not only engendered a teachable spirit, it also gave them an additional point of identification. In addition, it was hoped that by having them present their imitation in class a spirit of competition would help motivate the students to give the exercise a good effort.

4.2.4 Post Teaching Surveys

After the intervention was completed in both classes surveys were distributed to the class members within a week of the last class. These surveys had identical subjective questions to the first survey which facilitates the comparison of quantitative data. The survey also included two identical subjective questions which left the answers up to the students to facilitate the comparison of qualitative data. The survey given to the imitative group (group B) also included some questions specifically related to the use of imitation.

Group A Survey #2

Given to the control group *after* the teaching intervention

General Information

A. How many preaching classes have you taken prior to this semester either formally or informally?

None One Two-three More than three

B. How many times have you preached prior to this class?

___ Never ___ 1-5 times ___ 5-20 times ___ 20+ times

C. What do you see as your long range plan for ministry?

___ Pastor ___ Assoc. pastor (youth, children, education, etc.)

___ Missions ___ Teach college or seminary

___ Other

Style and Delivery

1. Key sentences in a sermon (Main idea, opening and concluding sentences, transitions, applications, etc.) need repeated editing. How many times do you, on average, edit these sentences?

(One or two edits) 1 2 3 4 5 (10+ edits)

2. Choosing the right words and structure for a key sentence in a sermon is as important as understanding the text.

Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Disagree

3. Being clear in writing is easier or harder than being clear in speaking.

Easier 1 2 3 4 5 Harder

4. The congregation to whom you are speaking should influence your word choice to what level:

Greatly influence 1 2 3 4 5 Little influence

5. In selecting words for a sermon a preacher should, or should not, carefully choose words that touch a person's will and emotions.

Should 1 2 3 4 5 Should not

6. The rate of speaking in a sermon should be slower or faster than the rate of normal conversation.

Slower 1 2 3 4 5 Faster

7. Which generally carries the more weight, verbal or non verbal communication.

Non verbal 1 2 3 4 5 Verbal

8. Good delivery should be spontaneous and not planned.

Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Disagree

9. A preacher's facial expressions reveal his/her feelings about the text.

Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Disagree

10. How much attention should the preacher give to using his whole body to communicate the message of the text?

Some attention 1 2 3 4 5 A great deal of attention

1. List three things you learned about style and rank them in order of importance

2. List three things you learn about delivery and rank them in order of importance

Group B Survey #2

Given to the imitative group *after* the teaching intervention

General Information

A. How many preaching classes have you taken prior to this semester either formally or informally?

None One Two-three More than three

B. How many times have you preached prior to this class?

Never 1-5 times 5-20 times 20+ times

C. What do see as your long range plan for ministry?

Pastor Assoc. pastor (youth, children, education, etc.)

Missions Teach college or seminary Other

Style and Delivery

1. Key sentences in a sermon (Main idea, opening and concluding sentences, transitions, applications, etc.) need repeated editing. How many times do you, on average, edit these sentences?

(One or two edits) 1 2 3 4 5 (10+ edits)

2. Choosing the right words and structure for a key sentence in a sermon is as important as understanding the text.

Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Disagree

3. Being clear in writing is easier or harder than being clear in speaking.

Easier 1 2 3 4 5 Harder

4. The congregation to whom you are speaking should influence your word choice to what level:

Greatly influence 1 2 3 4 5 Little influence

5. In selecting words for a sermon a preacher should, or should not, carefully choose words that touch a person's will and emotions.

Should 1 2 3 4 5 Should not

6. The rate of speaking in a sermon should be slower or faster than the rate of normal conversation.

Slower 1 2 3 4 5 Faster

7. Which generally carries the more weight, verbal or nonverbal communication.

Nonverbal 1 2 3 4 5 Verbal

8. Good delivery should be spontaneous and not planned.

Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Disagree

9. A preacher's facial expressions reveal his/her feelings about the text.

Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Disagree

10. How much attention should the preacher give to using his whole body to communicate the message of the text?

Some attention 1 2 3 4 5 A great deal of attention

1. List three things you learned about style and rank them in order of importance
2. List three things you learn about delivery and rank them in order of importance.
3. Why do you think a teaching method of imitation was used to teach style and delivery?
4. What were the most difficult parts of the imitation exercise?
5. What were the most rewarding parts of the imitation exercise?

At the end of the semester, which was approximately eight weeks after the intervention and after the students had actually preached a sermon in class, an informal discussion was held with the imitative group (group B) to measure the perceived effect of imitation upon the preparation for preaching a sermon and the students' opinion of the effectiveness of the imitative exercises after they had preached a sermon and after eight weeks had passed. The plan for the discussion is as follows:

Discussion Guideline Group B (imitative)

Style Imitation

How did the imitation exercise of working on style in an illustration (word choice, sentence structure) affect your preparation to preach in class?

How did the imitation exercise of working on style in an illustration (word choice, sentence structure) affect the actual preaching of the sermon?

How did the imitation exercise of working on style in an illustration (word choice, sentence structure) affect the results of your sermon?

Delivery imitation- the imitation of Patterson, Vines or Caner

How did the imitation of another preacher's delivery affect your preparation to preach in class?

How did the imitation of another preacher's delivery affect the actual preaching of your sermon?

Do you think that the imitation of another preacher's delivery affected the results of your sermon?

Overall Questions

How has your attitude toward the imitation methodology changed since you have preached?

How would suggest changing the exercises?

Did you tell any of your friends about it? How did they respond?

Should imitation be used in the Introduction to Preaching class? To what extent?

CHAPTER 5
REPORTING AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA
FROM THE USE OF IMITATION

This chapter will present and analyze the results of the surveys taken before and after the classes, as well as notes from the end of class discussion regarding the imitation intervention. The surveys consisted of three parts: the demographics, the objective questions with Likert scale answers, and the subjective questions. The demographic section sought to compare the make-up of the two classes to see if there was an appreciable difference that would affect the way in which the classes would respond. The objective questions were an attempt to gather quantitative information, which compared the change in knowledge and attitudes towards various aspects of the homiletical categories of style and delivery. The subjective questions were designed to gather qualitative information in narrative form, in order to compare the levels of learning. Additional subjective questions were asked to the imitation group seeking their response to the use of imitation. The results of the surveys will be presented using the surveys as a structural format, so that the reader can see the results of each question in the context of the survey. Comments and analysis will follow each question, with a summary analysis at the end of each section and at the conclusion of the chapter. Together these can form a trajectory from which we will draw some conclusions.

Often in reports, like this, the data is listed at the end of the chapter, separated from the commentary, which forces the reader an annoying flipping back-and-forth. Therefore, much of the data is provided in the body of the chapter for the convenience of the reader. A comprehensive record of the all the data is in the appendix. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the content of the surveys was approved by the review board of my institution and the surveys, which the students filled out, are in a secure file in my office.

5.1 Demographics

The purpose of the project is to test if the imitation methodology found in the composition classroom can be effectively used in the homiletical classroom. Thus, the focus of the analysis will be the comparison of change in the two groups. The demographics could be used to compare those with preaching experience to those without preaching experience or some other subgroup comparison. These type of questions are valid, but the focus of the project is articulating what homiletics pedagogy can learn about the use of imitation from composition pedagogy.

A. How many preaching classes have you taken prior to this semester either formally or informally?

Group A- Control Group

14 None 3 One 1 Two-three 0 More than three

Group B- Imitation Group

12 None 3 One 0 Two-three 0 More than three

There is no appreciable difference in the number of preaching classes previously taken by the students.

B. How many times have you preached prior to this class?

Group A- Control group

0 never 3 1-5 times 2 5-20 times 12 20+ times

Group B- Imitation Group

0 never 4 1-5 times 4 5-20 times 6 20+ times

The students of the control group are more experienced than those in the imitation group.

The control group has more than half with more than twenty preaching experiences; this makes the control class somewhat different from the imitation intervention class. Which makes this demographic something to be watched in the analysis of the results.

C. What do see as your long range plan for ministry?

Group A Control Group

11 Pastor 3 Assoc. pastor (youth, children, education, etc.)

4 Missions 5 Teach college or seminary

1 Other

Group B Imitation Group

6 Pastor 3 Assoc. pastor (youth, children, education, etc.)

1 Missions 3 Teach college or seminary

4 Other

The long range plan of seminary education is varied in both groups. The goal of becoming a pastor should heighten the students' interest in preaching since that is a primary responsibility of a pastor. The other roles will have preaching responsibilities but not at the same level as a pastor. Thus, the students with these aspirations may have a

diminished interest in preaching. The control group has significantly more who are studying to be pastors, which will be considered when examining the results.

The results of the demographic survey is that the control group has more preaching experience and has more who are intending to be pastors, which would cause one to think that the control group has a greater interest in preaching. This difference in make-up of the class could cause a difference in the knowledge of preaching that the students begin with. The amount of change in the classes could be more significant than the raw score on each question. It is anticipated that the control group, with its greater experience and interest in preaching, will score higher in the initial survey taken before the teaching of the classes.

Another factor is the standard deviation which measures diversity of the answers. A low standard deviation indicates uniformity in the answers: As the standard deviation rises, the diversity of answers increases. Since the control group has a higher percentage of those who have preaching experience and intentions to be pastors, it is thought that on the objective questions, the control group will have a lower standard deviation, due to the greater homogeneity of the group.

5.2 Quantitative Likert Questions

In comparing the results of the first survey, there is evidence that the groups started at different levels of homiletical knowledge. To measure the level of homiletical knowledge at the end of the teaching intervention would not measure the amount of learning that took place. Thus, the result that is focused upon in this section is the dynamic of change in each class, rather than the final level of knowledge. Since there is not an outside standard by which to measure the significance of change for an individual

question, an internal standard needs to be established, so that comparisons can be made. The internal standard by which the dynamic of change will be measured is the average dynamic of overall change in both groups. Each question saw a level of change which is listed as the *dynamic*. These dynamics, which measured the amount of change, were averaged for each group. The average change for both the control group and the imitation group turned out to be the same. In both groups, the average dynamic for all questions was .36 which is a 7 % change using a five point the Likert scale (see Appendix C, p.234 & 235). This percentage of change is one of the few similarities in the results of the two groups. It gives us a common standard by which to comment on the amount of change registered in each question.

5.2.1 Analysis of Objective Questions

1. Key sentences in a sermon (Main idea, opening and concluding sentences, transitions, applications, etc.) need repeated editing. How many times do you, on average, edit these sentences?

(One or two edits) 1 2 3 4 5 (10+ edits)

Control group

Before: Average- 3.16, Standard Deviation- 1.50

After: Average- 3.92, Standard Deviation- .95

Dynamic: Average- .76, Standard Deviation- .55

Imitation Group

Before: Average- 2.93, Standard Deviation- 1.16

After: Average- 3.60, Standard Deviation- .97

Dynamic: Average- .67, Standard Deviation- .19

This question sought to measure the students' attitudes toward their revision of word choice and syntax. The numbers of edits would show the amount of time and effort that was put into achieving good style. If the number increased, it would show that the students were willing to spend more effort on improving style. Both groups increased in the number of times they would edit key sentences. This amount of change or improvement, for both groups, is almost double the average change for other questions, which shows that both groups saw significant improvement. The imitation group did not change as much as the control group, but compared to the amount of change on this question, the difference was not a major issue. However, in this area, the imitation group did not improve as much as the control group.

2. Choosing the right words and structure for a key sentence in a sermon is as important as understanding the text.

Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Disagree

Control group

Before: Average- 2.16, Standard Deviation- 1.17

After: Average- 2.00, Standard Deviation- 1.29

Dynamic: Average- .16, Standard Deviation- .12

Imitation Group

Before: Average- 2.20, Standard Deviation- 1.15

After: Average- 2.40, Standard Deviation- 1.07

Dynamic: Average- .20, Standard Deviation- .08

It was thought that this question would show the attitude towards the importance of the effective use of style in a sermon in comparison to the importance of understanding the Scripture upon which the sermon is based. The results show that the groups moved in different directions. The control group began at 2.16 and moved down to 2.00, whereas the imitation group moved up from 2.20 to 2.40. Though they began close to each other (.04 difference) they ended up .40 apart from each other. The control group gave more importance to style after the lecture. In contrast, the imitation group gave more importance to the text after a lecture and imitation exercises. These findings are difficult to interpret because the groups moved in different directions. The intent of the question was to measure if style increased in importance. Comparing the importance of style to the importance of an understanding of the text may have been a poor choice when considering Southwestern students' high view of Scripture. The preaching philosophy of Southwestern is to present the meaning of the text of Scripture as accurately as possible. Apparently, the experience of imitating caused that group to be more concerned with the importance of understanding the text and less concerned with style. Perhaps this imitation exercise could cause them to see that the variety in style might lead to a misunderstanding of the text. It is difficult to determine if this area was positively affected by using imitation methodology. Seeing that the two groups moved in opposite directions, clarity of the question may have been a problem. When the difference in the direction of the two groups is combined with the standard deviation being 1.29 for the control group and 1.07 for the imitation group, which was the third highest, it supports that the question might have been confusing.

3. Being clear in writing is easier or harder than being clear in speaking.

Easier 1 2 3 4 5 Harder

Control group

Before: Average- 3.61, Standard Deviation- 1.33

After: Average- 3.23, Standard Deviation- 1.42

Dynamic: Average- .38, Standard Deviation- .09

Imitation Group

Before: Average- 3.20, Standard Deviation- 1.21

After: Average- 3.40, Standard Deviation- 1.17

Dynamic: Average- .20, Standard Deviation- .04

This question attempted to see if students struggled more with writing or speaking. In the area of style it would seem that oral clarity should be more difficult, due to its unchangeable nature; once spoken, words cannot be changed. This is balanced by the spoken word having immediate feedback from an audience. When a speaker senses that the listeners are not understanding or following, she can restate or repeat in order to bring clarity. The written word cannot do this. Again the groups moved in different directions. The control group rated clarity in writing as being easier. The imitation group moved in the opposite direction saying that it is harder to be clear in writing. The imitation exercises had both elements of speaking and writing, but the editing portion was focused on the writing of an illustration. The editing work was writing and not speaking. It is understandable that this group moved towards writing being harder because they worked at improving their writing. As in the previous question, it is difficult to determine the effectiveness of imitation. It seems that this question was not clear. This question had

the highest standard deviation average at 1.28, which also supports the lack of clarity in the question.

4. The congregation to whom you are speaking should influence your word choice to what level:

Greatly influence 1 2 3 4 5 Little influence

Control group

Before: Average- 1.79, Standard Deviation- 1.03

After: Average- 1.54, Standard Deviation- .52

Dynamic :Average- .25, Standard Deviation- .51

Imitation Group

Before: Average- 1.93, Standard Deviation- .59

After: Average- 1.60, Standard Deviation- .52

Dynamic: Average- .33, Standard Deviation- .07

Preachers need to be aware of the importance of the audience. While the concept of preaching can be seen as a responsibility to proclaim a message, it is never meant to be a proclamation that disregards the listeners. The history of Christian preaching has emphasized the importance of the audience from Augustine exhorting preachers to teach, delight, and move their listeners, to the current emphasis in a paper presented to the Evangelical Homiletics Society, in which the sermon was said to be unfinished until the preacher shapes it according to the audience at the time of delivery (McLellen, 2009). This question hoped to measure if the students became more aware of the importance of the audience in shaping how a message is presented. Both groups rated the importance of the

audience more important after the classes. The imitation group was ahead of the control group by .08. In this area, the imitation group improved slightly more than the control group.

5. In selecting words for a sermon a preacher should, or should not, carefully choose words that touch a person's will and emotions.

Should 1 2 3 4 5 Should not

Control group

Before: Average- 2.17, Standard Deviation- .79

After: Average- 1.62, Standard Deviation- .65

Dynamic: Average- .55, Standard Deviation- .14

Imitation Group

Before: Average- 2.20, Standard Deviation- .77

After: Average- 1.90, Standard Deviation- .57

Dynamic: Average- .30, Standard Deviation- .20

Another area that is important to preachers is to select words that produce in the listeners a recalling of an experience. George Campbell in his 1775 *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* called this vivacity and Timothy Warren, professor of Homiletics at Dallas Seminary, in a recent paper calls it bringing salient images to consciousness (T. Warren, 2005). Kenneth Burke would perhaps refer to it as allowing the audience to identify with what is being said. In this case, it is clear that the control group improved more than did the imitation group. The question was structured with a reverse in the direction of improvement. Thus, the figures should go down as opposed to up, which would indicate

improvement. This variety in the direction of improvement was used to counteract students marking the answers without closely looking at the meaning of the scale. Both groups started out only .03 apart, with similar standard deviations, but the imitation exercises seemed less effective than the standard lecture method. It should be noted that the imitation group did improve but not at the same rate.

6. The rate of speaking in a sermon should be slower or faster than the rate of normal conversation.

Slower 1 2 3 4 5 Faster

Control group

Before: Average- 3.05, Standard Deviation- .71

After: Average- 2.62, Standard Deviation- .87

Dynamic: Average- .43, Standard Deviation- .16

Imitation Group

Before: Average- 2.47, Standard Deviation- .64

After: Average- 2.20, Standard Deviation- .79

Dynamic: Average- .27, Standard Deviation- .15

While rate varies in both preaching and conversation, the general rate in preaching should be slower than in conversation. This not an absolute principle of preaching for it varies greatly with individuals. The intent of the class was to help younger preachers slow down, for based upon twenty years of listening to beginning sermons, most young preachers speak far too rapidly. The initial difference in the groups

was the highest on this question. The groups started at .58 apart from each other with the imitation group initially indicating that slower speech is preferred in preaching than in conversation. Thus, the imitation group, though made up of students who had less preaching experience, thought it best to speak more slowly in a sermon than in a conversation. After the classes, the imitation group was still .42 lower than the control group. So, the control group in the end had a significantly better score. To put it another way, the control group, even after the class, did not come to the initial level of the imitation group. The imitation group scored better without the class than the control class did with the class. However, though the end results are that the imitation group was far more convinced of the truth of this concept than the control group, the amount of change was still greater in the control group. When the amount of change is looked at by itself, the control group had the more effective teaching. This needs to be balanced by the wide margin between the two groups. The teaching that used the imitation exercises did not produce as much change as the traditional teaching of the control group, but this must be seen in light of the fact that the imitation group did not need to change as much as the control group.

7. Which generally carries the more weight, verbal or nonverbal communication.

Nonverbal 1 2 3 4 5 Verbal

Control group

Before: Average- 2.32, Standard Deviation- 1.25

After: Average- 2.08, Standard Deviation- 1.55

Dynamic: Average- .24, Standard Deviation- .30

Imitation Group

Before: Average- 2.00, Standard Deviation- .88

After: Average- 1.80, Standard Deviation- 1.23

Dynamic: Average- .20, Standard Deviation- .35

Studies indicate that nonverbal outweighs the verbal. In an often quoted article, Albert Meribian, psychologist and editor of numerous psychological journals, stated that the nonverbal carries as much a 93 % of a message (1968, p.53). While the amount that is carried nonverbally might be argued, no one would disagree that nonverbal communication is very important. In the atmosphere of a seminary in which the written aspects of Christianity are emphasized as indicated by the twenty-one hours of required Greek and Hebrew studies, it is understandable that students would tend to minimize the importance of the nonverbal. Thus, this area is an important concept to communicate in the preaching classes at Southwestern Seminary. The initial responses are the only significant differences in the answers to this question. Both groups rated the importance of nonverbal communication higher after the classes, with the control group only changing .04 more than the imitation group. The end results are worth mentioning because as in the previous question the control group is lagging far behind the imitation group. The imitation group had far less need to change but changed almost as much as the control group. The lecture methods produced just slightly more change than did the imitation methods, but the imitation group had less change to make.

8. Good delivery should be spontaneous and not planned.

Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Disagree

Control group

Before: Average- 4.22, Standard Deviation- 1.06

After: Average- 4.46, Standard Deviation- .78

Dynamic: Average- .24, Standard Deviation- .28

Imitation Group

Before: Average- 4.40, Standard Deviation- .74

After: Average- 4.50, Standard Deviation- .71

Dynamic: Average- .10, Standard Deviation- .03

The intent of this question was to judge if the students grasped the concept that good delivery has an element of planning as well as an element of spontaneity. In my fifteen years of teaching homiletics, I have observed that students in a preaching class are most concerned with the content but often neglect preparing how they will present it orally. The initial responses show that both classes are already convinced of this, as indicated by both scoring above 4.2. The dynamic of change was higher in the control group which again is balanced by the initial response in this group being lower than in the imitation group. The post-survey results are within .04 of each other. It seems that the lecture in the control group was more effective than imitation exercises but only slightly.

9. A preacher's facial expressions reveal his/her feelings about the text.

Agree 1 2 3 4 5 Disagree

Control group

Before: Average- 1.79, Standard Deviation- .85

After: Average- 1.77, Standard Deviation- 1.09

Dynamic: Average- .02, Standard Deviation- .24

Imitation Group

Before: Average- 1.87, Standard Deviation- .83

After: Average- 1.20, Standard Deviation- .42

Dynamic: Average- .67, Standard Deviation- .41

This response to this subset of nonverbal communication saw the largest difference in the dynamic of change. The control group saw virtually no change—only .02, in contrast to .67 change in the imitation group. This indicates that, in this area, the imitation methodology was very effective. In reflecting on the exercise, it is difficult to articulate why this may have occurred. The imitation of well known preachers perhaps helped the students examine closely how another preacher used his face to express his feelings. Or it might have been that the student, when trying to imitate those facial expressions, realized how varied the models were. The responses to this question give very clear indication that using imitation to teach preaching can be very effective. In this area, the lecture method didn't seem to work at all while the imitation exercises worked wonderfully.

10. How much attention should the preacher give to using his whole body to communicate the message of the text?

Some attention 1 2 3 4 5 A great deal of attention

Control group

Before: Average- 3.79, Standard Deviation- 1.13

After: Average- 4.38, Standard Deviation- .96

Dynamic: Average- .59, Standard Deviation- .17

Imitation Group

Before: Average- 3.73, Standard Deviation- .96

After: Average- 4.50, Standard Deviation- 1.08

Dynamic: Average- .77, Standard Deviation- .12

Often those new to preaching will remain stationary behind the pulpit and gesture in ways that barely can be seen over the edge of the pulpit. In striving to improve communication, students are encouraged to use their whole bodies to communicate, including moving from behind the pulpit and gesturing with large gestures. The whole body should be involved. Of course, this is tempered by an individual's comfort level and the setting in which the sermon is preached. But even in a very formal setting in which a preacher is expected to stay behind the pulpit, the gestures still need to arise from the whole body. Both groups improved greatly in this area with the imitation group improving .18 more than the control group. Again the nonverbal aspects of communication are taught more effectively using imitation.

5.2.2 Overall Observations Regarding the Objective Quantitative Likert Questions

When evaluating the consistency of responses to the questions, question number two and three saw the responses go in different directions, and both these questions had high standard deviations, which indicates that these two questions were not good questions. Consequently, these two questions were set aside in the overall evaluation. With that as a given, the following observations are based upon the responses to questions number one and numbers four through ten.

Below is a chart summarizing the margin of change or improvement for each question. The first column is a brief description of the question. The second and third columns are the average change for each group. Fortunately, in each case, there was always some improvement in both groups, so this change is a measure of improvement. The fourth column lists the group that had the higher level of change and the margin by which it led the other group. The last line is the total from all the questions.

	Control Group	Imitation Group	Greater improvement
1. Editing question	.76	.67	Control Gr. by .09
4. Audience effect	.25	.33	Imitation Gr. by .08
5. Will and Emotions	.55	.30	Control Gr. by .25
6. Rate of Speech	.43	.27	Control Gr. by .16
7. Verbal vs. Nonverbal	.24	.20	Control Gr. by .04
8. Spontaneous/Planned	.24	.10	Control Gr. by .14
9. Facial Expression	.02	.67	Imitation Gr. by .65
10. Use of Whole Body	.59	.77	Imitation Gr. by .18
Total	3.08	3.31	Imitation Gr. by .23

When each question is observed individually, the control group had greater improvement in five areas and the imitation group in three. This indicates that the imitation exercises, used as a teaching intervention, were not as successful at improving learning in five of the eight areas, as was the traditional lecture method.

Another view would be to count as negligible the difference between the groups when the difference was less than .10 change. To put it positively, only the areas in which there was significant difference would be compared. In this scenario, the control group saw improvement in three areas and the imitation in two. When comparing the amount of change, the effectiveness of the control group may not be that far ahead of the imitation group, as first thought.

Comparing the total amount of change presents a different picture. The imitation group had a total level of change of 3.31, compared to 3.03 level in the control group. Overall, the imitation group changed more than the control group.

It seems, that the results of the objective questions are somewhat inconclusive, in that the number of questions which saw improvement were greater in the control group, while the overall amount of improvement favors the imitation group.

5.3 Subjective Qualitative Questions

This portion of the survey had two different sets of questions. A common set of questions was given to both groups, after the class, in order to compare the answers and evaluate them as to the learning that took place in each of the groups. The imitation group had an additional question on the first survey which sought information regarding the students' attitude towards the use of imitation before the intervention. This group also had four additional questions on the second survey regarding their experiences with the

imitation exercises. At the end of the semester, eight weeks after the intervention, the imitation group participated in a discussion regarding the use of imitation.

The imitation group's answers regarding their initial attitude towards imitation pedagogy will be evaluated first, followed by the analysis of the set of questions common to both groups. Then questions unique to the imitation group and then the end of semester discussion will be analyzed. As with the objective questions above, the data is recorded here in the narrative for the convenience of the reader.

5.3.1 Question Asked Before Imitation Exercises

Because of the resistance and misunderstanding to the use of imitation in the realm of composition studies as recorded in earlier chapters, this question was asked to find out if homiletics students had some of the same reservations and hesitations about the use of imitation. It was assumed that the students would voice many of the same problems that some composition teachers and students have voiced. Below are the answers.

Please describe your initial attitudes towards the concept of imitation as a teaching method.

1. It doesn't seem to be a very good idea. There's not really a whole of authenticity in that. I don't think people would respond very well to that.
2. It is a valuable asset.
3. I believe it should be used with caution-personalities differ from person to person. Individuality should be allowed to be exhibited.
4. Not too excited. I believe to conform to a form/style may not be great for speakers. Different personalities will have different methods of delivery.

- However, I do see this as beneficial in some aspects- eye contact, enunciating clearly, etc.
5. I believe that some helpful characteristics of other preacher's delivery methods. Ultimately, however, an attempt to copy someone else's style will be ineffective because each must utilize his personality and not try to copy someone else's.
 6. Good, because it gets people out of their rut for a bit and allows them to explore different things they normally would not.
 7. I am concerned that the imitation will be pressed upon the student.
 8. I think a person should not imitate personality but can imitate righteous qualities.
 9. One should not strictly imitate another for delivery so there should be some freedom in what a student does yes they need to learn certain skills but it should not be ridged. [sic]
 10. Primarily positive. Much can be learned from imitating and adapting the positive aspects of an effective teacher's methods.
 11. If it is teaching to imitate other preachers then I am not in favor of it because a preacher must develop his own style unique to his personality and not try to make someone else's personality fit themselves.
 12. No idea.
 13. It depends on what is being imitated. For the case of preaching my initial attitude is positive. Seeing it done and hearing it, I think will always be a great way of learning.
 14. The concept of Imitation is a positive teaching method.
 15. Positive-we all do this whether by doing w/o knowing or a conscious decision.

The responses to the questions are evenly divided between negative and positive views. Three were neutral or expressing both negative and positive views, six negative and six positive. The openness to using imitation was greater than anticipated, given the very conservative and traditional make-up of Southwestern's student body. However, the negative attitudes towards it were still significant enough to warrant attention.

Answers 1, 4, 5, 8, and 11, expressed concern that an individual's personality would be lost because of imitating another personality. The following phrases express this:

"There's not really a whole of authenticity in that"

"Different personalities will have different methods of delivery"

"each must utilize his personality and not try to copy someone else's"

"I think a person should not imitate personality

"a preacher must develop his own style unique to his personality and not try to make someone else's personality fit themselves."

This opposition was addressed in the class sessions by assuring the students that imitation was not designed or intended to minimize their own personalities; it was to enhance them. Other opposition came from the concern that a student's freedom would be hindered as seen in answers seven and nine:

"I am concerned that the imitation will be pressed upon the student."

"One should not strictly imitate another for delivery so there should be some freedom in what a student does."

This opposition to the use of imitation, due to the perception of restricted freedom, was addressed by helping the students understand that greater freedom is the goal of imitation. To be sure, the act of imitating is restrictive, but that is only for the purpose of the classroom. Freedom comes when skills are improved by imitation and the student has greater freedom because of greater mastery of the skills of preaching.

These initial attitudes towards imitation verified that demystifying the false perceptions of imitation was an important part of the imitation exercise. The benefits presented in Chapter Three provided answers to the questions raised by the class, which were incorporated into the introductory portions of the exercises. Thus, homiletics was able to benefit from information gleaned from composition studies about imitation.

5.3.2 Questions Common to Both Groups

The responses to the subjective qualitative questions asked in the post intervention survey are listed below. The questions are listed followed by each student's response, beginning with student number one. The answers from the control group are listed first followed by the imitation group. After this listing analysis will follow.

Question #1- List three things you learned about style and rank them in order of importance.

Control Group responses

1. Body Language,
Clarity,
Word Choice

2. Face,
 Gesture,
 Words
3. Choose words,
 Body communication
4. Word choice is a bigger deal than I thought.
 Style affects the hearer's attentiveness.
 Style can touch or cause withdrawal.
5. Tone,
 word choice,
 body movement
6. Words do matter,
 the story matters
7. Must be clear,
 correct,
 captivating
8. Clear,
 correct
9. Use words as pictures to create an image,
 choose power packed words,
 use plain language
10. Structure,
 Audience

11. To use your whole body in preaching,
to be careful to fluctuate your voice,
don't be afraid to use a prop

Imitation group responses

1. Style should take its cue from and reinforce the tone of the message
Style can vary to fit the text while remaining an expression of exegetical sermon
Style can either add to or detract from the point of a passage
2. Clarity in the words I use
Using effective sentences
Have a captivating preaching style
3. Choose your words carefully and intentionally.
Use words that convey action as paint pictures.
Be clear, not abstract or ambiguous.
4. Effects textual potency.
Create comfort in the message.
Display intimacy with the text.

Analysis: In answers related to style, the control group listed more quantity in that they had more answers, but the quality of the imitation the groups is strikingly more complex. In the control group, most answers are very short indicating only the title of an area that was covered in class such as *body language*. The other short answers were broadly descriptive of a concept such as *clear* or *captivating*. While these were accurate answers

and part of the lecture, they were short and very broad, showing a learning level associated with memorizing. This level, according to Bloom's taxonomy, is the lowest level of learning which is comprehension or knowledge. Out of the eleven answers of the control group, two did respond with greater complexity of a directive such as *use words as pictures to create images*. In contrast to this, all the answers in the imitation group used a phrase to express a fuller concept. The majority of the answers of the control group shows only a comprehension of the material whereas the complexity of answers by the imitation group demonstrates an application or analysis or perhaps even synthesis which are the top three levels of learning. For example, one of the answers of the control was simply: *words*. (see answer number two). In contrast, answer number three from the imitation group was *Choose your words carefully and intentionally*. In the control group, only two responded with the higher levels of learning whereas in the imitation group all four of the respondents demonstrated these higher levels of learning. Thus, in the area of style, the imitation exercises provided a higher level of learning in the students.

Question #2- List three things you learned about delivery and rank them in order of importance.

Control Group Responses

1. State the exegetical idea,

Have subject /compliments that support each other.

Conclusion

2. Key sentences
3. Facial expressions
 - Planned movement or none,
 - Voice inflection
4. Non-verbal is important,
 - Planned delivery is better,
 - Eye contact
5. Voice-fluctuation of vocal chords,
 - Eye contact,
 - Big gestures
6. Nonverbal matters,
 - Voice matters,
 - Illustrations matter
7. Start with captivating story,
 - Body language is very important,
 - Hand gestures should match verbiage
8. Practice
9. Neat appearance,
 - Voice inflection,
 - Using gestures
10. Nonverbal's,
 - Voice,
 - Movement

11. Communicate clearly,

Feel passionate about your subject material,

Stay on the subject matters (do not chase rabbits)

Imitation Group Responses

1. Delivery of sermons should not lack the normal speech.

Gestures and expressions, not just words should be planned for maximum effectiveness.

To have the voice on Sunday, I must exercise it during the week.

2. Every movement has a purpose.

Eye contact and movement communicate something.

Facial expressions help communicate the text

3. Nonverbal communication is key.

4. Body language communicates way more than words.

Eye contact says a lot.

How attire can severely help or hurt our delivery.

Analysis: Many of the control group's answers are the short, title-type of answers such as *eye contact* and *big gestures*, but it seems that there was an increase in the number complex answers. When the answers of the control group are more closely studied, we see that there are eight responses that demonstrate a higher level of learning in the category of delivery. The answers of respondent number one demonstrated a higher level of learning, but they were about the content of a message and not delivery. Respondent number four had two answers which were on a higher level. Respondent six said that

nonverbal aspects, voice, and illustrations matter. Illustrations are not in the category of delivery, so that portion of the response does not apply to the effectiveness of teaching delivery. The three responses by student number seven and the middle portion of number eleven add four more, for a total of eight answers, which indicate a high level of learning. The total number of response by the control group was twenty-nine, eight of which demonstrated a higher level of learning. In contrast, the four respondents from the imitation group gave ten answers all of which reflect a higher level of learning. So, in both questions of style and delivery, the respondents of the group who received the imitation methodology showed a consistent higher level of learning.

5.3.3 Summary Analysis of the Comparative Portions of the Surveys

The use of lecture combined with imitation methodology in the homiletical classroom was more effective than just a lecture methodology. The evidence for this affirmation is not overwhelming but is still convincing. The objective portion of the survey had mixed results. The number of questions that saw improvement was greater in the control group, but the amount of overall positive change was greater in the imitation group. Based upon this portion of the survey, the results would be inconclusive. However, the results on the subjective portion favor the use of imitation. At first, the responses to the subjective portion of the survey seem to favor the control group learning, due to the greater number of responses. However, the majority of these responses in the control group indicated a knowledge or comprehension level of learning, which is the simplest form of learning. In stark contrast, all of responses in the imitation group indicated higher levels of learning such as comprehension and analysis. Thus, the

subjective portion of the survey shows that imitation methodology was more effective in producing a higher level of learning.

5.3.4 Questions Exclusive to the Second Survey of the Imitation Group

This portion of the survey was not a comparison but an evaluation of the imitation process. Five questions were asked only of the imitation group. Questions one and five were designed to measure the attitude of the students towards imitation after going through the exercises. Question two and three sought to discover positive and negative evaluations of the process and question four sought to measure the perceived learning that took place as a direct result of the imitation exercises.

5.3.5 Questions measuring the students' attitude toward the use of imitation

In all the responses, there are no negative responses. Considering that initially six out of fifteen students entered into the experience with a negative mindset about imitation, it is striking that there is no mention of anything negative. Since the surveys were confidential, there was no way to track if the same six students, who initially were negative, changed in their attitudes. We can at least say that in the end, nine students who responded to these questions thought favorably toward the use of imitation. With far more than half of the students (nine out of fifteen) responding favorably after experiencing imitation as a teaching methodology, it would seem that imitation received a good reception from the students.

1. Why do you think a teaching method of imitation was used to teach style and delivery?

1. It was worth, but was almost certainly more effective than merely listening to or watching a demonstration.
2. To show what you can do.

3. To stretch us and show that there are other effective forms of delivery/style beyond a regular comfort zone.
 4. To demonstrate the pros and cons of non-verbal cues.
 5. It's important to train ourselves.
 6. To open people to possibilities.
 7. So we can learn to be more comfortable presenting.
 8. To stretch us beyond what we realize we're capable of.
 9. I think it was used to push the student's boundaries of gestures, voice and facial expression
5. Should this teaching methodology of imitation be used in a preaching class? Why or why not?

1. I think so. I also think great care should be given to choosing preachers with excellent delivery habits to imitate. I had to practice some bad habits on part of this assignment. I found that helpful in identifying some of my own bad habits, but imitating the good techniques of the preacher did much more to help me develop new and possible positive habits.
2. Yes, but in moderation. Not to allow the imitation to over shadow God's move within the individual for a unique artistic expression.
3. Yes, it helps to prepare young preachers.
4. I think it would help those who are not as comfortable in front of people or who have not had a great deal of preaching experience.

5. Yes! It helps us to realize that in a sense we can be a powerful stage presence if we learn to control our bodies and use them. The imitation allowed us to “step inside” the bodies of those who know how to be powerful on stage.
6. I believe it should be used because it pushed me in areas I am naturally reserved. I think there is something within the imitation exercise that everyone could use help with in preaching.

In answering why imitation was used (question 1,) the most common response was to expand the students’ experiences using words such as, *push, stretch and show*. The common objection that imitation could hinder creativity or self-expression was not mentioned by the responders. Apparently, they saw imitation as opening them up to new experiences, which they saw as expanding rather than limiting them. Rather than being restricted by imitation, they spoke of being opened to new possibilities because of the imitation.

In keeping with that affirming spirit that was noted above, this question had only positive responses. But, they go beyond that to an almost motivational-speaker type of affirmation, with answers such as: *to show what you can do, to open people to the possibilities, to stretch us beyond what we realized we were capable of*. Some of the responses are less enthusiastic but still very positive. These responses show that these students were, apparently, given experiences that left them motivated to speak in glowing terms of imitation.

Question five asks specifically if imitation should be used in a preaching class. If there was to be a negative response, it seems that it would have been register under this

question. The response was, again, one hundred percent positive. One could argue that only six of the fifteen who filled out a questionnaire responded to this question. We cannot say that no one in the class was opposed to the use on imitation, only that no one responded in such a way. Based upon these six clear responses to the use of imitation, it can be concluded that, at least, these six students were in favor of its continued use.

3. What were the most difficult parts of the imitation exercise?

1. I found on the gestures and expressions, so the hardest part for me was keeping the words flowing smoothly without losing my place in the transcript
2. Body movement.
3. Breaking out of my comfort zone.
4. Recalling the positive non-verbal cues.
5. Imitating a great preacher.
6. Remembering all the movements and voice inflections.
7. Trying to mimic the smallest details of hand gestures, facial expressions, tone and emphasis on words, even shifting weight as they stand.
8. The most difficult part was trying to recall all the gestures and pushing myself to be equally elaborate with the movements.

4. What were the most rewarding parts of the imitation exercise?

1. Seeing how expressive a preacher can be without distracting from the message. If I used the those same expressions everyday no one would hear a word I said, but there are different rules for preaching and normal conversation.
2. To see that I can do things
3. Opened me up to animation to supplement the verbal.

4. Stretching myself.
5. Learning to be more comfortable with movements when preaching.
6. Just getting to kick back and be free by being someone else. Getting to holler on stage, throw out the arms, move around, etc. etc.
7. It helped me perform very elaborate gestures in front of a group of people. I am usually very conservative on my expressions when speaking to people.

Questions three and four were not so much to evaluate if imitation should be used, but rather to gain feedback as to how the teaching could be improved. Even in these responses, it is clear that these respondents felt that imitation was very positive. The delivery imitation activity was commented upon most frequently with favorable comments. Question three, which asked for difficult parts of the exercise, was another opportunity for students to express negative feelings toward the use of imitation, but there were none. The responses were regarding portions of the imitation that would be understandably difficult such as trying to read from a manuscript while trying to gesture and move. These difficult parts were not associated with the overall method but rather specific activities. Though questions three and four were intended to help improve the use of imitation, which they do, it is evident that these responses affirm the use of imitation.

5. List three things you will change in your preaching in the area of style and delivery due to this exercise in imitation. Please rank them in order of importance.

1. I will move carefully, analyze my gestures and plan them in much the way I plan transition statements, I will be more diligent to keep my vocal “breath” in shape during the week, I will use larger appropriate gestures.

2. Make sure not to let emotions override the text. Regard my style/delivery as artistic.
3. Eye contact. Body language. Imagery in my words.
4. Carefully choose words for illustrations, points, transitions etc., trying to make every word count. Learn to vary how loud to soft in voice when appropriate. More eye contact on individuals.
5. Improve my expressions in gestures, Pay more attention to facial expressions, Watch how I will use my voice (volume and clarity)

Question five shows that the students listed areas of delivery far more than they did style. Of the fifteen responses, three per respondent, style was mentioned five times, with delivery being mentioned eleven times. One response mentions style and delivery together. The delivery exercises seem to have had more impact, at least at this point. This greater impact might be affected by the delivery exercise coming last, which put it in close chronological proximity to the survey and due to the “impersonation” exercise being the more unusual of the two exercises. The upper levels of cognition are again demonstrated. One respondent only listed the title of the areas, but the other four all showed learning at the higher levels of application and analysis.

5.3.6 Summary of Survey Analysis

The comparison and analysis of the surveys shows that the responses indicate that, in this particular setting, imitation as a teaching methodology in the homiletical classroom is effective as a teaching methodology. The analysis of the objective part of the surveys was inconclusive, with the responses to the Likert questions showing the control group

improving in a greater number of areas, but a greater amount of change occurring in the imitation group. The questions that appeared on both terminal surveys, which allowed comparison of the groups, showed that the imitation group had higher levels of learning. The answers to the questions that were exclusive to the imitation group continue to show a higher level of learning as well as very positive attitudes towards the imitation exercises. While the first part of the analysis was inconclusive, the later two parts indicted that the imitation intervention was the more effective teaching methodology.

5.4 Concluding Informal Discussion by the Imitation Group

Approximately eight weeks after the teaching intervention, during which time the students preached in the classroom, an informal discussion was held to measure the effects, or perceived effects, of imitation teaching methodology upon the students. To put the concluding discussion in context, the surveys were given after the interventions in the classes, but before the students preached in class. The major difference, beside eight week delay, was having a preaching experience behind them. Hopefully, this would allow them to evaluate the imitation exercises effect upon their abilities to preach an actual sermon.

The discussion was held a room adjacent to the school cafeteria and a light lunch was provided for the eight participants, since we met over the lunch hour. The following questions were prepared to guide the discussion.

Discussion Guideline 3313B

Style Imitation

How did the imitation exercise of working on style in an illustration (word choice, sentence structure) affect your preparation to preach in class?

How did the imitation exercise of working on style in an illustration (word choice, sentence structure) affect the actual preaching of the sermon?

How did the imitation exercise of working on style in an illustration (word choice, sentence structure) affect the results of your sermon?

Delivery imitation- the imitation of Patterson, Vines or Caner

How did the imitation of another preacher's delivery affect your preparation to preach in class?

How did the imitation of another preacher's delivery affect the actual preaching of your sermon?

Do you think that the imitation of another preacher's delivery affected the results of your sermon?

Overall Questions

How has your attitude toward the imitation methodology changed since you have preached?

How would suggest changing the exercises?

Did you tell any of your friends about it? How did they respond?

Should imitation be used in the Introduction to Preaching class? To what extent?

The dynamics of the discussion resulted in the proposed questions being abandoned and a more free flowing structure being followed. As various topics came up, these were pursued for more details rather than following the prescribed outline. Thus, the structure, rather than following the above plan, is a collection of random comments under two broad categories: Style and Delivery. What follows is an abbreviated transcript made from notes taken during the discussion.

Follow up Discussion

I. How did the imitation methodologies affect style?

A. With regard to rewriting illustration-

1. This helped challenge how we thought about the wording of illustrations. Each work was understood to count.
2. Exercise was more beneficial than lecture.
3. Lecture provided tools, exercise showed importance.
4. The exercise of writing out the illustration provided a guide for others.
5. I grasped the importance of editing work because of the professor's example of how he imitated another's style.
6. Editing was beneficial because it provided word-smithing.
7. Peer criticism was beneficial because it helped to see hearer's perception.

B. With regard to improving the illustration in the sermon.

1. This helped me to include more details as I told illustrations.
2. We always wonder where the stopping point is with regard to specifics. What is too much? The criticism/feedback was helpful with this but it was not present in the lecture.

II. How did the imitation methodologies affect delivery?

A. Mannerisms

Studying mannerisms helped us study ourselves with regard to gestures, etc. In addition, vocal variety and rhetorical skill of those messages listened to were helpful to preparing introduction class sermon.

B. Greased the skids (made the class easier)

1. This provided a lack of formality to the preaching event when the time came it helped remove the wall of nerves.
2. The process was fun and provided a level of comfort.
3. It opened up ability to show personality.
4. The restrictions provided freedom.

C. Criticisms

1. Did not know what end goal was to be.
2. Possibly have imitation exercise prior to illustration exercise
3. Possibly assign/limit number of each preacher imitated, since most imitated the same preacher

D. Additional pluses

1. Began to understand what the model preachers are doing when you do it. For example, when one preacher moved up on the balls of his feet.
2. Provides freedom in communications. How body movement can be a plus or hindrance, importance of vocal variety, how large gestures can be helpful and not hinder.
3. Became clear that the best gesture partnered with appropriate words are more impactful.

4. Demonstration of the “impersonation” by professor was beneficial, even essential.

E. Attitude: How was it changed during the process?

1. Most were open to it, but prior to exercise, it was not viewed as beneficial until the process was clarified.

2. It was very important to clarify that we are not to be clones.

3. There was an element of fun in the exercise.

Analysis

Many of the students’ comments in the discussion were repetitive of the subjective portions of the surveys such as mentioning the improvements in word choice and use of gestures. It was encouraging that, after an eight-week gap, the students were able to articulate specific areas of style and delivery that were improved. Apparently, there was still a sense of improvement resulting from the imitation exercises.

Another theme that merits comment is the students affirming that the exercise was more valuable than the lecture. It is not surprising that these students agree with the effectiveness of experience over lecture. It may be that the increased learning in the imitation group was not so much because of imitation as it was having some kind of exercise past the lecture. While this can’t be verified or challenged based upon the results of this survey, it should at least be noted.

An unexpected observation by the students was the atmosphere created in the classroom by the imitation exercise, or as the students referred to it: the *impersonations*. The students used the term *greasing the skids*, a metaphor that implies making a difficult task easier. They spoke of the *impersonation* exercises as being fun and breaking down

walls of nervousness. The light hearted competitive spirit that existed when the impersonations were presented created a *esprit de corps* in the students. After acting in what seemed to be a foolish manner in front of each other in the imitation exercise, they didn't feel so nervous and self-conscious when they preached. This was an unexpected benefit from the imitation exercise.

The students also affirmed that the professor's demonstration of the exercise was important to them. This affirms that imitation as a good pedagogical methodology because the professor gave them a model to imitate. By the professor showing them how to imitate, they were able to imitate his example. So, imitating helped them to imitate. For future reference, when imitation is used, it is important for the instructor to demonstrate how it should be done. The students also appreciated the professor's clarifying and emphasizing that the goal of the initiation is not to become a clone.

This seems to be a good place to mention some of the factors that helped make imitation a successful experience. The demystifying of imitation was very important, for there is significant misunderstanding and reservations about the use of imitation. An instructor will need to remember that the amount of preparation was much greater for an imitation exercises than for a simple lecture, but the benefits are worth the effort.

Part of this preparation is the instructor's willingness to demonstrate the process of imitation. It only follows, if the instructor is asking the students to produce a classroom product based upon a model, that a model of the process also be provided. This modeling of the process of imitation by the instructor also helps greatly in producing a positive atmosphere towards imitation. Another important element in the success of using

imitation was the instructor's personal testimony, that as a learner, he had benefited from imitation as a teaching methodology.

5.5 Summary of the Analysis of the Teaching Intervention

The teaching of homiletics can greatly benefit from using composition teaching methodologies. In this empirical study, the use of an imitation methodology, derived from composition studies, was more effective at teaching style and delivery to homiletic students, than was a traditional lecture methodology. Imitation was also accepted by the majority of students as a valid and even enjoyable teaching methodology.

There are five reasons for making the above claim. First, the results of the surveys indicated that higher levels of learning took place in the imitation groups. Second, the class began with some reservation about the use of imitation but ended with only positive comments about its use. Third, the results of imitation helping to build *esprit de corps* among the students shows there were unexpected benefits. Fourth, the students still affirmed the positive effects of imitation eight weeks after the experience. Fifth, the students affirmed the positive effect of imitation upon their ability to preach a sermon.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND EVALUATION

The intentions of this project were to show how the composition teaching method of imitation can inform the teaching of homiletics and to test that with an empirical study. The research yielded insights into its use which were applied to the test case and verified that the teaching of preaching can be improved by using methods gleaned from composition pedagogies. That which began as a hunch was verified by quantitative and qualitative surveys of the classes and serves as a basis to encourage homiletics educators to borrow from the related field of composition for effective and proven teaching ideas.

Contributions: The study contributes to the broad field of humanities by attempting to synthesize various disciplines, or it could be stated as attempting to create a meta-narrative of several related fields, which are not often brought together. The history of rhetorical education, contemporary composition education, homiletical education, and an empirical study were brought together to better understand imitative pedagogies, and to create a basis for formulating a teaching plan for the use of imitation in a homiletical classroom. One of the affirmations of this interdisciplinary study was the describing of the close relationship of rhetoric, composition and homiletics. Rhetoric and composition are commonly joined, as are rhetoric and homiletics, but to a lesser degree. This study highlighted the connection of homiletics and composition.

This study also describes the decline of imitation during the eighteenth century and that there still exist hesitancy for use in today. Currently, there is a small resurgence in its use, but it is still not as common, as a teaching method, as it was for hundreds of years. The decline of its use was described, but a needed area of research is to articulate why. A few reasons such as the emphasis upon the scientific method and the importance of individuality were suggested, but the reason for its decline needs a more thorough examination.

This project articulates various forms and ways that imitation was and is being used in composition classrooms. This compiling is not boasting of a comprehensive examination of all the ways imitation is being used, but it is beneficial in that it delineates five forms of imitative pedagogy: copying word-for-word, using the same form and structure, imitating the process, copying principles, and copying of an image. The presentation of the various forms might result in educators being more apt to use at least one of them.

I began this project with the attitude that imitation was just another teaching idea that is found in the teachers' guide section of a textbook, but the study revealed that imitation is part of life and uniquely part of being human. When brought to the classroom, it is a formalizing of a process that is common to all of life. While its use may have declined in the classroom, it is still part of our lives.

Weaknesses: The limited quantitative research was a satisfactory study, considering the time and place and scope of the project, but a broader study would be helpful to establish a better understanding of what seminarians need to be taught about preaching. The use of imitation being tested at a broader level is problematic because it

would need to be tested in various seminars, which would require that professors would not only be willing to use imitation, but to use it in a consistent teaching plan. Perhaps at a professional gatherings of homiletic professors, there could be inquires as to those who would be willing to participate in a research effort. The qualitative section of the surveys could also be improved with clearer wording of the questions.

My lack of experience in teaching composition caused me to rely on what others have said and are saying. The ideal person to demonstrate how composition teaching methods can be used to teach preaching would be one who taught composition and is now teaching homiletics. That person may be hard to find, but until then, a collaboration between a composition teachers and homiletics teachers could result in many more composition teaching methods improving learning in the homiletics classroom.

The attempt at the synergistic approach creates a frustration because each area that is brought into the synergy could be developed with more research. One could separate this work into at least three dissertations: one that focused entirely upon the historical use of imitation, another examining the contemporary practice of imitation, and a more complete and thorough empirical study.

There is an area that is perhaps a weakness or, at least, a potentially weak area. Having been a professional oral communicator for thirty years, my entering a program in Rhetoric was for the purpose of deepening my understanding of the spoken word. Due to the rhetoric program at my institution being dropped in my second year, and due to four of my seminars being in composition, I found myself in a field that demanded a very steep learning curve. While the journey has benefited me greatly, particularly in the area of my own writing and critical thinking, I feel that there are oversights in this project due

to my approaching this as one who came late to this area of study. As I review my work, I still sound like an oral communicator who is putting his speech on paper. I feel like a welcomed guest, but not part of the family.

The context in which preaching takes place creates another difficulty. An essential element of preaching makes it difficult to analyze sermons as we would other pieces of literature. This element makes it more complicated to teach, as well. Those who practice preaching and those who listen to sermons as part of their religious expression believe that a sermon is more than just a human experience. At various levels, there is belief that, not only is there a preacher and the congregation, there is third party in the process of preaching: God. This makes the study of sermons as a literary or rhetorical creation difficult. The academic audience, while acknowledging that many hold to a theistic world view, strives to write and communicate in such a way that religious views are not the basis for argument. Susan Crowley encourages us to use the ancient art of rhetoric as an antidote to what she calls “apocalyptic” form of thinking (Crowley, 2006, p. 3). The intent is that unbiased and clear communication results. While I have attempted to adopt this approach in this study, it should be remembered that those who preach, both today and across the centuries, view the actions of a supreme being as part of the preaching process. In the more narrow setting of a seminary where this world view is assumed, additional elements would be included, such as the role of prayer in learning to preach, and relying upon God’s empowerment when structuring a sermon. This project, while striving to approach the subject from an academic point of view, may have slipped into the narrower form of thinking that comes with those who practice preaching.

Application of the Project: Homiletics instructors should become familiar with and use some of the teaching methods used to teach composition. Since there is a close link between the two fields, and since homiletic pedagogy is so limited, composition teaching methods can provide a wealth of ideas as to how to effectively teach preaching. These teaching exercises will need to be augmented to fit preaching but often they can be transferred directly.⁴² Homiletic professors should obtain a few composition textbooks which have a section on ideas for teaching. I suggest the following works:

1. Jack Rawlins and Stephen Metzger, (2009) *The Writer's Way*.

The authors reveal their propensity for imitation in the prologue: "Learning is done by imitating a mentor" (p. P-5). Early in the book, they give an example of imitating (p. 37-40), but do not assign imitation in this chapter. Later they ask the students to use what they call a structural template to write an essay. This structural template is not an outline to imitate, but a loose description of a kind of essay such as an argumentative essay (p. 127). Half way through the book they increase their use of imitation when they cite model student essays and direct their students to pick one of the example essays and "write one like it" (p. 219). These model essays could easily be replaced with model sermons.

2. Nancy Wood, (1995/2003) *Perspectives On Argument*. (2009)

Perspectives On Argument Resource Manual.

In both the textbook (p. 123) and the manual (p. 49) she gives the students a detailed guide as to what should be in an essay. One is an informative essay and

⁴² The teaching plan for the empirical study contained an exercise that was taken directly from a text intended for use in a composition setting. See p. 189.

the other is a Rogerian argument paper. While it is not the imitation of a model, it does ask the students to follow the principles that were seen in a model. The prescribed outline of the Rogerian Argument gives more structure than a simple argument paper—it is imitating a certain kind of argument. Having had this class and experienced this exercise, I found it to be an effective way to teach that form of argumentation both for understanding and appreciation. The exercises were flexible enough that I frequently used my sermons instead of an essay

3. Anne Wysocki and David Lynch, (2007) *Compose Design Advocate*.

The outline of the book and the basic teaching design is to teach the rhetorical principles and then the students apply them in their writing, followed by analysis of the argument. They sparingly use imitation when they ask the students to bring in a short and ineffective text which the students re-write to make it effective (p. 59). Their exercises can be easily adapted to sermons. Rather than students bring an ineffective text, an ineffective sermon could be viewed by the class.

4. Lester Faigley and Jack Selzer, (2007) *Good Reasons With*

Contemporary Arguments. They clearly presented principles that are to be used to construct written arguments, which can be applied to arguments in sermons. One of their examples has commentary in balloons on a model essay which can serve as an example of using the same method of balloons to comment on a written form of a sermon.

Another source that homiletics professors could consult would be to subscribe to a journal such as *College English* or *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*. The

journal covering the two year college seems to be more practically oriented and has a section on teaching ideas that could prove more useful than journals that focus more on theory and other aspects of English studies. Homiletic professors who teach at seminaries which have an undergraduate program would do well to enter into a dialogue with composition teachers in order to receive first hand ideas about teaching methodologies. If the seminary is only a graduate school, then an instructor at a local university or two year college would be a good relationship to foster.

Since preaching and composition are linked through rhetoric, composition teachers should think creatively as to how to use sermons to teach composition. Those students whose church attendance is part of their life experience should be aware that many of the same principles that they are trying to master in FYC, to some degree, are exemplified in the sermons to which they listen every Sunday. An assignment could be to write a rhetorical analysis of a sermon which they heard. To do this they will need to have access to a recording, so that they can review the content. The temptation will be to analyze a written sermon, such one that is commonly seen in anthologies: Jonathan Edward's *Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God*. While there is merit in analyzing historical sermons, it would seem that more benefit would come from analyzing a sermon that a student actually experienced. When using preaching, composition teachers need to remember that a sermon is not that different from an essay, with the exception of a dependence upon the authority of scripture. This is an assumed warrant in the minds of the congregation. Some pastors rely heavily upon it, others not as much.

Preaching could also help composition studies in examining the area of motivating the audience to put the subject of the discourse into action. Preaching is very

open about the persuasive element as it aims to motivate people to make concrete changes in their lives. If one knows about God's love, but doesn't show love, then the sermon has failed. How do preachers seek to move people to action? Often students are asked to examine the claims and warrants of an argument, the structure of a work is articulated, but the open motivation that one hears in a sermon is not often seen in other discourses. This gives the composition teacher an opportunity to help the students by having them analyze what, in a sermon, moved or failed to move them to action.

The broadest application of the project is a call for a resurrection of imitative teaching methods in the field of composition, and in the field of homiletics; it is a call to aggressively introduce them. This resurrection would require that teachers in both fields should be open to this form of teaching. The hesitancy may come because of a lack of understanding, which can easily be demystified by research into its theory and use. This hesitancy should remind teachers to take the time to demystify imitation for their students.

This resurrection can take place by teachers being willing to try methods that for generations were the default method of teaching. This does not mean that they are adopting the traditional and ancient philosophies of teaching. The various teaching philosophies can embrace imitation and will adapt it accordingly. The formalistic school of thought might, more readily, adopt these more traditional ways of teaching, due to the more conservative mindset. The expressionist will find that the constraints of imitation can free expressions that students might otherwise repress. The constructionist school can adapt these methods and will find that there is a generative as well as a dialogical element in imitative exercises. Cicero's view that imitation helped develop Roman rhetoric

reminds us that imitation links us to the past in a concrete way. To read Hemingway or Hawthorn is good; to read the sermons of Luther or listen to the sermons of Billy Graham is good, but imitating a section of their work links us to them and improves our abilities so that our writing or preaching improves our culture. In the use of imitation teaching methods, the past and the present can come together to serve the future.

Areas for Future Study: If imitation teaching methodologies can transfer from composition to homiletics, one wonders if other teaching methods would be equally beneficial. How can the use of argumentation theory in composition pedagogies inform how argumentation theory should be used to teach homiletics? Can the discussion of severity and charity in evaluations of student writing affect the ways in which student sermons are evaluated? When one writes it is self-expression, but it is separated from the self by the medium of paper and ink, or screens and word programs; when one preaches, self expression is more closely linked to the person. If composition teachers are discussing how to more effectively critique student writing, then homiletics teachers should listen closely so that the critique of preaching could be improved.

A closer examination of the history of rhetoric could help in a current debate in homiletics concerning the content of a sermon. Some would say that the content of the Bible should be the focus of each sermon while others would put the audience in the place of prominence. The distillation of the argument brings it down to the definition of preaching. Is preaching primarily a proclamation of the Biblical content or is it a speech created by the preacher to help his/her congregation? In the examination of the relationship of preaching and rhetoric, the “new” form of preaching that emerged around 1100, called the university sermon, seems to be a departure from viewing preaching as a

proclamation of the content of the Bible. Was this truly a new form of preaching? What is the long range effect of this new way of thinking about preaching?

As briefly mentioned above, the decline in the use of imitation in teaching methodologies during the eighteenth century needs closer examination in order to understand why it declined. How did the Cartesian influence effect it? And, if Cartesian thinking is being replaced by postmodernism, then why have imitation teaching methods not experienced more acceptance? I have described what occurred, but much more work needs to be done to better understand why it occurred.

Teachers of homiletics have much to learn from teachers of composition. I have only briefly alluded to the learning flowing from homiletics to composition, but it should flow. The differences of world-views and the usual separation of religion from education should not keep these two disciplines from listening to each other, and even collaborating, in order to give the students a better educational experience in both fields.

APPENDIX A

REVIEW OF 25 COMPOSITION TEXTBOOKS

Review of 25 Selected Composition Textbooks

All of the books were filled with examples of good writing which has an implied imitative purpose but only eight made the clear connection between the examples and the students' writing. What follows is an annotated bibliography with a more concise listing at the end of the chapter. Please note that the books which used imitation have an understandably longer comment.

1. Marian Arkin, M., & Cecilia Macheski. (2006) Research Papers: A Guide and Workbook. This spiral bound step-by-step guide used imitation only slightly. The authors gave a list of topics which the student was to rewrite into a thesis sentence by adding a point of view. This is a form of paraphrasing, which might be considered imitation.
2. Nora Bacon (2009) The Well-Crafted Sentence. She articulated three pedagogical principles to help writers improve: by studying the work of excellent writers, striving for rhetorical variation and then writing (p.v-vii). Of course, she provided examples of excellent writing but did not encourage any form on imitation.
3. Sylvan Barnet & Hugo Bedau (2008) Current Issues And Enduring Questions. This text probably would be used in a second semester FYC class as its aim is to help students analyze and then write arguments. There is nothing on imitation.
4. Susan Blau and Kathryn Burak, (2007/2010) Writing in the Works. Both editions of this work were examined. Their basic philosophy is that composing, brainstorming, and

revising exist in a circular relationship and are constantly influencing each other. Their assignments reflect this inter-relational dynamic, with imitation not having a part.

5. Nancy Cavender and Howard Kahane, (2010) Logic and Contemporary Rhetoric. This book designed for a class on the composition of argumentation does not use imitation in the student assignments.

6. John Chaffee, Christine McMahon, and Barbara Stout, (2008). Critical Thinking, Thoughtful Writing. The title expresses well the authors' teaching philosophy and methodology: principles are presented and then the student is expected to use the principles in their writing. Imitation is not mentioned but the numerous examples which the students analyze implies imitation.

7. Edward Corbett, E. P.J., Myers, N., & Tate, G., (2000) The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook. Though this was not a textbook, it was designed to give teachers of FYC classes a collection of articles with teaching ideas. Imitation is not mentioned. However, as cited earlier in the chapter (p.7), Corbett details the exact copying of an essay.

8. Lisa Ede, (2008) The Academic Writer. Ede's social constructionist views are seen in the emphasis upon collaboration and community, but no use of imitation.

9. Lester Faigley and Jack Selzer, (2007) Good Reasons With Contemporary Arguments. They clearly presented principles that are to be used to construct written arguments but no use of imitation.

10. Donald Hall and Sven Birkerts, (2007) Writing Well. These authors use what could be called a form of parody which they call downwriting and upwriting (p. 20-21). It is a process of summarizing and expanding. For downwriting, the students take a long descriptive paragraph from a model such as Fitzgerald or Hemingway and try to summarize it in one sentence. The opposite of that is upwriting which takes a simple sentence and expands it with details. This down-and-up-writing forces the students to look closely at a text in order to summarize it and then when the expansion of upwriting takes place, it is easy to use the models which they summarized to serve as a way of expanding the simpler statement.

Later in the book, they specifically suggest an imitation activity, but instead of an imitative teaching method, it was an oral brainstorming activity which they should have described as a recalling of past experiences (p.73). Another use of imitation was paraphrasing (p. 124), which was used to teach the figures of metaphors and similes, and it was also used to teach sentence structure (p. 135). These exercises in paraphrasing were designed to focus on understanding the concepts rather than directly affecting the students writing. Imitation or paraphrasing was used to advance understanding, which indirectly will improve writing, but it was not the intent for students to adopt skills from the imitation. Hall and Birkerts used imitation more than most authors though it was in a limited fashion.

11. Joe Marshall Hardin, (2007) Choices: Situations For College Writing. This book takes into account the changes that have occurred over the past 50 years in how writing is produced. Word processors and interactive computer programs are integrated into their

teaching methods. This emphasis upon the changes brought about by technology perhaps explains why there was no use of the seemingly archaic teaching method of imitation.

12. John Mauk and John Metz, (2007/2010) The Composition of Everyday Life. Their basic plan is seen in the outline of each chapter: (1) analyze the strategy of a model, (2) explore you own ideas, and (3) write. Imitation is not specifically used, but its indirect use seems to be the basis behind the analyzing of the model.

13. John Mauk and John Metz, (2007) The Composition of Everyday Life. and (2007) Instructor's Manual, the Composition of Everyday Life. In this companion resource book for the previous work, the authors reveal their pedagogical aims when they state that they are not trying to teach writing by itself, they are trying to teach thinking (viii). They believe that if they can get their students to think a certain way, they will be better writers. Perhaps this approach guided them away from using imitation. It is hard enough for people to submit to imitating a model writer, but to imitate a model thinker seems even harder.

14. John Mauk and John Metz, J. (2009) Inventing Arguments. This book, designed as a second semester or second year FYC text, follows the pattern of their other books in which imitation is not explicitly used.

15. Robert Miller, (2007) The Informed Argument. The author's main teaching method is the building of a portfolio which is added to throughout the semester. The student learns more and more complex concepts of writing and is to revise older work by

incorporating new concepts from previous work (vi-vii). No mention of imitation, though numerous examples are given.

16. Christina Murphy & Steve Sherwood, (2003) The St. Martin's Sourcebook for writing Tutors. This collection of essays covers a broad spectrum of situations that a graduate student working in a writing center or in a one-on-one setting might encounter, from ESL students to working with deaf students. There is no mention of imitation being used to help students in this more directly personal setting.

17. Lee Odell and Susan Katz, (2010) Writing Now Shaping: Words And Images. The basic plan is for students to analyze a model in order to teach them a concept. This is followed by a writing assignment in which the principles are applied. At first glance, their teaching seemed to have no use of imitation, but when examined more closely, they guide the student through an analysis of several models articulating various writing principles followed by a very detailed guide to write a similar work. While they do not use the word *imitation*, that is what is taking place.

18. Sandra Perl and Mimi Schwartz, (2006) Writing True: The Art and Craft of Creative Nonfiction. This book teaches various structures for storytelling by presenting them and assumes the student can apply them to his writing. It would seem that the assignments would ask the students to follow a guideline, but the principles are just presented and the application of them is up to the student.

19. Jack Rawlins and Stephen Metzger, (2009) The Writer's Way.

The authors reveal their propensity for imitation in the prologue: "Learning is done by imitating a mentor" (p. P-5). Early in the book, they give an example of imitating (p. 37-40) but do not assign imitation in this chapter. Later they ask the students to use what they call a structural template to write an essay. This structural template is not an outline to imitate but a loose description of a kind of essay such as an argumentative essay (p. 127). Half way through the book, they increase their use of imitation when they cite model student essays and direct their students to pick one of the example essays and "write one like it" (p.219). No further guidelines are given as to what to imitate or why, but it is imitation.

Later in the book, they use imitation directly (p. 274-79). The student is to imitate the purpose and outline of a model essay. This imitative approach is further emphasized with an example of how another student imitated the essay. So, an imitation of the imitation is provided as an additional source to imitate. It seems that the practice of Rawlings and Metzger is to use imitation later in the class instead of earlier. They do not mention pedagogical philosophy to substantiate this reoccurring use of imitation, but it would seem they want the student to be proficient to some degree before the student imitates a model, which may not be realistic in FYC class.

20. Duane Roen, Gregory Glau, and Barry Maid, (2009). The Brief McGraw-Hill Guide.

It seems that these authors have much to say about guiding writers for the "brief" guide is 1000 pages long when prefaces and appendices are included. They have numerous writing exercises, but none of them contain imitation as a teaching methodology.

21. Duane Roen, et al.(2002), Strategies for Teaching First-Year Composition. In this idea book for FYC instructors, from the fifty plus ideas contributed by dozens of different authors, only one suggests the use of imitation and that is only an indirect use. Mary Salaibrici (p. 173) asks students to assume the role of one of the players in the Rosenberg spy trial. The student assumes the persona and writes from that perspective. This is in a sense asking the students to imitate how they think another person would respond.

22. Nancy Wood, (1995/2003) Perspectives On Argument. (2009) Perspectives On Argument Resource Manual. In both the textbook (p. 123) and the manual (p.49), she gives the students a detailed guide as to what should be in an essay. One is an informative essay and the other is a Rogerian argument paper. While it is not the imitation of a model, it does ask the students to follow the principles that were seen in a model. The prescribed outline of the Rogerian Argument gives more structure than a simple argument paper—it is imitating a certain kind of argument. Having had this class and experienced this exercise, I found it to be an effective way to teach that form of argumentation both for understanding and appreciation. Wood seems to like this type of exercise for she uses it five more times (p. 149, 195, 241, 256, 309.)

23. Dorothy Seyler, (2008). Read, Reason, Write. The title is a good description of the text in which the student is to read good literature, use the models to learn what good writing is and then write. There is no use of imitation other than very indirectly.

24. Richard Veit and Christopher Gould, (2006) Writing, Reading, and Research. Their philosophy is that critical reading is most basic in learning to write (p. xv), and thus it is

most emphasized throughout their book. There is a section of paraphrasing, but that is designed to teach how to properly paraphrase when quoting a source.

25. Anne Wysocki and David Lynch, (2007) Compose Design Advocate. The outline of the book and the basic teaching design is to teach the rhetorical principles and then the students apply them in their writing, followed by analysis of the argument. They sparingly use imitation when they ask the students to bring in a short and ineffective text which the students re-write to make it effective (p. 59). This may seem like a more direct form of imitation using the model as a basis, but it is negative imitation for the student sees the model as what not to do rather than something to be emulated.

APPENDIX B
HANDOUTS FOR CLASS SESSIONS

Experiences with the Use of Style

Take five minutes to think about a time when you were very concerned with the way you said something, such as: proposing marriage, asking a boss for a raise, filling out an application for a job or entrance to a school. Use the following questions to help you organize your thoughts. After five minutes we will break into groups of three or four and tell each other about our experiences. The person who has been at seminary the longest goes first.

1. Briefly identify and describe the situation.
2. Describe what you did before you spoke or turned in an application.

Did you practice what you were going to say?

Did you edit a written application?

Did you have other people help you?

3. What was the result?
4. Do you think your style affected the outcome? If so, how?
5. Did your style affect the emotional atmosphere while you were talking? If so, how?

Handout #2

STYLE

I. Your preaching style must be CLEAR.

A. Beware of the barriers to clarity.

B. Break down these barriers to clarity.

1. Use effective words.

2. Use effective sentences.

THE ESSENCE OF CLEAR LANGUAGE IS ECONOMY.

II. Your preaching style must be CORRECT.

THE ESSENCE OF A CORRECT LANGUAGE IS EXPEDIENCY

III. Your preaching style must be CAPTIVATING.

A. Draft into your service words of force.

B. Strive for the sublime. (Transport listeners to a “new” reality.)

THE ESSENCE OF CAPTIVATING LANGUAGE IS ENERGY.

Handout #2 page 2

DANGERS:

Remember the following dangers of style.

1. Style may generate misunderstanding (especially metaphors.)
2. Style may be impersonal.
3. Style may be artificial

DEVELOPMENT:

Increase the effectiveness of your style by ...

1. Becoming word conscious.
2. about style.

Joseph Williams. *Style, The Basic of Clarity and Grace*. Pearson , 2006

3. Digging into word tools.
4. Reading ALOUD the classic literature.
5. Analytically listening to the media.
6. Writing for the ear.
7. Re-writing for economy, expediency, and energy.
8. Speaking often.
9. Revising and repeating messages.
10. Being prepared.

* Dr. Pearson acknowledges his dependence upon his friend, Timothy Warren, for some of the content of this lecture.

Handout #3

My original illustration:

When I was twelve, my great uncle Freddie told me about something he saw when was twelve. It took place in a field not far from my great grandfather's house. The field was near the top of a hill and was hidden away from the busy manufacturing center of Worcester, Massachusetts. My Uncle had to make his way through a small section of forest that was filled with winter snow, and climb about two miles up a steep hill, but he and some friends wanted to see what was going on. There had been reports that a man with crazy ideas was experimenting with liquid fueled rockets. Everyone thought he was nuts, including my uncle, but nuts and twelve year old boys somehow go together. They climbed to the field which was surrounded by a stone wall. They didn't venture out into the field, but they saw some metal frames and unfamiliar equipment. They also saw a man who was working on this strange equipment, and after that man stepped away. They saw a rocket fly into the air and land in a neighboring garden. It didn't seem to be that big of an event, so they made their way home. My uncle told me this story in the summer of 1969 because that was the summer that a liquid fuel rocket took men to the moon and back.

After consulting a NASA website for specific dates I edited my work trying to make it more of a story with more effective style.

Edited version:

The walk was uphill through shushing snow melting on top of a carpet of decaying leaves but my uncle kept climbing, feeling the cold March Massachusetts air sting his lungs as he began to breathe more deeply. He could make out the clearing through the leafless winter forest, but it wasn't the clearing that he and his teenage friends came to see.

Slowing down the closer they came to the clearing and taking each step with care to make the least noise possible, my uncle and his friends stepped onto a two-foot high stone wall that surrounded three sides of the five acre field. They had a great view of what they came to see with no one to hinder their view because the other onlookers had come up the other side of Pakachaog hill in their Model A's and Model T's and a few horse drawn buggies. He and two friends had the clearest view, standing on top of a stone wall, watching this man with his bottles and frames assembling a device in the middle of the field. They couldn't hear what he said but when the crowd on the other side all moved back behind the safety of the cars, Freddie and his friends stepped down behind the stone wall. Mr. Goddard stepped toward a frame that held a rocket, just at shoulder level. He made some adjustments and then stepped back. My uncle watched as this liquid fueled rocket raced into the sky and landed in a cabbage patch. In a matter of seconds the boys as well as the on lookers on the other side of the field were leaving. "Well, that wasn't so much." the boys thought. One of them said, "I guess he is a nut, you know my dad said that Goddard was building this rocket to go to the moon."

Handout #4

The following three illustrations show the use of good style.

McGuiggan, Jim. *Jesus: Hero of Thy Soul*. West Monroe, LA: Howard, 1998. p. 22.

Jerry Harvill told a story about novelist Marjorie Byrd, who was visiting the MacIntosh home in the western Highlands of Scotland. A gale was howling around the cottage that lay outside the village, and Mr. MacIntosh was away on business. At the height of the fierce storm came a knock at the door. A family friend, a young lad, severely crippled and drenched to the skin, had walked from the village to check on Mrs. MacIntosh. She brought him in to warm at the fire. “Aren’t you afraid?” the boy asked Mrs. MacIntosh and her guest intensely. The novelist was about to say no, when Mrs. MacIntosh spoke the words every boy longs to hear: “Of course we were afraid,” she said, “but now that you’re here, it’s all right, because now we have a man in the house.” The boy straightened his twisted frame, looked at the two women, and said with a firm voice, “Well, then, I’d best be checking to make sure everything is snug.”

Lucado, Max. “Forgiveness for Bitter Days.” *Preaching* 23.2 (Sept/Oct 2007) 45.

You and I save things. Favorite photos, interesting articles—we all save things. Homer and Langley Collyer hoarded things. Newspapers, letters, clothing—you name it, they kept it.

Born in the late 1800s to an affluent Manhattan couple, the brothers lived in a luxurious three-story mansion at the intersection of Fifth Avenue and 128th

Street. Homer earned a degree in engineering; Langley became a lawyer. All seemed good in the Collyer family. But then mom and dad divorced in 1909. The boys, now in their 20s, remained in the home with their mother. Crime escalated. The neighborhood deteriorated. Homer and Langley retaliated by escaping the world. For reasons that therapists discuss at dinner parties, the duo retreated into their inherited mansion, closed and locked the doors.

They were all but unheard of for nearly 40 years. Then in 1947 someone reported the suspicion of a dead body at their address. It took seven policemen to break down the door because the entrance was blocked by a wall of newspapers, folding beds, half a sewing machine, old chairs, part of a winepress and other pieces of junk. After several hours of digging, policemen found the body of Homer, seated on the floor, head between his knees, his long and matted gray hair reaching his shoulders.

But where was Langley? That question triggered one of the strangest searches in Manhattan history. Fifteen days of quarrying produced 103 tons of junk—gas chandeliers, a sawhorse, the chassis of an old car, a Steinway piano, a horse’s jawbone and, finally, one missing brother. The stuff he kept had collapsed on and killed him.

McGuiggan, Jim. *Jesus: Hero of Thy Soul*. West Monroe, LA: Howard, 1998. p. 201-04.

In Tuscumbia, Alabama, in 1870 the Keller’s baby girl fell ill, and this resulted in her becoming blind, deaf, and mute. She was nineteen months old. Without communication she grew into a “little human animal,” trapped in the

silent darkness, a victim to moods and to the ways her sad parents spoiled her because they didn't know what else to do. "Every day she slips further and further away," said her mother, "and I don't know how to call her back."

Then Annie Sullivan arrived. She wasn't much more than a child herself, but she had known real life and all the pain, frustration, and heartache that goes with it. But her suffering had taught her toughness as well as compassion.

She isn't long at the Keller's before Helen shows her the power of a key—she locks Sullivan in her room so she can't trouble her anymore. Annie, realizing that she can't help Helen because the parents continue to interfere with her work with the girl, asks them to let her have complete control over the child, in a little summer house next to the main house.

They take Helen for a long drive so she won't know where she is, they deposit her in the summer house, and they leave immediately. By now Helen regards Sullivan as her tormentor, so you can imagine her horror when she realizes she is left alone with someone who will give her no peace. In panic, she tries to find the door, to escape the clutches of this one who refuses to let her do as she wishes; but when she finds it, it's locked, and the woman has the key. Locked in by sightless eyes and unhearing ears, she's now locked in with her torturer.

For two weeks Sullivan "torments" Helen, refusing to let her eat or sleep or play unless she is willing to abide by the rules. She tirelessly teaches her the letters of the alphabet on her hands, trying to get through to her that words stand

for things, that things have names, and that the shapes made by her fingers and hands are the letters that spell the names that stand for the things.

Two weeks fly by without a breakthrough. The parents can no longer stand the separation and resist Sullivan's pleas for more time. They take Helen back—prison's ended; torment's over; she's free again.

As soon as she's back in the house, she goes around checking all the doors to see that they're unlocked, and then she takes the key and puts it in her mother's pocket, making sure that her tormentor won't have power over her again. All the obedience and rules she has learned are tossed to the winds and the animal behavior returns. Finally, it all comes to a head when Helen in a fit of anger pours a jug of water over Sullivan. Her teacher ignores the protests of the parents, grabs the jug and Helen, drags her out to the pump, forces her to fill the jug with water while she spells W..A..T..E..R on the girl's fingers and hands.

And that's when it happens. All of a sudden Helen stops struggling. She throws away the jug and allows the water to run through her fingers as she strains to say the one word she had learned when she was a nineteen-month-old baby: water! The light comes on in her mind; she struggles to understand that what was being spelled out on her fingers stands for what she feels pouring over her hands. Her prison walls are collapsing; she now has a rational connection with her world—*words are things*.

Afraid to believe, in case she's mistaken, she makes Sullivan pump more water, feels it, grabs her teacher's hand, and spells out WATER? The teacher confirms it and slowly the tears begin to flow as freedom steals into her life.

Ecstatically, she wants to know the name of everything—the word for what’s under her feet, for the soil she can pick up in her hands, for the thing the water comes out of. The father and mother join the celebration and there’s crying and laughing as the girl communicates with the world around her and learns the name “Mother.”

All of a sudden, she turns from her parents, finds Sullivan, and asks her what her name is. Sullivan spells out “teacher.” Softness and gratitude spread over Helen’s face. She stumbles her way back to her mother, who holds her and doesn’t want to let her go; but Helen, groping for the key in mother’s pocket, gets it and wriggles free. Back she goes to the teacher, opens her hand, and presses the key into it. Now she knows! Now she trusts! All along her tormentors had been her friend; the one who had been locking her in was wanting to set her free.

Handout #5

Preaching 3313

Calvin Pearson

Delivery

Definition:

Importance:

Mehrabian, Psy. Today. Sept.1968. p.53) (Communication comes from: 55% face, 38% voice, 7% words

Nonverbal communication:

Elements of Delivery

Face

Body

Dress

Movement

Eye Contact

Vocal

Sources for good delivery

Attitude

Emotions

Creativity

Responding to Audience

Love Spirit's filling

APPENDIX C
SURVEY DATA AND TABULATION

SURVEY DATA AND TABULATION

Control Group Survey #1	Average	St. Dv
Q 1- Number Edit	3.16	1.50
Q2- Text and style	2.16	1.17
Q3- Write- Speak	3.61	1.33
Q4- Cong. Influence	1.79	1.03
Q5- Emotions	2.17	0.79
Q6- Rate	3.05	0.71
Q7- Verb- Nonverbal	2.32	1.25
Q8- Spontaneous - Planned	4.22	1.06
Q9- Facial Expression	1.79	0.85
Q10- Body	3.79	1.13
Total	2.81	1.08

Control Group Survey #2	Average	St. Dv.
Q 1- Number Edit	3.92	0.95
Q2- Text and style	2.00	1.29
Q3- Write- Speak	3.23	1.42
Q4- Cong. Influence	1.54	0.52
Q5- Emotions	1.62	0.65
Q6- Rate	2.62	0.87
Q7- Verb- Nonverbal	2.08	1.55
Q8- Spontaneous - planned	4.46	0.78
Q9- Facial Expression	1.77	1.09
Q10- Body	4.38	0.96
Total	2.76	1.01

Intervention Group Survey #1

Q 1- Number Edit	2.93	1.16
Q2- Text and style	2.20	1.15
Q3- Write- Speak	3.20	1.21
Q4- Cong. Influence	1.93	0.59
Q5- Emotions	2.20	0.77
Q6- Rate	2.47	0.64
Q7- Verb- Nonverbal	2.00	0.88
Q8- Spontaneous - planned	4.40	0.74
Q9- Facial Expression	1.87	0.83
Q10- Body	3.73	0.96
Totals	2.69	0.89

Intervention Group Survey #2	Average	St. Dv
Q 1- Number Edit	3.60	0.97
Q2- Text and style	2.40	1.07
Q3- Write- Speak	3.40	1.17
Q4- Cong. Influence	1.60	0.52
Q5- Emotions	1.90	0.57
Q6- Rate	2.20	0.79
Q7- Verb- Nonverbal	1.80	1.23
Q8- Spont. - planned	4.50	0.71
Q9- Facial Expression	1.20	0.42
Q10- Body	4.50	1.08
Total	2.71	0.85

Amount of Change

Control Group Survey

Comparison	pre-	post-	change
Q 1- Number Edit	3.16	3.92	0.76
Q2- Text and style	2.16	2.00	0.16
Q3- Write- Speak	3.61	3.23	0.38
Q4- Cong. Influence	1.79	1.54	0.25
Q5- Emotions	2.17	1.62	0.55
Q6- Rate	3.05	2.62	0.43
Q7- Verb- Nonverbal	2.32	2.08	0.24
Q8- Spont. - planned	4.22	4.46	0.24
Q9- Facial Expression	1.79	1.77	0.02
Q10- Body	3.79	4.38	0.59
Average Change			0.36

Amount of Change

Imitation Group Survey

Comparison	Pre	Post	Change
Q 1- Number Edit	2.93	3.60	0.67
Q2- Text and style	2.20	2.40	0.20
Q3- Write- Speak	3.20	3.40	0.20
Q4- Cong. Influence	1.93	1.60	0.33
Q5- Emotions	2.20	1.90	0.30
Q6- Rate	2.47	2.20	0.27
Q7- Verb- Nonverbal	2.00	1.80	0.20
Q8- Spont. - planned	4.40	4.50	0.10
Q9- Facial Expression	1.87	1.20	0.67
Q10- Body	3.73	4.38	0.65
Average Change			0.36

REFERENCES

- Abbott, D. P. (1990). Rhetoric and Writing in Renaissance Europe and England. In J. J. Murphy (Ed.), *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Modern America* (pp. 95-120). Mahwah, NJ: Hermagoras.
- Adams, K. (1993) *A History of Professional Writing Instruction in American Colleges*. Dallas: SMU Press.
- Alan of Lille. (1202/1981). *The Art of Preaching* (G. Evans, Trans.). Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications.
- Alberic of Monte Cassino. *Flowers of Rhetoric*. (J. Miller, Trans.). (1973). In J. Miller, M. Prosser and T. Benson, Eds. *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*, (pp.33-36). Indiana UP.
- Anson, C. M. (1999). Distant Voices: Teaching Writing in a Culture of Technology. *College English*, 61, 261- 80.
- Aristotle. (1991). *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civil Discourse* (G. A. Kennedy, Ed. and Trans.). Oxford: Oxford UP.
- . (2007) *On Sophistical Refutations* (W. A. Pickard-Cambridge, Trans.) http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/sophist_refut.1.1.html, accessed 1-27-09.
- Arrington, P. (1988). A Dramatisitic Approach to Understanding and Teaching Paraphrase. *College Composition and Communication*. 39:185-197.
- Asante, M. An Afrocentric Communication Theory. In *Malcolm X as a Cultural Hero and Other Afrocentric Essays* (pp. 552-562). Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Ascham, R. (1571/1934). John Mayor. Ed. *The School Master*. Bell and Sons: London.

Auerbach, E. (1958). *Literary Language and Its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. New York: Pantheon.

---. (1953). *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

Augustine. (1993). *Confessions* (F. J. Sheed, Trans.). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

---. (1997). *On Christian Teaching* (R.P.H. Green, Trans.). Oxford: Oxford World's Classics.

---. (1958). *On Christian Doctrine* (D.W. Robertson, Jr. Trans.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

---. (1996). *Teaching Christianity* (E. Hill, Trans.) Hyde Park, NY: New City Press.

Barclay, W. (1959). *Educational Ideals in the Ancient World*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Barrow, R. (1977). *Greek and Roman Education*. London: Macmillan Education.

Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, Music, Text* (S. Heath, Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang.

Bartholomae, D. (1985/2003). In Cheryl Glenn, Melissa A. Goldthwaite and Robert Connors. *The St. Martian's Guide to Teaching Writing* (pp. 403-417). Boston: St. Martians.

---. (1995). Writing with Teachers: A Conversation with Peter Elbow. *College Composition and Communication*, 46.1, 62-71.

Bazerman, C. (2005). An Essay on Pedagogy by Mikhail M. Bakhtin. *Written Communication*, 22.3, 333-38.

Berlin, J. (1982). Contemporary Composition: The Major Pedagogical Theories. *College English*, 44, 765-77.

---. (1988). Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class. *College English*, 50, 477-94.

---. (1987). *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.

---. (1990). Writing Instruction in School and College English, 1890-1985. In J. J. Murphy (Ed.), *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Modern America* (pp. 183-220). Mahwah, NJ: Hermagoras.

---. (1984). *Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges*. Southern Illinois UP.

Berkeley, F. (1910/1995). *A College Course in Writing from Models*. In J. Brereton, *The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College* (pp. 378-86). Pittsburgh UP.

Bialostosky, D. H. (1998). Liberal Education, Writing, and the Dialogic Self. In *On Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric and Writing* (pp. 187-196). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bizzell, P. (1994). *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*. Pittsburg: U of Pittsburg.

---. (1982/1994). Cognition, Convention, and Certainty: What We Need to Know About Writing. In *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*. Pittsburg: U of Pittsburg.

---. (1979). Thomas Kuhn, Scientism, and English Studies. *College English*, 40.7, 764-71.

---. (1984). William Perry and Liberal Education. *College English*, 46.5, 447-454.

Black, C. (1988). The Rhetorical Form of the Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian Sermon: A Response to Lawrence Wills. *Harvard Theological Review*. 81:1. 1-18.

Blackwood, A. W. (1931). The Teaching of Homiletics To-day. *Union Seminary Review*, XLII, 367-81.

Blair, H. (1817). *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*. New York: George Long.

Boyd, R. (1991). Imitate Me; Don't Imitate Me: Mimeticism in David Bartholomae's "Inventing the University." *JAC*, 11.2, 335-45. Retrieved November 16, 2004., from <http://jac.gsu.edu/jac/11.2/Articles/7.htm>.

Brandt, D. (1990). *Literacy as Involvement: The Acts of Writers, Readers, and Texts*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois.

---. (1998). Sponsors of Literacy. *College Composition and Communication*, 49, 165-85.

Brereton, J. Ed. (1995). *The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College. 1875-1925*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P.

Bruns, G. (1992). *Hermeneutics Ancient and Modern*. New Haven: Yale UP.

Bullmore, M. (1995). *St. Paul's Theology of Rhetorical Style : an Examination of I Corinthians 2.1-5 in Light of First Century Greco-Roman Rhetorical Culture*. xxxxxxx: International Scholars Publications.

Broadus, J. A. (1944). *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* (E. C. Dargan, Ed.). NY: A.C. Armstrong and Son. (original work published 1870).

Brooke, R. (1988). Modeling a Writer's Identity: Reading and Imitation in the Writing Classroom. *College Composition and Communication*, 39.1, 23-41.

Brown, F, Driver, S., and Briggs, C. (1979). *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Brown, P. (1967). *Augustine of Hippo*. Los Angeles:U of California.

Bruffee. K. (1993). *Collaborative Learning*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.

---. (1984). Collaborative Learning and the "Conversation of Mankind". *College English*. 46.7, 635-652.

Buber, M. (1970). *I and Thou*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Buttrick, D. (1987). *Homiletic: Movies and Structures*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Campbell, G. (1832/2010). *Lectures on Systematic Theology and Pulpit Eloquence*. Boston: Lincoln and Edmands. Online books.google.com/books. accessed 3/28/2010.

---. (1963). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (L. F. Bitzer, Ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.

Carter, M. (2007). Ways of Knowing, Doing, and Writing in the Disciplines. *College Composition and Communication*, 58.4, 385-418.

- Carter, S. (2007). Living inside the Bible (Belt). *College English*, 69.6, 572-96.
- Camargo, M. (1995). Between Grammar and Rhetoric: Composition Teaching at Oxford and Bologna in the Late Middle Ages. in W.Horner, (Ed.), *Rhetoric and Pedagogy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 83-94.
- Cassidorus. (James O'Donnell trans), *Institutiones Divinarum*.
<http://www9.georgetown.edu/faculty/jod/texts/cass.inst.html> accessed 4/13/09
- Castiglione, B. (2002). *The Book of the Courtier* (D. Javitch, Ed.). New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Cave, T. (2002). *The Cornucopian Text*. New York: Oxford UP.
- Chapell, B. (1994). *Christ-Centered Preaching: Redeeming the Expository Sermon*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Chaplin, M. (1988). Issues, Perspectives and Possibilities. *College Composition and Communication*. 39.1, 52-62.
- Clark, D. (1957). *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Conley, T. (1994). *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*. Chicago: The U of Chicago P.
- Connors, R. (1997). *Composition-Rhetoric*. Pittsburg: U of Pittsburgh P.
- . (2000). The Erasure of the Sentence. *College Composition and Communication*, 52.1, 96-128.
- . (1986). Textbooks and the Evolution of the Discipline. *College Composition and Communication*, 37. 2,178-94.

- . (1986). Personal Writing Assignments. *College Composition and Communication*, 38. 2,166-83.
- Corbett, E. P. J. (1965/1971) *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. New York: Oxford UP.
- . (1971). The Theory and Practice of Imitation in Classical Rhetoric. *College Composition and Communication*, 22.3, 243-50.
- Covino, W. (1988). *Forms of Wondering: Dialogue for Writing on Writing, for Writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Cicero, M. T. (1970). *Cicero on Oratory and Orators* (J.S. Watson, Trans. and Ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.
- Craddock, F. B. (1985). *Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Crenshaw, J. L. (1998). *Education in Ancient Israel: Across the Deadening Silence*. New York: Doubleday.
- Crowley, S. (1998). *Composition in the University*. Pittsburg: U of Pittsburg P.
- . (2006). *Toward a Civil Discourse*. Pittsburg: U of Pittsburg P.
- D'Angelo, Frank J. (1973). Imitation and Style. *College Composition and Communication*, 24.3, 283-90.
- . (1983). Imitation and the Teaching of Style. In P. Stock, Ed. *Forum: Essays on Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing* (pp. 173-188). Portsmouth, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Dabney, R. (1902). *Sacred Rhetoric*. Richmond, VA: General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. (Original work published in 1870).

- Dargan, E. C. and Turnbull, R. G. (1974). *A History of Preaching* (Vols. 1-3). Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Davis, H. G. (1958). *Design for Preaching*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- . (1961). The Teaching of Homiletics. *Encounter*, 22, 197-207.
- Deahl, J. (1900). *Imitation in Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Demond, A. (2002). Beyond Explanation: Pedagogy and Epistemology in Preaching. *Homiletic*, XXVII.1, 1-12.
- DeSilva, D. (2004) *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity.
- Dickinson, B. A. (1988). *Imitation in the Writing Process: Origins, Implications, Applications*. Diss. U of Arizona.
- Ding, H. (2008). The Use of Cognitive and Social Apprenticeship to Teach a Disciplinary Genre: Initiation of Graduate Students Into NIH Grant Writing. *Written Communication*, 25.1, 3-52.
- Donald, M. (2005). Imitation and Mimesis. In Susan Hurly and Nick Chater, Eds. *Perspectives on Imitation: From Neuroscience to Social Science* (pp. 283-300). Cambridge, MA: MIT UP.
- Donahue, P. and Quandahl, E. (1987/1989). Freud and the Teaching of Interpretation in Donahue, P. and. Quandahl, E. Eds. *Reclaiming Pedagogy: The Rhetoric of the Classroom*. (pp.49-58). Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.
- Downs, D. and Wardle, E. (2007). Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re) Envisioning 'First-Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies.' *College Composition and Communication*, 58.4, 552-84.

- Duduit, M. (2010). The 25 Most Influential Preaching Books of the past 25 Years. *Preaching*, 25.5, 18-19.
- Dunnington, J. (1984). We Are Copycats. *The English Journal*, 73.2, 59-60.
- Dupree, J. V. (1983). *A Burkean Analysis of the Messages of Three Television Preachers: Jerry Falwell, Robert Schuller, and Jimmy Swaggert*. The Pennsylvania State University. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.
- Eden, K. (2005). *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the Ancient Legacy and Its Humanist Reception*. New Haven: Yale UP.
- Edwards, Jr., O.C. and Schlafer, D. J. (1995). Learning to Preach- and How Short Conferences Can Help. *Homiletic*, XX.1, 1-5.
- Elbow, P. (1995). Being a Writer vs. Being an Academic. *College Composition and Communication*, 46.1, 62-71.
- . (1993). Ranking, Evaluating, and Linking: Sorting Out Three Forms of Judgment. *College English*, 55.2, 187-206.
- . (1985). The Shifting Relationships between Speech and Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 36.3, 283-303.
- . (1993). The War between Reading and Writing: And How to End It. *Rhetoric Review*, 12.1, 5-24.
- . (1973). *Writing Without Teachers*. New York: Oxford UP.
- Else, G. (1958). "Imitation" in the Fifth Century. *Classical Philology*, 53, 73-90.
- Ewald, H. (1993). Waiting for Answerability: Bakhtin and Composition Studies. *College Composition and Communication*. 44.3, 331-348.

Emporius the Orator. *Concerning Ethopoeia*. (J. Miller, Trans.). (1973). In J. Miller, M. Prosser and T. Benson, Eds. *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*, (pp. 33-36). Indiana UP.

Erasmus, D. (1511/2009). *De Ratione Studii* (On the Right Method of Instruction).
<http://www.holycross.edu/departments/classics/wziobro/ClassicalAmerica/ErasmusdeRationeHP.html> (accessed 5/11/09).

---. (1508/1963). *On Copia of Words and Ideas* (D. King and H. D. Rix, Trans.). Milwaukee, WI: Marquette UP.

Erdmann, E. (1993). Imitation Pedagogy and Ethical Indoctrination. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 23.1, 1-11.

Eschholz, P.A. (1988). The Prose Models Approach: Using Products in the Process. In T.R. Donovan and B.W. McClelland (Eds.), *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition*. (pp. 21-36). Urbana: NCTE.

Faigley, L. (1986). Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal. *College English*, 48, 527-42.

Falk, J. S. (1979). Language Acquisition and the Teaching and Learning of Writing. *College English*, 41, 436-47.

Fant, C. and Pinson, W. (1971). *20 Centuries of Great Preaching: An Encyclopedia of Preaching*. (Vols. 8, 9, & 12). Waco, TX: Word.

Fantham, E. (1978). Imitation and Decline: Rhetorical Theory and Practice in the First Century After Christ. *Classical Philology*, 73.2, 102-16.

---. (1978). Imitation and Evolution: The Discussion of Rhetorical Imitation in Cicero De Oratore 2. 87-97 and Some Related Problems of Ciceronian Theory. *Classical Philology*, 73.1, 1-16.

Farley, W. E. (2005). Can Preaching be Taught? *Theology Today*, 62, 171-80.

Farmer, F. (2005). On Style and Other Unremarkable Things. *Written Communication*, 22.3, 339-47.

Farmer, F. M. and Arrington, P. K. (1993). Apologies and Accommodations: Imitation and the Writing Process. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 23, 12-34.

Farmer, H. H. (1942). *The Servant of the Word*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Fasol, A. (1996). *A Complete Guide to Sermon Delivery*. Nashville: Broadman.

Fenelon, F. (1951). *Dialogues on Eloquence* (W. S. Howell, Trans.). Princeton: Princeton.

Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.

Flannigan, M. C. (1980). Composition Models: Dynamic and Static Imitations. *Theory Into Practice*, 19, 211-19.

Fleming, D. (1998). Rhetoric as a Course of Study. *College English*, 61.2, 169-91.

Ford, T. (2003). Preaching in the Reformed Tradition. In L. Taylor's, *Preachers and People in the Reformation and Early Modern Period* (65-90). Boston: Brill.

Fosdick, H. E. (1956). *The Living of These Days: An Autobiography*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers.

- Foster, C. R., Dahill, L. E., Goleman, L. A. and Tolentino, B. W. (2006). *Education Clergy: Teaching Practices and Pastoral Imagination*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Freidman, B. (1943). Imitation in Learning and Teaching. In H. Rivlin (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Modern Education*. New York: Hubner.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Fulkerson, R. (2005). Summary & Critique: Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century. *College Composition and Communication*, 56.4, 654-87.
- Gammie, A. (1945). *Preachers I have Heard*. London: Pickering and Inglis LTD.
- Gardner, J. (1980). *The Art of Fiction*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Goodwin, D. (1992). Imitatio and Eighteenth-Century Rhetorics of Reaffirmation. *Rhetorica*, 10, 25-50.
- Gorgias. (2001). Ecomium of Helen. In P. Bizzell and B. Herzberg, Eds. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Reading from Classical Times to the Present* (pp. 44-47). Boston and New York: Bedford.
- Gorrell, D. (1982). *Copy/Write*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- . (1987). Freedom to Write through Imitation. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 6, 53-59.
- Golden, J. and Corbett, E.P.J. (1990). *The Rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, and Whately*. Carbondale, Il: Southern Ill UP.
- Greene, T. M. (1917). *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. London: Yale UP.

- Gruber, W. E. (1977). Servile Copying and the Teaching of English Composition. *College English*, 39, 491-97.
- Gunung, J. (1886). *The Practical Elements of Rhetoric*. Boston: Ginn.
- . (1900). *The Working Principles of Rhetoric*. Boston: Ginn.
- Guth, H. P. (1985). How I Write: Five Ways of Looking at the Blackbird. In Tom Waldrep, Ed. *Writers on Writing* (pp. 117-131). New York: Random House.
- Halasek, K. (2005). An Enriching Methodology: 'Dialogic Origin and Dialogic Pedagogy of Grammar' and the Teaching of Writing. *Written Communication*, 22.3, 355-62.
- . (1999). *A Pedagogy of Possibility*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP.
- Halliwell, S. (2002). *The Aesthetics of Mimesis*. Princeton NJ: Princeton UP.
- Halloran, S. M. (1990). From Rhetoric to Composition: The Teaching of Writing in America to 1900. In J. J. Murphy, Ed. *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Modern America* (pp.151-182) Mahwah, NJ: Hermagoras.
- Harris, M. (1980). Modeling: A Process Method of Teaching. *College English*, 40, 780-90.
- Haston, W. (2007). Teacher Modeling as an Effective Teaching Strategy. *Music Educators Journal*, 93.4, 26-30.
- Heath, M. (2002/3). Theon and the history of the Progymnasmata. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 43, 129-60.
- Henderson, J. (1983). Erasmus on the Art of Letter Writing. In J.J. Murphy Ed. *Renaissance Eloquence* (pp. 331-55). Berkeley: U of California.

- Himelick, R. (Ed. and Trans.), (1971). *Erasmus and the Seamless Coat of Jesus*. Lafayette, IN: Purdue UP.
- Horner, W. B. (1990). Writing Instruction in Great Britain: Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. In J. J. Murphy (Ed.), *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Modern America* (pp. 121-50). Mahwah, NJ: Hermagoras.
- . (1995). (Ed.) *Rhetoric and Pedagogy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hooke, R. B. (2002). I Am Here in this Room... *Homiletic*, XXVII.1, 13-21.
- Hooley, Daniel M. (1990). On Relations Between Classical and Contemporary Imitation Theory: Some Hellenistic Suggestions. *Classical and Modern Literature*, 11, 77-92.
- Howe, R. (1963). *The Miracle of Dialogue*. New York: The Seabury Press.
- . (1967). *Partners in Preaching: Clergy and Laity in Dialogue*. New York: The Seabury Press.
- Huie, Jr., W. P. (1986). Teaching in a Strange Land. *Homiletic*, XI.1, 5-8.
- Hurley, S. (2004). Media, Violence, and Freedom of Speech. *Philosophical Studies*. 117. ½. 165-218.
- Hunt, M. (1988). *Imitatio Revisited: A Curriculum Based Upon Mimesis*. *Freshman English News*, 7, 16-19.
- Isocrates. (2000). *Isocrates I: The Oratory of Classical Greece* (Vol. 4) (D. M. Mirhady and Y. L. Too, Eds.). Austin: U of Texas P.
- Javitch, Daniel. (1985). The Imitation of Imitations in Orlando Furioso. *Renaissance Quarterly*, 38.2, 215-39.
- Johanke, C. (2000). *Composing Research: A Contextualist Paradigm for Rhetoric and Composition*. Logan, Utah: Utah State UP.

Jonson, B. (1640/1982). *Timber: or Discoveries*. In G. Parfitt (Ed.), *Ben Jonson: The Complete Poems*. (373-458). New Haven: Yale UP.

Jones, I. T. (1957). *Principles and Practice of Preaching*. New York: Abingdon.

Juzwik, M. M., Curcic, S., Wolbers, K., Moxley, K. D., Dimling, L. M. and Shankland, R. K. (2006). Writing Into the 21st Centurey: An Overview of Research on Writing, 1999 to 2004. *Written Communication*, 23.4, 451-76.

Keck, L. E. (1983). Toward a Theology of Rhetoric/Preaching. In D. S. Browning, Ed. *Practical Theology* (pp. 126-147). Cambridge: Harper and Row.

Kehl, D. G. (1986). Composition in the Mimetic Mode: *Imitatio* and *Exercitatio*. In D. McQuade, Ed. *The Territory of Language: Linguistics, Stylistics, and the Teaching of Composition* (pp. 284-291). Carbondale: Southern IL UP.

Kempis, T. A. (2002). *Imitations of Christ*. A. Corft and H. Bolton, Trans. Retrieved June 5, 2008, from Leadership University www.leaderu.com/cyber/books/imitation/imitation.html. Original work published in 1380.

Kennedy, G. A. (1972). *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

---. (1999). *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P.

---. (1998). *Comparative Rhetoric*. New York: Oxford UP.

---. (1959). The Earliest Rhetorical Handbooks. *The American Journal of Philology*, 80.2, 169-78.

- Kent, T. (Ed.). (1999). *Post-Process Theory: Beyond the Writing Process Paradigm*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.
- Kiniry, M. and Strenski, E. (1985). Sequencing Expository Writing: A Recursive Approach. *College Composition and Communication*, 36, 191-202.
- Knoblauch, C. H. and Brannon, L. (1984). *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing*. Portsmouth, NH Boynton/Cook.
- Kristeller, P. (1983). Rhetorica in Medieval and Renaissance Culture. In J.J. Murphy, Ed. *Renaissance Eloquence* (pp. 1-19). Berkeley: U of California.
- Larsen, D. (1998). *The Company of Preachers: A History of Preaching from the Old Testament to the Modern Era*. Grand Rapids: Kregel.
- Larsen, R. (1978). Back to the Board. *College Composition and Communication*, 29.3, 292-294.
- Leroux, N. (2002). *Luther's Rhetoric: Strategies and Style from the Invocavit Sermons*. Missouri: Concordia Academic Press.
- Lischer, R. (Ed.). (2002). *The Company of Preachers: Wisdom on Preaching, Augustine to the Present*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Litfin, D. and Robinson, H. (Eds.). (1983). *Recent Homiletical Thought*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Litfin, D. (1973). The Five Most-Used Homiletical Texts. *Christianity Today*, August 11, 14.
- . (1994). *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Littleton, K. (2000). Rethinking Collaborative Learning: An Overview. In R. Joiner, Ed. *Rethinking Collaborative Learning*, (pp. 248-257). London: Free Association Books.

Loscalzo, C. A. (1988). Burke, Burke, Still the Lurk. *Homiletic*, XIII.1, 5-8.

Long, T. and Tisdale, L. (Eds.). (2008). *Teaching Preaching as a Christian Practice*. Louisville, KY: Westminster.

Loux, Ann. (1987). Using Imitations in Literature Classes. *College Composition and Communication*, 38.4, 466-72.

Lunsford, A. (1990) *Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspective on Collaborative Writing*. Carbondale: S Illinois UP.

Luther, M. (1574/1878). *The Table Talk of Martin Luther*, Hazlitt, W. (trans.). London: George Bell & Sons.

---. (15174/1979). *Conversations with Luther*, Smith, P. (trans.). Connecticut: Keats Publishing.

---. (1574/1967). *Luther's Works, Volume 54: Table Talk*. Tappert, T. (trans.). Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Lynskey, W. (1957). Imitative Writing and a Student's Style. *College English*, 18.8, 396-400.

MacQueen, H., Waelde, C. and Laurie, G. (2007). *Contemporary Intellectual Property*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Mandel, Barrett J. (1980). The Writer Writing is not at Home. *College Composition and Communication*, 31.4, 370-77.

Marsh, T. (1949). Approach to Preaching Through Classical Rhetoric. *Religion in Life: A Christian Quarterly*, XIX.1, 567-77.

Matott, G. (1976). In Search of a Philosophical Context for Teaching. *College Composition and Communication*, 27.1,25-31.

Maurus, Rabanus. On the Training of the Clergy. (J. Miller, Trans.). (1973). In J. Miller, M. Prosser and T. Benson, Eds. *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*, (pp. 125-27). Indiana UP.

Mayer, L. V. (1991). *Fundamentals of Voice and Diction*. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown.

McCarthy, D. (1972). *Old Testament Covenant*. Atlanta: John Knox.

McCellen, D. (2009). *The Unfinished Sermon*. Paper Presented at Evangelical Homiletic Society, Oct. 2009.

McKenzie, A. M. (2000). Homiletical Grammars: Retrospect and Prospects. *Homiletic*, XXV.1, 1-10.

McKeon, R. (1936). Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity. *Modern Philology*, 34, 1-35.

---. (1942). Rhetoric in the Middle Ages. *Speculum*, 17.1, 1-32.

McLeod, S. H. and Soven, M. (Eds.). (1992). *Writing Across the Curriculum: A Guide to Developing Programs*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mesnard, P. (1966). The Pedagogy of Johann Sturm. *Studied in the Renaissance*, Vol.13, 200-19.

Mehrabian, A. (1968). Communication Without Words. *Psychology Today*, Sept. 1968,53.

Meuser, F. (1983). *Luther, The Preacher*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.

Meuser, F. and Schneider, S. (eds.) (1969). *Interpreting Luther's Legacy*. Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House.

Meyer, C. (1998). Teacher to Teacher: What is the Most Effective Writing Assignment You've Ever Given? *The English Journal*, 88.2, 32.

Michael, I. (1987). *The Teaching of English from the Sixteenth Century to 1870*. London: Cambridge UP.

Michaelis, W. (1973). Mimeomai. In Gerhard Kittle, Ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, pp. 659-74.

Milic, L. (1967). Theories of Style and Their Implications for the Teaching of Composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 16, 66-9. In G. Tate and E. P. J. Corbett, Eds. *Teaching Freshman Composition* (pp. 255-260) New York: Oxford UP.

Miller, J., and Prosser, M. and Benson, R. (1973). *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP.

Minock, M. (1995). Toward a Postmodern Pedagogy of Imitation. *JAC*, 15.3, 489-510. Retrieved November 17, 2004, from <http://jac.gsu.edu/jac/15.3/Articles/6.htm>.

Moffett, J. (1970). Learning To Write by Writing. In G. Tate and E. P.J. Corbett (Eds.), *Teaching High School Composition* (pp. 43-60). New York: Oxford UP.

Moore, D. J. (1974). *Martin Buber: Prophet of Religious Secularism*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.

Morgan, G. C. (1955). *Preaching*. London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, LTD.

Morgan, J. (1951). *A Man of the Word: Life of G. Campbell Morgan*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

Muckelbauer, J. (2003). Imitation and Invention in Antiquity: An Historical-Theoretical Revision. *Rhetorica* 21.2, 61-88.

Murphy, J. J. (1960). Saint Augustine and the Debate about a Christian Rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 46, 400-10.

---. (1974). *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Augustine to the Renaissance*. Berkeley: U of California P.

---. (1983). One Thousand Neglected Authors: The Scope and Importance of Renaissance Rhetoric. In J.J. Murphy Ed. *Renaissance Eloquence* (pp. 20-36). Berkeley: U of California.

---. (1999). Roman Writing Instruction as Described by Quintilian. In J. J. Murphy (Ed.), *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Modern America* (pp. 19-76). Mahwah, NJ: Hermagoras.

---. (Ed.). (2001). *Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts*. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies. (original work published 1974).

Murphy, J. J., Katula, R. A., Hill, F. I., and Ochs, D. J. (2003). *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Myers, M. (1983). Approaches to the Teaching of Composition. In M. Myers and J. Gray, (Eds.), *Theory and Practice in Teaching Composition*. (pp. 3-43). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Nichols, J. R. (1976). The Pedagogy of Preaching. *Homiletic*, 1, XI-XV.

Neusner, J. (1985). Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis. In *Parashiyyot 68 Through 100 on Genesis 28:10 to 50:26* (Vol. 3). Brown Judaic Studies, no. 106. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

North, S. (1987). *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton.

Nystrand, M., Greene, S. and Wiemelt, J. (1993). Where Did Composition Studies Come From? An Intellectual History. *Written Communication*, 10, 267-333.

Old, H. O. (2007). *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church: Vol. 6 The Modern Age*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Olson, C. B. and Land, R. (2008). Taking a Reading/Writing Intervention for Secondary English Language Learners on the Road: Lessons Learned from the Pathway Project. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 42.3,259-69.

O'Malley, J. (1985). Erasmus and the History of Sacred Rhetoric: The Ecclesiastes of 1535. *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*. 5.1, 1-29.

Ong, W. (1982). *Orality and Literacy*. New York: Routledge.

---. (1979). *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue*. New York: Octagon Books.

---. (1971). *Rhetoric, Romance and Technology*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP.

Ostrom, H. (1998). "Carom Shots" Reconceptualizing Imitation and Its Uses in Creative Writing Courses. In D. Starkey (Ed.), *Teaching Writing Creatively* (pp. 164-171). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Papillion, T. (1995). Isocrates' techne and Rhetorical Pedagogy. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 25, 149-63.

Parker R. (1845/1858). *Aids To English Composition*. New York: Harper Bro.
http://openlibrary.org/authors/OL159878A/Richard_Green_Parker. accessed 5/12/10.

---. (1837). *Progressive Exercises in English Composition*. Boston: Gould.
http://openlibrary.org/authors/OL159878A/Richard_Green_Parker. accessed 5/12/10.

Patton, J. (1977). "Wisdom and Eloquence: The Alliance of Exegesis and Rhetoric in Augustine. *Communications Studies*, 28:2, 96-105.

Parker, T. H. L. (1992). *Calvin's Preaching*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press.

Perelman, C. and Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969/2000). *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame.

Perry, L. M. (1961). Trends and Emphases in the Philosophy, Materials, and Methodology of American Protestant Homiletical Education as Established by a Study of Selected Trade and Textbooks Published between 1834 and 1954. Unpublished dissertation, Northwestern University at Evanston.

Peterson, J. (1991). Valuing Teaching: Assumptions, Problems, and Possibilities. *College Composition and Communication*, 42.1, 25-35.

Pigman, III, G.W. (1980). Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance. *Renaissance Quarterly*, 33.1, 1-32.

Porter, K. (2006). *Meaning, Language, and Time: Toward a Consequentialist Philosophy of Discourse*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

---. (2001). A Pedagogy of Charity: Donald Davidson and the Student-Negotiated Composition Classroom. *College Composition and Communication*. 52.4, 574-611.

Plato. *Cratylus* (B. Jowett. Trans.). *The Internet Classic Archive*. Retrieved November 21, 2006 from <http://etextlibrary.adelaide.edu.au/mirror/classics.mit.edu/Plato/cratylus.html>>.

---. *Gorgias* (D. J. Zeyl, Trans.). (1999). In J. Nienkamp, Ed. *Plato on Rhetoric and Language: Four Key Dialogues (Ion, Protagoras, Gorgias, Phaedrus)* (pp. 85-164). Mahwah, NJ: Hermagoras.

---. *Republic* (C.D.C. Reeve, Trans.). (2004). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

---. *Phaedrus* (A. Nehamas and P. Wooduff, Trans.). (2002). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

---. *Protagoras* (S. Lombardo and K. Bell, Trans.). (1999). In J.Nienkamp, Ed. *Plato on Rhetoric and Language: Four Key Dialogues (Ion, Protagoras, Gorgias, Phaedrus)* (pp. 39-85). Mahwah, NJ: Hermagoras.

Potolsky, M. (2006). *Mimesis*. New York: Routledge.

Pseudo-Cicero. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (H. Caplan, Trans.). (1981). Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.

Quackenbos, G. (1873). *First Lessons in Composition*. New York: Appleton. Google Books, <http://books.google.com/books>. accessed 5/21/10.

Quintilian. *Quintilian on the Teaching of Speaking and Writing: Translations from Books One, Two and Ten of the Institutio Oratoria* (J. J. Murphy, Ed.). (1987). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP.

Rebhorn, W. (1995). *The Emperor of Men's Minds*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP.

---. (Ed. and Trans.) (2000). *Renaissance Debates on Rhetoric*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP.

- Reid, R. S. (2004). Being Baptist. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 7.4, 587-602.
- Rendtorff, R. (1998). *The Covenant Formula*. Edinburg: T& T Clark.
- Roberts, M. C. (1980). On Being Imitated: Effects of Levels of Imitation and Imitator Competence. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 43.2, 233-40.
- Robbins, H. and R. Parker. (1935). *Advanced Exposition*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Robinson, H. W. (2001). *Biblical Preaching: The Development and Delivery of Expository Messages*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Rodd, T. (1983). Before the Flood: Composition Teaching in America 1637-1900. *The English Journal*, 72.2, 62-69.
- Roemer, K. M. (1984). Inventive Modeling: Rainy Mountain's Way to Composition. *College English*, 46, 767-82.
- Rummel, E. (Ed.). (1990). *The Erasmus Reader*. Toronto: U of Toronto P.
- Ruskiewicz, J. J. (1979). Back to the Source: Personal Research in Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 30, 222-23.
- . (1979). Parody and Pedagogy: Explorations in Imitative Literature. *College English*, 40, 693-701.
- Ryan, H. R. (1989). *Harry Emerson Fosdick: Persuasive Preacher*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, Inc.
- Schiappa, E. (1999). *The Beginnings of Rhetorical Theory in Classical Greece*. New Haven: Yale UP.
- Schultz, L. (1999). *The Young Composers: Composition's Beginnings in Nineteenth Century Schools*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP.

- Schwartz, E. (1968). Mimesis and the Theory of Signs. *College English*, 29.5, 343-54.
- Scott, F. and Denney, J. (1909). *Paragraph-Writing: A Rhetoric for Colleges*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Scott, I. (1910). *The Imitation of Cicero*. New York: Columbia UP.
- Selzer, J. (1984). Exploring Options in Composing. *College Composition and Communication*, 35, 276-84.
- Seneca, L. (64/1970). *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales, Vol. II*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
- Shafer, G. (2000). Teaching Writing in the Twenty-First Century. *The English Journal*, 90.1, 29-33.
- Shen, F. (1989). The Classroom and the Wider Culture: Identity as a Key to Learning English Composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 40.4, 459-66.
- Sheridan, T. (1762/1968). *A Course of Lectures on Elocution*. Bronx, NY: Benjamin Blom.
- . (1759/1969). *A Discourse on Elocution and the English Language*. Los Angeles: Augustan Reprint Society, UCLA.
- Shor, I. (1980). *Critical Teaching and Everyday Life*. Boston: South End.
- Shuger, D. (1988). *Sacred Rhetoric*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.
- Simpson, D. (1968). *Cassell's Latin Dictionary*. New York: Wiley.
- Sleeth, R. E. (1953). Teaching Preachers. *The Pulpit: A Journal of Contemporary Preaching*, 24.10, 20-21.
- Smith, G. (1994). *The Prophets as Preachers*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman.

- Spencer, J. (1982). Learning to Write through Imitation. *English Quarterly*, 15, 42-45.
- Spitz, L. (1975). The Course of German Humanism. In Oberman, H. and Brady, T. eds. *Itinerarium Italicum*. (pp. 371-436). Leiden, Netherlands: Leiden E. J. Brill.
- Starkey, P. (1974). Imitatio Redux. *College Composition and Communication*, 2, 435-37.
- Struever, N. (1970). *The Language of History in the Renaissance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.
- Sullivan, D. L. (1989). Attitudes toward Imitation: Classical Culture and the Modern Temper. *Rhetoric Review*, 8.1, 5-21.
- Swift, F. H. (1919). *Education in Ancient Israel*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company.
- Taylor, L. (2003). *Preachers and People in the Reformations and Early Modern Period*. Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, Inc.
- Tensley, B. (1989). Johann's Sturm's Method for Humanistic Pedagogy. *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 20.1, 23-40.
- Tertullian. *De Idololatria* (J.H. Waszink and J.C.M. Van Winden, Trans.). (1987), New York: Brill.
- . *De praescriptione haereticorum*. H.T. Bindley, trans. (1914). *On the Prescription of Heretics*. London: SPCK. Online book, www.tertullian.org/articles/bindley_test/bindley_test_07prae.htm. accessed 5/18/10.

Thucydides. (1980). *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP. Loeb Classical Libraray.

Tomasello, M. (1999). *The Cultural Origins of Human Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.

Too, Y. L. (Ed.). (2001). *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Boston: Brill.

Toohey, W. and Thompson, W.D. (1967). *Recent Homiletical Thought*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Tourney, L. (1975, March 13-15). *Imitation: Creative Possibilities of an Unfashionable Doctrine*. Address. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, St. Louis, MO.

Vines, J. and Shaddix, J. (1999). *Power in the Pulpit: How to Prepare and Deliver Expository Sermons*. Chicago: Moody.

Wagner, D. M. (1957). *The Expository Method of G. Campbell Morgan*. Westwood, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Company.

Walborn, E. D. (1987, March 19-21). *Imitatio Revisited: Its Theoretical and Practical Implications into the Twenty-First Century*. Address. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Atlanta, GA.

Walton, K.L. (1990). *Mimesis as Make-Believe: On the Foundations of the Representational Arts*. Cambridge, MA:Harvard UP.

Walzer, A. (2000). On Reading George Campbell:” Resemblance” and “Vivacity” in the “Philosophy of Rhetoric”. *Rhetorica*. 18.3, 321-42.

Wardlaw, D. M. (Ed.). (1989). *Learning Preaching*. Lincoln, IL: The Academy of Homiletics.

Warren, T. (2006). Presence in Persuasion. Paper presented at the Evangelical Homiletics Society, Oct. 2006.

Weathers, W. (1969). *Copy and Compose: A Guide to Prose Style*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

---. (1970). Teaching Style: A Possible Anatomy. *College Composition and Communication*, 21.2, 144-49.

Weathers, W. and Winchester, O. (1967). *The Strategy of Style*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Webb, R. (2001). The Progymnasmata as Practice, In Y.L. Too's (Ed.) *Education in Roman and Greek Antiquity*, (p. 289-316). Boston: Brill.

Weinsheimer, J. (1984). *Imitation*. London: Rutledge and Kegan.

Wess, R. C. (1981). Imitation Theory and Teacher Writing: An Annotated Bibliography. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 11:243-52.

Wiersbe, W. (1994). *Preaching and Teaching with Imagination*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

---. (1993). *Living with the Giants: The Lives of Great Men of the Faith*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Wilson, T. (1560/1982). Derrick, T. (Ed.) *The Arte of Rhetorique*. New York: Garland. In P. Bizzell and B. Herzberg (1990) *The Rhetorical Tradition*. Boston: Bedford. pp. 587-621.

- Wills, L. (1984). The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity. *Harvard Theological Review*. 77.3, 277-99.
- Winter, L. (1911). *A Life of Martin Luther: The Great Reformer of the Sixteenth Century*. Nashville: Smith & Lamar.
- Woods, M. (1990). The Teaching of Writing in Medieval Europe. In J. J. Murphy (Ed.), *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Modern America* (pp. 77-94). Mahwah, NJ: Hermagoras.
- . (1991). A Medieval Rhetoric Goes to School: And to University: The Commentaries on the "Poetria Nova". *Rhetorica*, 9.1, 55-65.
- . (1993). Some Techniques of Teaching Rhetorical Poetics in the Schools of Medieval Europe. In Theresa Enos (Ed.), *Learning from Histories of Rhetoric* (pp. 91-111). Carbondale, Ill: Southern Ill .U.
- Wood, N. (2004). *Perspectives on Argument*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Winterowd, W. (1970). Style: A Matter of Manner. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 56, 161-67.
- Würthwein, E. (1979). *The Text of the Old Testament* (E. F. Rhodes, Trans.). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Young, F. and Young, K. (1914). *Freshman English*. New York: Holt.
- X, Malcolm. (1965). *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*. New York: Grove Press.
- Zoellner, R. (1969). Talk-Write: A Behavioral Pedagogy for Composition. *College English*, 30.4, 267-320.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Calvin F. Pearson has served as a pastor and an associate professor of preaching for more than 30 years. He is currently pastoring at Crossroads Baptist Church in The Woodlands, TX. He taught preaching at Dallas Seminary and Southwestern Seminary in Fort Worth. He has the following degrees: B.A. Houston Baptist University, Th.M. Dallas Seminary, M.Div. Southwestern Seminary, D. Min. Gordon/Conwell Seminary. He has published several articles on preaching and hopes to write a book on what Homiletics can learn from Rhetoric.