

Investigating the Instruction and Reading Samples for Opinion Writing in L1 Persian Textbooks

Rafiee Marzieh, PhD

English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University,

Najafabad, Isfahan, Iran

Abstract: The present study examined the writing instruction textbooks commonly used at different levels of education in Iran. The study actually sought to address the following questions: (1) what kinds of writing instructions are provided in Persian L1 writing textbooks?, and (2) how are reading materials, which are indicative of writing instructions, rhetorically organized? For this purpose, the framework suggested by Kubota and Shi (2005) has been worked out in order to find the types of instructions provided in the textbooks. A number of 20 opinion sample texts in the textbooks were analyzed in order to identify their rhetorical organizations. Regarding the first research question, the findings revealed that though the analyzed textbooks promote linearity, logic, good organization, clarity and awareness of audience, all being features of Persian rhetoric, they do not focus on deductive patterns of writing in which main ideas are, as a rule, stated in the introductory paragraph. As for the second research question, the findings illustrated three patterns of rhetorical organization in the sample texts. Among these patterns, although the most pervasive one is main-idea-initial pattern, which is akin to prototypical English and Persian rhetoric, lack of preview statement in the sample texts implies that there is still a culturally situated interpretation about deduction in Persian textbooks.

Keywords: Writing Instruction; Rhetorical Analysis; Opinion Writing; Critical Contrastive Rhetoric

1. Introduction

In evaluating rhetorical information presented in a written text, Farrell (1996) clearly mentioned this point that the organization of the argument and its relevance to the topic is the factor which influences the reader, and this is definitely what one would expect to find in a well-constructed discourse. In the case of English and Persian, for instance, an English native speaker expects a linearity in the texts, as Kaplan (1966) found, typically following a deductive organization which begins with a topic statement followed by specific evidence used to support the argument while Persian, like other oriental languages, follows an indirect development of organizational patterns, or as Kaplan (1966, p. 10) describes it "turning and turning in a widening gyre". This is to say that in the evaluation of a piece

of written work by a person with a different language background, one may conversely be affected by the mismatch between the preferred rhetorical structures of the writer and reader. By the same token, if non-native English speakers master the syntax and vocabulary of English, their chance to communicate their message effectively is still low. This situation seems to be unfair to that person because, as Farrell (1996, p. 504) argues, "while the accuracy of grammar and word use can be objectively determined, rhetorical structure may merely be a matter of preference".

Contrastive examination of the rhetorical styles and cultural thought patterns used in different languages has been the focus of attention over the last decades in ESL research on composition. For example, it has been

found that Japanese and Chinese students tend to be more indirect than Americans in their writing (Matalene, 1985; Wu & Rubin, 2000). The claim of L1 to L2 transfer has been made by Kaplan (1966) when he stated that rhetorical structures of students' L1 intervene when they write in L2. Since that time, many studies have supported the concept of "contrastive rhetorics" by merely comparing the rhetorical structure of L2 texts with the rhetorical structures produced by the same individuals when writing in their L1 (e.g. Hirose, 2003; Kubota, 1998; Uysal, 2008), or with the rhetorical structure produced in the same language by native speakers (e.g. Hyland & Milton, 1997; Kobayashi, 1984; Reid, 1992).

Considering the issue from a critical perspective, critical contrastive rhetorics calls into question the prescriptive nature of contrastive rhetorics by claiming that reflection of native speakers' expectations of a piece of reading and writing blurred the meaning of "plurality, complexity, and hybridity of rhetorical patterns" (Kubota & Lehner, 2004, p. 10). This fact generates concern about the way in which rhetorical organization and writing is instructed, and more specifically, it is concerned with what types of rhetorical strategies are promoted in textbooks. Critical contrastive rhetorics, which critiques this assumption that English rhetorical conventions are ideal and preferred to other rhetorical organizations (Kubota & Lehner, 2004), on the one hand, raises the question of how these conventions should be instructed in textbooks in order to reduce rhetorical convergence of other languages into English and on the other hand, try to promote L2 writers' agency.

One contribution to this debate would be an analysis of the textbooks in order to investigate what types of instruction are provided for the students and what types of writing they are expected to produce. The purpose of the present study was three fold: First, it analyzed L1 Persian textbooks

commonly applied in Iran educational context from lower and upper level secondary education to higher education. The second objective was to examine the types of instructions offered to the participants' writing essays, and third, it analyzed model essays and reading materials which illustrate writing instruction, particularly those modeling opinions or arguments regarding their rhetorical organizations. For the first research question, instruction provided for all text types, rather than opinion essays, was examined because the textbooks integrated all text types throughout each volume. For the second question, however, only opinion essays were put to analysis because, as stated by Crowhurst (1990), such writing seems to be more challenging for students than narrative writing, and consequently need explicit teaching.

2. Review of literature

Concerning a number of studies conducted on contrastive rhetorics between Persian and English, it has been found that a prototypical Persian rhetorical structure is characterized by linear, logical and deductive organizational pattern (see for example Rashidi & Dastkheyr, 2009). Similar to English, Persian rhetorical pattern is perceived to be characterized as being linearly organized around a central thesis (Kaplan, 1966). Although this view has been pervasive in Persian/English contrastive rhetorics field, in analyzing L1 Persian and L2 English texts, some studies found other types of patterns as well.

In a study to investigate the English and Persian rhetorical organization patterns in argumentative writing, Rashidi and Dastkheyr (2009) compared English and Persian organizational patterns in argumentative texts written by Iranian students. Applying a within-subject group comparison, sampling thirty L1 and L2 compositions, the results revealed that the majority of students used deductive pattern of organization in their writing, both in their L1 and L2, though there were a small number

of students who chose inductive pattern in Persian. In a similar vein, Khatib and Moradian (2011) examined popular English and Persian newspaper editorials to check their paragraph structures of deductive, inductive and quasi-inductive. The results indicated that the two languages are similar in the use of deductive writing style.

In order to analyze whether Iranian EFL learners use similar or different rhetorical organization in their writing, Khiabani and Pourghassemi (2009) analyzed the L1 and L2 compositions written by 120 Iranian EFL students. After the evaluation of essays, the researchers found out that both groups of students apply the same rhetorical organization, i.e. inductive pattern. In this regard, Khodabandeh, Jafarigohar, Soleimani and Hemmati (2013), by analyzing the overall rhetorical structure of students' English and Persian argumentative essays, noted that majority of students in their study employed off-type organization pattern in both English and Persian pre-argumentative essays, while after the instruction the participants switched their writing patterns to deductive one.

Among these findings, though, some researchers reported that Iranian EFL learners apply patterns other than deductive organization, or they even reported non-specific-pattern phenomenon in their studies. The possible impact of rhetorical structure of English and Persian on English reading comprehension was examined by Vahidi (2004). Focusing on Kaplan's (1966) model of linearity and circularity of the English and Asian languages, Vahidi reported that in Persian writing samples, main ideas were not as tightly organized and directly stated as in English writing. The researcher concluded that the participants did not follow any particular rhetorical organization patterns.

All in all, the contrastive rhetorical studies between English and Persian has constructed an image of Persian rhetoric as being deductive, linear and direct, quite similar to English rhetoric. However, according to

Kubota and Shi (2005) this prescriptive view of the rhetorical pattern of languages can be challenged. The questions that are popped up in our minds are generally that: How is writing taught? And what types of rhetorical strategies are promoted in Persian L1 textbooks instructed to Persian students at universities? The answer to these questions would shed some unique lights on the structures to which Persian students are exposed; in other words, the answers help us to see if students are exposed to Persian prototypical rhetorical patterns or some other rhetorical conventions. To this end, this study addressed the following questions:

- (1) What kinds of reading instructions are provided in Persian L1 writing textbooks?
- (2) How are reading materials, which illustrate writing instructions, rhetorically organized?

3. Method

3.1. Textbooks

Iran's educational system (elementary, secondary and tertiary) offers some free and compulsory courses of writing instruction at almost all levels of education, from K-12 through higher education in universities. Although the instruction is uniform in K-12, in higher education, universities are free to choose from the textbooks which are appropriate for the course and curriculum. In elementary education, students are mostly instructed on dictation, with some elementary instructions on punctuations. Because the focus of this study is on the organization of paragraphs, we skip these textbooks. The textbooks applied for the purpose of this study had been chosen from the lower and upper secondary level through the higher education levels. In junior high schools, there are a number of uniform courses offering Persian writing instructions in the form of workshops. The textbook which is applied at lower level secondary education is divided into nine units, starting with introductory unit on word

formation, sentence organization, essay writing and different types of writing organizations, types of writing patterns and four units on polishing and information on figures of speech. Each unit contains miscellaneous exercises based on the structure of that unit. A sample of short paragraph is also provided in each unit after the instruction. The three volumes of the high school textbook series are designed to instruct different types of paragraph instructions. The textbooks are organized into various units, while each unit instructs one paragraph structure. In the first book, writing reports, argumentative paragraphs and comparison and contrast paragraphs are instructed, beside a unit which instructs how to make a plan for the essays. While writing descriptive paragraphs, diary writing and letter writing are instructed in the second textbook, the focus of the third book in this series is mostly on writing reports, which was not considered in this analysis. A sample of paragraph, written by students, is included in each unit which provides a typical sample of that organization. All the books in this series contain writing exercises which roughly ask students to write a paragraph on the structure they have just been taught.

We browsed the net, surveyed teachers, government sources, friends and family members to identify the most popular and usable textbooks in higher education. Based on the inquiry and investigations, the latest editions of the textbooks applied in universities among all the fields of studies have been selected to be analyzed in this study. Due to the non-uniform nature of instruction in universities, we selected the textbooks which are quite commonly used among universities in all fields of studies. Although all of the textbooks have different plans, they mostly contain types of writing in brief, accompanied by a sample of all types of rhetorical patterns.

3.2. Identification of writing instruction

Table 1. Text types and number of reading lessons in textbooks

The framework suggested by Kubota and Shi (2005) has been worked out in order to find the types of instructions provided in the textbooks. The twelve ideal qualities or key descriptors of good writing identified by Kubota and Shi (2005) are as follows: (1) awareness of audience, (2) good organization and paragraphing, (3) clarity or ease of understanding, (4) effective supporting details and counter opinions, (5) awareness of purpose, (6) accurate information, (7) separating of facts from opinion, (8) placement of main point at the beginning, (9) creativity, (10) integration of emotion/views with the outside world, (11) genuine emotions, (12) integration of emotion and view. Among these twelve features, the first nine have been known to be the features of English writing instruction in North America and the other three were regarded as writing generally instructed in Asian languages textbooks such as Chinese (Kubota and Shi, 2005).

3.3. Identification of opinion writing

The other focus of this study is to analyze the rhetorical structures of opinion essays in the textbooks in order to make it clear whether students are exposed to the Persian prototypical rhetorical patterns or not. The organization of high school education textbooks was straightforward, i.e. each volume of this series was explicitly organized under specific text types. As Table 1 shows, each of the three volumes of these textbooks contains a good portion of descriptive (12 texts), diary/biography (7 texts) and analytical writing (6 texts). In addition, books 1 and 2 have a focus on narrative texts and letter writing and book 3 has the focus on opinion writing.

Regarding the textbooks in higher education, as mentioned before, there was no unity in the type of texts presented in the textbooks. As table 1 shows, the textbooks in this level have a collection of all text types.

Text types	B. 1	B. 2	B.3	B. 4	B. 5	B. 6	B. 7	B. 8	B. 9	B. 10	Total
Narrative	2	2		4	9	1	2		5	7	31 (20%)
Analytical			6	1	2	1					10 (6%)
Opinion			4	8				1	4	3	20 (12%)
Old prose	5				20		2				22 (14%)
Descriptive	1	8	3	3	5	6	3	3	2	4	36 (23%)
Student sample	1	1									2 (1%)
Letter writing		6		1		4				2	13 (8%)
Diary/Biography		7				1		2	3		13 (8)

4. Findings

4.1. Writing instruction

Table 2 shows the number of sections or units which mention the descriptors of good writing. The analysis reveals that the textbooks mentioned all of the descriptors and good qualities for good writing, though some of them are emphasized less than three times, such as "awareness of purpose" (2 times), "creativity" (2 times) and genuine emotion (1 time). As Table 2 illustrates, among the writing instructions and exercises analyzed, a high number of them promoted "good organization and paragraphing" (16 times),

"awareness of audience" (9 times), "clarity or ease of understanding" (13 times) and "effective supporting details and counter argument" (7 times). This finding is in line with previous studies (for example see Shomossi, Ketabi & Eslami, 2012) which showed that Persian rhetoric, like such languages as Japanese and Spanish, has a reader-responsible nature. It is found that the existence of topic sentence in a paragraph and opinion statement in the whole text is the characteristic of a Persian student writing whose concern is readers (Shomossi, Ketabi & Eslami, 2012).

Table 2: Number of sections/units which mention ideal qualities of good writing

Ideal qualities	Number of instruction/practice sections in the textbooks		Total
	Other texts	Opinion texts	
Awareness of audience		9	9
Good organization and paragraphing	4	12	16
Clarity	3	10	13
Effective supporting details and counter-opinions		7	7
Awareness of purpose	2		2
Accurate information	3	5	8
Separation of facts from opinions		6	6
Main point placed at the beginning		4	4
Creativity	2		2
Integration of emotion/views with the outside world	3		3
Genuine emotion	1		1
Integration of emotion and view	5		5

Contrary to the stereotypical characteristics of Persian rhetoric which emphasizes main point at the beginning, the finding reveals that this ideal characteristics of good writing was mentioned in low frequency (4 times) over the whole textbooks. The reason why Persian learners of English were seen to have no specific patterns in their writing (Vahidi, 2004) can be the fact that this point is not highlighted in textbooks. The characteristics of writer's subjective feelings such as "creativity" (2 times), "integration of emotion/views with the outside world" (3 times), "genuine emotion" (1 time) and integration of emotion and view (5 times) are emphasized in text types other than opinion writings, such as narrative writing (Kubota & Shi, 2005).

In order to identify whether these ideal qualities of good writing and writing instruction are represented in the reading materials, we analyzed the rhetorical patterns of model essays and samples in the textbooks. The following part summarizes the results.

4.2. Rhetorical organization of opinion writing

In order to answer the second research question, we carefully analyzed the 20 opinion sample texts in the textbooks. The initial observation shows that all the texts organized to have three parts; introduction paragraph(s) which introduces the essays' topics, body paragraphs that presents supporting details and evidences, and conclusion paragraph which generally concludes the essays by reinforcing the opinion or argument (Kubota & Shi, 2005). Table 3 summarizes the structure of all readings in the textbooks (see Appendix 1 that presents the findings in Persian). The location of main point, initial, middle or final (Kubota, 1998) and the opinion statement are also bolded in the table. Shi and Kubota (2007, p. 185) define "main idea/point" and "opinion" as "the most important message in the text" and "the author's point of view, belief, or bias" respectively.

Insert table 3 here

The location of main point and opinion in the texts analyzed reveal 3 patterns with some sub-patterns: the first pattern has main idea in the introduction; the sub-pattern contains either main idea in the introduction with opinion statement in the concluding paragraph (n=7), main point in the introduction with no statement of opinion (n=1) or main point in the introduction and opinion in the body paragraphs (n=1); the second pattern contains those texts in which main point is not mentioned in the introduction; the sub-patterns are texts with main point in the body paragraphs and opinion in the concluding paragraph (n=2); main point in the body paragraphs with no statement of opinion (n=3); texts in the third pattern are categorized to either have opinion statement in the introduction and main idea in the body paragraphs (n=4); or have just opinion in the body paragraphs (n=2).

The first pattern which is the most frequent pattern among others (45% of all texts) has the topic or main point in the introduction and an opinion statement in the concluding paragraph. These types of texts (like 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 15, and 16), as mentioned by Kubota & Shi (2005) are largely informational, i.e. they are concerned to provide information to the readers with the opinion at the end as a closing. There are some texts, quite similar to this pattern with slight differences in the location of statement of opinion, in which main ideas are stated in the introductory paragraph but either there is no mention of the opinion statement (like text 4) or if it ever exists, it is located in the body paragraphs (like text 18).

Unlike the first pattern, the second pattern contains those texts whose main ideas are not mentioned in the introduction paragraph. According to Hinds (1990), these kinds of texts are categorized as "quasi-inductive", "inductive" or "delayed introduction of purpose" texts whose main ideas do not appear until the end. Among the texts analyzed, texts 9 and 20 have the main point in the middle and the opinion in the concluding paragraph and texts 11, 12 and 13 which have only one main idea located in the

body paragraph, with no opinion statement in the texts.

The next pattern contains texts which have an opinion statement in the beginning and in the introduction paragraph. The examples of this pattern are texts such as 5, 8, 14 and 17 with the opinion statement in the beginning and a delayed introduction of main idea in the body paragraph, and texts 10 and 19 with the statement of opinion in the introduction while there is no statement of main point in the whole text. According to Kubota and Shi (2005), texts with the opinion statements in the opening paragraph are likely to have a restatement of opinion in the concluding paragraph as well. Regarding the texts in this pattern, characterized as no opinion statement in the concluding paragraph, we can conclude that these texts neither do have the features of Persian nor do English rhetorical organization. It is worth noting that this pattern takes up a considerable portion of whole texts (30%).

The above analyses illustrate that the texts selected from the textbooks have all a clear organization of introduction, body and conclusion. The texts reveal there are three patterns by which these texts are organized. The next part discusses these patterns in more details.

5. Discussion and conclusion

The findings in the study revealed that the textbooks examined provide good writing features such as clarity, logic, good organization and paragraphing, awareness of audience, and writer responsibility- features assumed to be pervasive in Persian and English rhetoric (Kubota, 1998; Shomoussi & Ketabi, 2012). Contrary to Persian rhetorical organization regarding the location of main idea, the analyses indicate that the textbooks do not emphasize on this feature of Persian rhetoric. This finding is in line with previous claims about the Persian students' organization in their writing in which no specific pattern (deductive, inductive, quasi-inductive) was identified (Vahidi, 2004). As alluded to earlier studies done by Khiabani and Pourghassemian, (2009) and Khodabandeh et. al. (2013), there was signs of rhetorical organization

other than deductive, such as inductive and off-type pattern. The reason why students do not follow Persian rhetoric in their writing can be the fact that, among other things, they are not adequately instructed in this regard.

The second research question addressed the rhetorical organization of reading materials in the textbooks. A close examination of reading texts revealed that most of the texts demonstrated to have three-part organization of introduction, body and conclusion, , respectively, which "introduces the topic", "presents supporting details and evidence" and "typically reinforces the opinion or argument" (Kubota & Shi, 2005, p. 109). The sample texts analyzed reflected three patterns and some sub-patterns; the most pervasive one was main-idea-first pattern. This finding supports previous observations (Rashidi & Dastkheyr, 2009) that Persian students follow a deductive pattern in their writing, i.e. placing the main point in the beginning paragraph and opinion in the conclusion. The miscellany in this pattern, main point in the introduction and opinion in some cases in the body paragraph and main-point-initial- can only be interpreted as poor structures of these samples resulting from lack of experience or instruction in Persian writing. The question raised here is the reason for the discrepancy between the type of instruction in textbooks and the rhetorical organization of sample essays. As mentioned before, the textbooks analyzed, quite surprisingly, do not have emphasis on the deductive pattern in their instruction while the sample essays analyzed based on their rhetorical organization illustrate that a considerable portion of them follow deductive pattern. The second pattern can be classified as "quasi-inductive" or "inductive" pattern which have "delayed introduction of purpose", according to Hinds (1990). As previously discussed, Persian composition in L1 and L2 provided examples of "inductive" pattern (Khiabani and Pourghassemian, 2009) and off-types patterns (Khodabandeh et. al., 2013). The findings of this study can be interpreted clearly by the findings of previous observations of

Persian students' writing. The next pattern, taking a significant portion of samples analyzed, has a tendency to be called opinion-initial pattern, quite contrary to what Persian and English are organized.

It is important to point out, however, that though Persian reading samples showed to have a tendency towards deductive patterns, as was suggested by previous studies, they merely contained either main topic or an opinion in different location in the texts without providing any preview statement. The existence of preview statement in the introduction paragraph, as argued by Kubota (1990) and Kubota and Shi (2005), are considered to be a typical style in English writing. The sample essays showed that Persian writers, based on various cultural interpretation of logic in their writing, tend to follow the Persian deductive pattern not the English one. This finding, as Kubota and Shi (2005, p. 121) argue, "caution(s) us against a contrastive rhetoric that is biased towards an Anglophone perspective". As thoroughly discussed by Kubota and Lehner (2004), critical contrastive rhetoric encourages us to critically reflect on the L1 and L2 rhetorical patterns, considering the fact that there is no "preferred" discourse pattern in writing.

The authors declare that they have no competing interests, both financial and non-financial.

Hossein Vahid Dastjerdi and Monsoor Tavakoli participated in the article's design and coordination and helped to draft the manuscript.

References

Crowhurst, M. (1990). The development of persuasive/argumentative writing. In R. Beach, & S. Hynds, *Developing discourse practices in adolescence and adulthood* (pp. 200–223). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Farrell, L. (1996). A case study of discursive practices and assessment processes in a multiethnic context. *Journal of Pragmatics* , 16, 267–289.

Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In U. Connor, & A. M. Johns, *Coherence in writing: research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 87–109). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Hirose, K. (2003). Comparing L1 and L2 organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Japanese EFL students. *Journal of Second Language Writing* , 12, 181–209.

Hyland, K., & Milton., J. (1997). Qualification and certainty in L1 and L2 students' writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* , 6 (2), 183–205.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning* , 16, 1-20.

Khatib, M., & Moradian, M. (2011). Deductive, Inductive, and Quasi-Inductive Writing Styles in Persian and English: Evidence from Media Discourse. *Studies in Literature and Language* , 2 (1), 81-87.

Khiabani, N., & Pourghassemi, H. (2009). Transfer of L1 organizational patterns in argumentative writing of Iranian EFL students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Iranian Journal of TEFLL* , 23-38.

Khodabandeh, F., Jafarigohar, M., Soleimani, H., & Hemmati, F. (2013). Overall Rhetorical Structure of Students' English and Persian Argumentative Essays. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* , 3 (4), 684-690.

Kobayashi, H. (1984). Rhetorical patterns in English and Japanese. *Dissertation Abstracts International* , 45, 2425A.

Kubota, R. (1998). An investigation of Japanese and English L1 essay organization: Differences and similarities. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* , 54, 475–507.

Kubota, R., & Lehner, A. (2004). Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 7–27.

Kubota, R., & Shi, L. (2005). Instruction and reading samples for opinion and argumentative writing in L1 junior high school textbooks in China and Japan. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 15, 97–127.

Matalene, C. (. Contrastive rhetoric: An American writing teacher in China. *College English*, 47, 789–808.

Rashidi, N., & Dastkheyr, Z. (2009). A comparison of English and Persian organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Iranian EFL students. *JOLIE*, 2 (1), 131- 152.

Shi, L., & Kubota, R. (2007). Patterns of rhetorical organization in Canadian and American language arts textbooks: An exploratory study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 180–202.

Shomossi, N., Ketabi, S., & Eslami Rasekh, A. (2012). Audience awareness of Persian learners of English writing: Towards a model of task-oriented strategies. *Applied Research in English*, 1 (1), 87-102.

Uysal, H. (2008). Tracing the culture behind writing: Rhetorical patterns and bidirectional transfer in LI and L2 essays of Turkish writers in relation to educational context. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 183-207.

Vahidi, S. (2004). A contrastive study of rhetorical structure of English and Persian and its possible impact on English reading comprehension. *Pazhuhesh-e Zaban haye khareji*, 183-198.

Wu, S. Y., & Rubin, D. L. (2000). Evaluating the impact of collectivism and individualism on argumentative writing by Chinese and North American college students. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 35, 148–178.

Appendix 1

عنوان	نوبتدنگی	فقر لغت	ناهمواری (در استقاده از لغات)	وجان	همه چیز را فدای فرهنگ کنید
تعداد پاراگراف ها	7 پاراگراف	6 پاراگراف	6 پاراگراف	6 پاراگراف	8 پاراگراف

مقدمه در پاراگراف های اول	جزئیات تکمیل کننده در پاراگراف های بنده	نتیجه در پاراگراف آخر	عنوان
نویسنده کسی را گویند که کارش اینست یعنی معانی و مطالبی در ذهن دارد که از آن سودی یا لذتی عام، برای خوانندگان حاصل می شود، (نکته، اصل)	اما نوپسندگی نیز همانند همه هنرهای دیگر، دو جنبه دارد که یکی معنی و دیگری صورت است	حاصل این سهل انگاری است که زبان فارسی امروز، اگر چه بسیار پیش از دوران پیشین در نوشتن بکار میرود، از هر جهت بسیار ناتوان و تهیست شده است.	چه خدماتی ادبیات به جامعه بشری کرده است؟
نویسندگان امروز ما، با این مجموعه ی الفاظ معدود همه چیز را می نویسند (نکته ی اصلی)	مقایسه ای میان آثار نویسندگان مشهور و بزرگی چون ششاهمه فردوسی و آثار نویسندگان کنونی	نویسندگان ما، با این بی میلانی که در اتخاذ شیوه ی خاص دارند نشان می دهند که صاحب ذوق و اندیشه ی مستقلی نیستند و همه هم رنگ جماعتند. (عقیده)	آموزش و پرورش نو
اینگونه عبارتهای "ناهموار" در نوشته های امروز، کم نیست و این خود نشانه های آشکار خامی کار نویسندگان است (نکته ی اصلی)	نمونه هایی از ناهموازی در نوشته های ما	ثبت کلمات به صورت عامیانه ی آنها، کار دشوار و مهمی نیست و به هر حال ملایمی که با معنی تطبیق نکند از استعمال آنها جز عباراتی ناهموار حاصل نخواهد شد (عقیده)	دانشساز و آقعی، معرفت و افعی
وجدان یا ضمیر قوه ایست که در انسان که به غیر و شر امور حکم کرده، شخص را به پیروی خیر و پرهیز از شر میگذرد. (نکته ی اصلی)	این قوه ی مخفی و ملایمی وجدان است که آفرینگار جل و علا در نهاد آدمی به ودیعت نهاده است تا فرزندان بشر را از نیک و بد آگاه و از راه خطا به راه صواب دلالت نماید.	پس وجدان است که حیات بشر را ضمانت می کند و در اهمیت آن همین قدر کافی است.	انسان متحد و انسان عقب مانده
البته همه چیز را فدای فرهنگ کردن و همه ی کارها را گذاشتن و سر طره ی دانش را گرفتن، مبالغه است ولی این مبالغه از سیاق عبارت فارسی و طرز بیان و تعبیر برای نشان دادن اهمیت	ضامن بقای یک ملت غیر از فرهنگ نیست. (نکته ی اصلی)	پس وقتی مسلم شد که تنها ضامن بقا و موجب تعالی و ترقی هر کشوری فقط فرهنگ آن است، چرا آن توجهی که لازم است به فرهنگ خود نمی کنیم.	

تعداد پاراگراف ها	مقدمه در پاراگراف های اول	جزئیات تکمیل کننده در پاراگراف های بدنه	نتیجه در پاراگراف آخر	عنوان
12 پاراگراف	البته برای حل مشکلات حیاتی و دریدن پرده های جهل و خرافات همه ی طبقات، مساعی جمیل، مجنون داشته اند، اما تاثیری که گویندگان و نویسندگان در روشن کردن افکار و هدایت کردن جوامع داشته اند، بدون تردید کمتر از سایرین نبوده است	افتخار ملت ها از فرهنگ آن ملت جدا نیست - یک شاعر و نویسنده در عصر خود، همچون گوهری تابناک در زمان خود می درخشد. شعر و ادبیات چیزی منفک از زندگی بشر نیست.	خلاصه به این نتیجه می رسیم که تا جهانی است و در آن دل و جانی، هم شعر و ادب تاثیر و اهمیت شایان دارد و هم شاعر و ادیب و نویسنده، گر آنقدر و در خور همه گونه ستایش و تحسین است. (عقیده)	ایران را چرا باید دوست داشت؟
7 پاراگراف	در جامعه ی آشفته ی ما، آنچه همه ی مردم بر آند، لزوم مبهم آموزش و پرورش است، آموزش و پرورش جز این که داریم. (نکته ی اصلی)	گاه از آموزش و پرورش ناسازی ست که کنجکروی و حقیقت پژوهشی آنان (دانش آموزان) را فرو می شناسند، فردیت و شخصیت را می کشند و ذهنشان را با انبساط کردن محتویات کتابهای درسی و پذیرفتن آراء دیگران خو می دهد	چه ببینیم، چه نبینیم، اگر اندیشه ی بقا و سعادت این آب و خاک را در سر می پرورانیم، باید در آموزش و پرورش نیمه مرده ی خود، جان تازه بدمیم (عقیده)	عظمت نویسی
15 پاراگراف	معمولا پیش مردم ظاهر ظاهری بی خبر، دانشمند واقعی کسی است که از اقران خود بیشتر بداند. (عقیده)	اگر واقعا فضیلت علم موقوف بر این است که سر اسر عمر به خواندن و یادگرفتن و به حافظه سپردن، بگذرد، آیا هیچ عقل درست و ذوق سلیمی روا می دارد به دنبال تحصیل و تعلیم که مستلزم تحمل همه قسم زحمت و از خود گذشتگی است (پرویم)؟	معرفت همان چیزی است که پس از خواندن همه چیز و فراموش کردن همه چیز، در دماغ به وجود می آید.	نویسنده خوب باید دارای چه شرط و خصوصیاتی باشد؟
23 پاراگراف	دورانی که ما در آن زندگی می کنیم پر است از شگفتی ها، از یک سو شاهد توفیق های خارق العاده ای در زمینه ی علم هستیم و از سوی دیگر نشانه های نومید کننده ای از درمادگی و بی پناهی بشر می بینیم	انسان متجدد و انسان عقب مانده، هر دو یکسان در گریناد مشکلات افتاده اند (نکته اصلی)	در این تیره بین واقعت و ربا، همه ی مردان و زنان باید جانب ضعیف تر.... را بگیرند. اگر انسانیت بیدار شود می توان به پیشرفت واقعی جهان امید بست و گرنه افق آینده تیره و تار خواهد بود. (عقیده)	با سمل جوان ارتباط منطقی برقرار کنیم

تعداد پاراگراف ها	مقدمه در پاراگراف های اول	جزئیات تکمیل کننده در پاراگراف های بدنه	نتیجه در پاراگراف آخر	عنوان
12 پاراگراف	برای برخی این مشکل پیش آمده است که مبین دوستی و حش ملیت با حب نوع بشر که مستلزم حس بین المللی است چگونه سازگار می شود؟	به عقیده من، ایرانی از آن اقوام است که استعداد ادای وظایف انسانیت را دارد. (نکته اصلی)	پس ما ایرانیان حق داریم که مبین پرست و ملت دوست باشیم... چنانکه از خارجان در... تصدیق کرده که (ایرانی) وجودش در عالم انسانیت مفید بوده و هست... و ما باید قدر آن مهربانیها را بشناسیم و منظور داریم.	ارتباط جمعی
17 پاراگراف	اما تعجب در اینجا است که غالب همین مردم که برای رفع عیبجویی دیگران در حفظ ظاهر گاهی ار حد اعتدال نیز قدم فراتر میگذارند، هر روز در نوشته و گفته های خود مرتکب هزار غلط انشایی و	کسانی که در نوشته های خود استمرار را مرتکب غلط املائی میشوند، ... علاوه بر آنکه از آن درجه از ذوق ... محرومند، ... آن همت را ندارند که زشتی و نادرستی را از میان بردارند و صحیح و سالم	آیا ضبط صحیح هزار کلمه و به خاطر سیردن آنها آنچنان دشوار است که اطعمه یک شخص عادی برنیاید؟	بازی
6 پاراگراف	پیش از پرداختن به اصل موضوع، باید تفاوت میان دو امر، یعنی فن نوشتن و هنر نویسندگی را خاطر نشان ساخت.	نویسنده خوب کسی است که خوب ببیند، خوب بشنود، خوب درک کند و آنچه دریافته است ... به دامن دفتر آرد (نکته اصلی)	پایه های کاخ رفیع عدل و جوانمردی و اخلاق به دست رادمردان توانایی نهاده است.	تلاش و تکاپو
20 پاراگراف	آری ما عشق زیبایی و جلالیم، چشم ما، گوش ما، لب ما، دست ما، بدن ما، ... همه جمال و زیبایی را دوست می دارند	معلوم می شود جمال مظهر حکمت و حکمت مبداء جمال است (نکته اصلی)	جمال و حکمت دو جلوه آفرینش است که یکی دل و دیگری عقل را می رباید.	همدیگر را دوست داریم
5 پاراگراف	به نظر می رسد جهان در آستانه قرن بیست و یکم، آستان جنگ جدیدی به نام جنگ ابدیست است. (عقیده)	اگر ما توانیم با جوانان داخل کشور خودمان ارتباط صحیح و منطقی برقرار کنیم، قطعا در بیرون مرزها با مشکلات پیشتری روبرو هستیم. (نکته اصلی)	پس به خود ببینیم و تا فرصت از دست نرفته ... اول نسل خود را دریافته و با آنان ارتباط منطقی برقرار کنیم، و ثانیاً خود را برای یک ر بیارویی فرهنگی ... آماده کنیم	پیشن افراد در مسیر انتخاب

تعداد پاراگراف ها	مقدمه در پاراگراف های اول	جزئیات تکمیل کننده در پاراگراف های بدنه	نتیجه در پاراگراف آخر
6 پاراگراف	پدیده است که ما در عصر ارتباط جمعی به سر می بریم و در واقع حتی می توان گفت در دورانی زندگی می کنیم که وجه	تأثیرات رسانه‌ای جمعی بر افکار مردم	بنا بر این در دنیای امروز، نقش رسانه‌های گروهی در آموزش، جهت‌گیری، جهت دادن، تبلیغ، و ... بسیار مهم و حیاتی است
10 پاراگراف	بنای وسیله‌ای برای صرف انرژی، کامها، و آرزوهای وازده‌ی راضی نشده انسان است.	تأثیر بنای بر روح و روان انسان انواع بازی ها	(ورزشکار) بازی و ورزش را برای کام‌های وازده نمی‌کند بلکه برای افتخار آفرینی و درس زندگی دادن به هم‌نوع خویش به ورزش می‌پردازد (عقیده)
8 پاراگراف	کتاب دروازه ورود به قلبهاست، کتاب مونس تنهایی است، ... کتاب رفیق و یار انسان در تمام زندگی است. (عقیده)	بنا بر این، نقش و اهمیت کتاب واضح و روشن است. (نکته اصلی)	بنا بر این، پژو و هشگران، موافقان، مترجمان، ناشران، و بالاخره دست اندرکاران کتاب وظیفه‌ای بس خطیر در مقابل تک تک افراد جامعه خود دارند.
7 پاراگراف	از اولین لحظه حیات، انسان برای به دست آوردن حداقل نیازهای خود از قبیل خوراک، مسکن، پوشاک دست به تلاش همه جانبه می‌زند. (نکته اصلی)	کوشش اولین وظیفه انسان است که باید این وظیفه‌ی مقدس را به بهترین نحو انجام دهد (عقیده)	بنا بر این هیچ چیز جز در سایه‌ی تلاش و تکاپو و استقامت و ثبات قدم به عرصه‌ی وجود نمی‌تواند گذارد
9 پاراگراف	پس از گذشت چند هزار سال، هنوز هم مردم به عوامل ایجاد کننده کثرت و جانبداری فکر می‌کنند	در دنیا چیزهای بسیار زیادی اتفاق می‌افتد که هر یک از آنها می‌تواند محبوبیت ایجاد نمایند که یکی از آنها عشق روزیدن... است (عقیده)	برادران، خواهران، ... سعی کنند دوست باشند تا قلبها به هم نزدیک و ... دلها ملو از شادی ... باشد
10 پاراگراف	اصول خوب انسان، چون پرتوهای نورانی خورشید به هر سو گسیل ... می‌یابند.	پس به کمک بینشی که از جهان و تفکر و درایتی که در خود احساس می‌کند به انتخاب امکانات موجود برای رسیدن به هدف چنگ می‌زند و مسرش را انتخاب می‌کند (نکته اصلی)	در این صورت پیش‌مخرب فرد می‌تواند تریاکی برای عدم پیشرفت جامعه‌ی ساختار محسوب شود (عقیده)