Incorporating the post-process approach into the Thai EFL writing classroom
การประสานแนวการสอนแบบหลังกระบวนการในห้องเรียนการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษของไทย

สมศักดิ์ แก้วนุช[1]
Somsak Kaewnuch

บทคัดย่อ

    ทฤษฎีและแนวทางในการสอนในสาขาการสอนเขียนนั้นอาจแบ่งออกเป็น 3 กลุ่มใหญ่ กล่าวคือ แนวการสอนแบบกลุ่มกึ่งเก่าใหม่ (current-traditional approach) แนวการสอนแบบกระบวนการ (process approach) แนวการสอนแบบหลังกระบวนการ (post-process approach) กลุ่มแรกนั้นเน้นความถูกต้องทางไวยากรณ์และรูปแบบของงานเขียนและได้ครอบงำการสอนเขียนมานับร้อยปี การสอนเขียนแนวนี้ถูกมองว่ามีแนวคิดแบบปิดกั้นผู้เรียน ส่วนการสอนเขียนแบบกระบวนการซึ่งเน้นอิสระของผู้เขียนและสถานการณ์การเขียนนั้นให้คุณค่ากับสติปัญญาและแบ่งการเขียน (writing act) เป็นขั้นตอน เช่น ขั้นก่อนเขียน (pre-writing) ขั้นเขียน (writing) และขั้นหลังเขียน (post-writing) การสอนแนวนี้ถูกมองว่าพยายามทำให้การเขียน (writing act) เป็นสากล ซึ่งโดยธรรมชาติแล้วจะมีลักษณะเป็นสถานการณ์ (situated) ตีความ (interpretative) และไม่แน่นอน (indeterminate) ในทางตรงกันข้ามแนวการสอน

[1]ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร. คณะคณะครุศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏพิบูลสงคราม ประเทศไทย
Assistant Professor, Ph.D., Faculty of Education, Pibulsongkram Rajabhat University, Thailand

Corresponding Author: E-mail: noneandnone02@gmail.com

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

1

แบบหลังกระบวนการมองการเขียนว่าไม่ได้ประกอบด้วยกระบวนการเดียวแต่ประกอบด้วยหลายกระบวนการและหลายความจริง (realities) บทความฉบับนี้แนะนำว่าแนวการสอนแบบหลังกระบวนการซึ่งยึดหลักการของกลุ่มหลังสมัยนิยม (postmodernism) และกลุ่มต้านระเบียบแบบแผน (anti-foundationalist) นั้นมีประโยชน์ในการออกแบบวิธีการสอนในห้องเรียนการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศในประเทศไทย

คำสำคัญ: การสอนเขียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ การสอนเขียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศในประเทศไทย แนวการสอนแบบกลุ่มกึ่งเก่าใหม่ แนวการสอนแบบกระบวนการ แนวการสอนแบบหลังกระบวนการ

Abstract

Theories and approaches in the discipline of composition can be classified into three major groups: current-traditional, process, and post-process. Current-traditional rhetoric, emphasizing correctness and form, has dominated writing instruction for over a hundred of years, and is blamed for its suppressive philosophy. The process approach, stressing student autonomy and rhetorical situations, values the cognitive faculty and divides the writing act into stages, such as pre-writing, writing, and post-writing. This approach is attacked for trying to universalize the writing act, which is by nature situated, interpretative, and indeterminate. The post-process approach, instead, views writing as containing not one process but many processes, and also many realities. The present paper suggests that the post-process approach, which adopts tenets of

postmodern and anti-foundationalist perspectives, is useful in designing a teaching method in the Thai EFL writing classroom.

Keywords: current-traditional rhetoric, EFL writing instruction, process approach, post-process approach, Thai EFL writing instruction

Introduction

Silva (1990, as cited in Mu, 2005) identifies four major approaches in English as a second language (ESL) writing instruction: the controlled approach, the current-traditional approach or the product approach, the process approach, and the social approach. The controlled approach, influenced by structural linguistics and behaviorist psychology, focuses on sentence patterns and vocabulary as part of habit formation. The current-traditional approach apparently values form and correctness. The process approach divides the act of writing into stages. The social approach sees writing as part of communication.

In the United States, where the discipline of composition is most well-established, however, the latest approach is the post-process approach, which emerged rather clearly in the 1990s in response to the flaws of the process approach. One important post-process argument against the process approach is that the act of writing cannot be generalized into stages due to the discursive, contingent nature of writing. Another argument is that writing cannot be taught, for, as Thomas Kent (1993, as cited in Kastman Breuch, 2002) claims, "writing is a situated, interpretive, and indeterminate act" (p. 121). And one more argument, which is shared by the social approach in ESL writing

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

3

instruction, is that writing is a way of socialization. It is an artifact not of individuals but of society. What is implied by this argument is, therefore, that knowledge is socially constructed.

The teaching of English writing in non-native contexts mostly emphasizes linguistic proficiency. Grammar is very important for EFL writing (Rustipa, 2016). Linguistic issues such as accuracy, complexity, the lexicon, fluency, and cohesion are the primary concerns of ESL writing instruction (Polio, 2014). Those emphases imply the significance of the writer as the center of discourse and the acceptance of cognitive ability in writing, two important stances of the earlier approaches in the field of composition (controlled and current-traditional approaches). Learning through those emphases, it could be said, students lack the knowledge about how language actually works in society. What is insufficient in the EFL context is the incorporation of the social aspect of writing, which the author thinks is essential in the development of students' writing. The present paper will point to the benefits of applying the post-process approach in the English as a foreign language (EFL) writing classroom, both the benefits from the situational, uncertain, and indeterminate nature of writing and the benefits from viewing writing as a means to create knowledge.

In the sections below, the paper will first explore some theoretical and pedagogical concepts that have driven the theories or approaches in composition. Then the paper will dig into three major approaches (current-traditional, product, and post-process), connecting them with the philosophies and pedagogies mentioned in the first

section. After that, the paper, drawing on the knowledge from the first and second sections, will explain how we might combine all the three approaches into a teaching method that emphasizes post-process methodology. As the literature review will show, a post-process approach that also accommodates current-traditional and product approaches might be the most appropriate method in the Thai EFL writing classroom. Finally, the paper will summarize the main tenets of the post-process approach that incorporates the other two approaches.

Theoretical and Pedagogical Background

To decipher the nature of writing and the usefulness of seeing knowledge as socially constructed, which is a principle of post-process writing, one should start from separating theories and pedagogies in the discipline of composition into two sides—those that support the autonomy of the learner or view the learner as a capable, coherent self, and those that encourage mutual learning or view humans as incoherent and knowledge as socially-constructed.

First of all, there are some theories that advocate the creation of the capable, coherent learner. Two important theories related to this creation are "modernism" and "structuralism." Modernity is an imaginary age put forth by philosophers who believe that education can spawn educated and transcendental citizens (Eagleton, 2001). The modern subject is supposed to possess the thinking ability that allows him/her to go beyond lived experiences to reach ultimate truths. In terms of learning to write, one could imagine, the modern student is expected to

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

5

be the center of discourse, to have the ability to arrange words and sentences effectively in an expected format, to be able to understand grammatical rules, to be able to tackle the complexity of thought, and to present competing and chaotic thoughts in a comprehensive way. Finally, it should be noted that modernism also expects the student to create knowledge by himself/herself.

Structuralism may not directly aim at creating a coherent self, but it too expects humans to own the mental ability to embark upon the complexity of information in order to discover the structures that govern things—human behavior, schools, hospitals, natural phenomena, economy, politics, etc. Structuralists maintain that "codes, signs, and rules govern all human social and cultural practices, including communication" (Bressler, 2003, as cited in Kaewnuch, 2012, p. 41). Culler (1997) points out that structuralism focuses on identifying underlying structures by which meanings are created. With regard to teaching writing, structuralism leads to teaching sentence structure or choosing words to fit the sentence, but its influence is obvious in its emphasis on formats or genres. The paragraph structure, the presentation of news, the five-paragraph essay, the business letter, etc. are under the influence of structuralism. Therefore, a pedagogy adopting structuralism values mental ability or individualistic intelligence.

Then in sharp contrast to modernism and structuralism, there emerged two theories called "postmodernism" and "poststructuralism," that reject individualism and instead accept pluralism. In other words, these theories reject that the subject can be conscious and coherent.

6

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

Postmodern theory declines that consciousness originates in the human mind, arguing that the human is the effect rather than the cause of discourse (Faigley, 1992, as cited in Kaewnuch, 2014b). The condition of postmodernism is clearly described in Marxism. Marxism offers us an understanding about society, economy, culture, and politics, arguing that it is not consciousness or any spiritual entity but life and interactions that shape our ideas and concepts (Bressler, 2003, as cited in Kaewnuch, 2014b). Implicit in postmodernism, therefore, is that knowledge is created not by individuals but by society. To put it simply, knowledge is socially constructed.

Like postmodernism, poststructuralism embraces pluralism. Postmodernism has broader implications outside the realm of literary interpretation than poststructuralism, which is used synonymously with deconstructionism. Poststructuralism posits that "a text has many meanings, and therefore, no definite interpretation. ...A text has an almost indefinite number of possible interpretations" (Bressler, 2003, p. 95). Thus, poststructuralism holds a corresponding notion as that of post-process approach in Composition—that writing as well as its products (texts) is indeterminate. Both theories, therefore, resist definite forms and stages, but embrace pluralism.

Next, pedagogies that may have been the origins of approaches in Composition can also be grouped into those that advocate individualism and those that reject it and welcome pluralism. A distinction made by Dewey (1997) is between "traditional education" and "progressive education." The former refers to "education from within," or education that promotes personal growth. It is the education

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

7

in which the student seeks and evaluates knowledge solitarily. On the other hand, progressive education is "education from without," in which the student creates knowledge not only from what he already possesses in the brain but also from interactions with others, and schools become sites of exchanges and collaborations. Learning is achieved not by rote but by doing. According to spring (2002), Dewey's two important, though controversial, ideas are "that all knowledge has a social origin and that the interests of the child are the primary sources of learning" (p. 241). This means that Dewey tries to support learning from society and rejects the traditional way of education where the teacher dominates students. Thus, Dewey's division of "traditional education" and "progressive education" means that the former can be viewed as suppressive, while the latter as "liberal" or "student-centered."

Other important pedagogies revolve around attempts to liberate students, to see them as freed subjects. In Pedagogy of the Oppressed, for example, Freire (2005) rebuts the concept of "banking education," in which, as he describes, the teacher tries to give as much knowledge to students as possible while the student receives it passively. Instead, Freire proposes that the teacher facilitate conscious learning with others in order to rebel against suppression. Next, critical pedagogy, which may be seen to be the foundation of theories, such as feminism, post colonialism, deconstruction, and Marxism, emerged to empower students suppressed by dominant cultures, to help them to build their own identities, and to accommodate diversity (Nieto, 1999), thus, embracing

8

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

not only pluralism and the idea that knowledge is created by society, but also that education must eradicate injustice and promotes justice.

Three Major Approaches in Composition

Now that some theories and pedagogies that influence practices in Composition have been explored, it is time to look at some theories and pedagogies in this discipline. However, for the ease of explanation, it is useful to group the theories and pedagogies. Theorists have been doing so, and they have usually identified similar categories. For example, Berlin (1987) views approaches to teaching writing as objective, subjective, and transactional. Faigley (1986) identifies three views: expressive, cognitive, and social. McComiskey (2000) points out three levels of writing: textual, rhetorical, and discursive.

The above theorists see similar trends, though their categories do not match evenly. First, writing is seen as the writer's product and the writer is viewed as unified and capable of expressing himself/herself deftly. Second, writing is thought as a means of communication involving selecting words, occasions, exigencies, and so on to match the rhetorical situation. In this stage, too, the writer is seen as owning a coherent mind capable of crafting the writing in a way he/she wishes it to be. Third, writing is regarded as unstable, indefinite, dialogic, and constantly changeable, depending on the context. The writer, on the contrary, is incoherent.

The interpretation of those views by Berlin, Faigley, and McComiskey can certainly vary from one person to another. The author, however, sees a line of three major sequential movements that have

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

9

been influenced by those views, including the current-traditional approach, the process approach, and the post-process approach. In fact, these approaches subsume all theories and pedagogies in this discipline. For instance, Pratt (1991)'s theory of contact zone, which explains the asymmetrical relations of power in social spaces or contexts, is a version of the post-process approach. In an advanced writing classroom, for example, students may write about the relationship among doctors, nurses, and workers in a hospital, using data from interviews. This reflects not only that knowledge is constructed by society but also that writing is a site of conversation, a true belief of post-process pedagogy.

Let us now consider the three major approaches to teaching writing.

Current-traditional rhetoric may be seen as the monolith in writing instruction due to its long dominance over other theories for a hundred of years (Berlin, 1987). The term "current-traditional" was first used in 1959 by Daniel Forgaty (Kennedy, 1998), but this rhetoric had been formulated in the late nineteen century in freshman composition (Crowley, 1998). The rhetoric is a teaching philosophy that emphasizes form over content. It stresses grammar, syntax, spelling, punctuation, mechanics, and modes of writing (expository, description, narration, and argument) (Kennedy, 1998). According to Crowley (1998), books of this rhetoric do not pay attention to the suitability of the writing in a given rhetorical situation, but instead delineate errors that can be committed by careless or lazy students.

Current-traditional rhetoric, therefore, is rooted in structuralism in that it imposes formats or genres of writing and also in modernism in

that it is the kind of education that values the power of the mind. This aspect of modernism originates in romanticism, which gives importance to the power of emotions and imagination (Bressler, 2003). The mind has the power to understand grammatical rules. The mind is careful enough to always use a comma, for example, after a subordinate clause that comes before a main clause. In addition, the mind has the power to cope with the complexity of information and to analyze and present it in a structure that all humans would find it easy to comprehend. Most writing teachers certainly make use this mind in the writing classroom, where their students must avoid errors and be able to structure a paragraph or essay, or to imagine the overall idea governing a long paper.

Banking concepts, in which knowledge is stable and given to students by books and teachers, are the philosophy fueling current-traditional rhetoric. The student is held responsible for, for example, learning grammatical rules, using a variety of sentences, using correct punctuation marks and spellings, and following the organization required for each writing task. The teacher is responsible for teaching rules and models for organizing ideas, identifying errors and having the student correct them, and awarding and punishing the student based on the quality of the writing. Obviously, current-traditional rhetoric is teacher-centered and so considered suppressive.

The second major approach is the process approach, which arose in the 1960s in reaction to the dominance of current-traditional rhetoric or the product approach (Matsuda, 2003). This approach emphasizes the teaching of writing not as a product but as a process. It respects the

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

11

student's voice and gives importance to teacher and peer feedback as well as revision. Murray (1997) specifies ten implications of teaching process. It 1) uses students' texts as main sources of writing, 2) lets them find their own topics, 3) encourages them to use their own language, 4) encourages them to write drafts in order to discover what exactly they want to say, 5) lets them use any form of writing that best presents their ideas, 6) has them consider the mechanics in the last stage, 7) allows enough time for the writing, 8) examines students' papers to see other choices they could have chosen to say, 9) views each student as having his own way of writing, and 10) imposes no rules or absolutes.

The process approach, therefore, was a paradigm shift from current-traditional rhetoric, corresponding to Hairston (1982)'s assertion, which came out two decades after the emergence of the process approach. In this paradigm shift, Hairston points to the principal features of teaching writing, including, for example, the focus on the writing process, teacher intervention during the writing process, strategies for invention and discovery, emphasis on rhetorical elements (audience, purpose, and occasion), teacher evaluation of the fulfillment of the audience's needs and the writer's intention.

The most important aspect of the process approach, which faces disapproval, is the division of the writing act into stages. A famous model of the writing process is given by Flower and Hayes (1997), in which the writing consists of three dimensions: the task environment; the writer's knowledge of the topic, audience, and plan; and the writing processes. Flower and Hayes see writing as involving not just one

process but processes of generating ideas, planning, organizing, setting a goal, translating, reviewing, evaluating, and revising. Meanwhile, the writer keeps monitoring the writing during all these processes. Due to the stages, Gary Olson (2002) blames the process approach for presenting a series of generalizations about writing that people can hold true all the time. Theorists identifying with Olson often argue that the writing act is indivisible because it is situated, interpretative, and indeterminate (Kent, 1993, as cited in Kastman Breuch, 2002), or because it is involved multiple realities (Korzybski, 1933, as cited in Varnum, 1992). Another important criticism is that process instruction oversimplifies the multiplicity of perspectives long present in Composition (Matsuda, 2002), e.g. that writing is a mode of learning (Emig, 1977).

In terms of foundational theory and pedagogy, unlike current-traditional rhetoric, the process approach is not contradictory in itself. Current-traditional rhetoric believes in the power of the mind but suppresses it by imposing rules and formats to follow, by forcing students to leave out some ideas they would otherwise include if not required by genres. On the other hand, the process approach respects students' autonomy and, despite teacher intervention and some organizational requirements, leaves students fully responsible for what they want to say. As a result, the origin of the process approach is in modernism in that it gives importance to the human mind and in Deweyan progressive education in that it is student-centered.

Finally, the third major approach is the post-process pedagogy. The term "post-process" arose in the 1990s (Matsuda, 2002). It could be

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

13

seen as an argument to forward postmodern and anti-foundationalist perspectives (Kastman Breuch, 2002). Kastman Breuch (2002) encourages writing teachers that "writing as an activity rather than a body of knowledge, [their] teaching methods as indeterminate activities rather than exercises of mastery, and [their] communicative interactions with students as dialogic rather than monologic" (ibid., p. 120). Indeed, the post-process approach was the result of "the social turn" in the 1980s (Matsuda, 2002), which we begin to see in some points of Hairston (1982)'s description of writing instruction in the paradigm shift. For example, writing is viewed as a recursive rather than a linear process; that is, there is no beginning and no ending. Writing is an activity containing intuitive, non-rational, and rational conditions. One piece of writing can include more than one mode, such as exposition and description. Pre-writing, writing, and revision overlap and intertwine.

One very important aspect of writing in the post-process approach is that writing is now thought of as a mode of learning. Hairston concurs with Emig (1977) that a principle of teaching is viewing that "writing is a way of learning and developing as well as a communication skill" (p. 86). Emig contends that the notion that writing is a mode of learning is debatable but not a private opinion, mentioning Lev Vygotsky, Jerome Bruner, and A. R. Luria as also holding this idea. Emig claims that writing "provides connections, establishes explicit and systemic conceptual groupings through lexical, syntactic, and rhetorical devices, represents most available means (verbal language) for economic recording of abstract formulations" (p. 127). Such activities can create knowledge.

Next, returning to Matsuda (2003)'s claim that the process approach oversimplifies various theories and approaches in Composition, one sees that he is mostly right. There are many issues that are useful but that teachers of the process approach would otherwise pay less attention if they focus only on the stages of the writing act. For instance, Bruffee (1997) elaborates on the usefulness of collaborative learning, maintaining that communities create, approve, and maintain knowledge, and such knowledge gains authority. Broad (2003) focuses on the textual qualities valued by writing teachers, including power, agency, ethos, change in the student, intellectual thinking, analysis, voice, personality, audience awareness, coherence, unity, and so on. Some of these textual qualities, such as coherence and unity, are already addressed by process pedagogy, but most of them are not. Post-process pedagogy, as the above explanations reveal, should fulfill or respond to the needs better.

Theoretically and pedagogically, post-process pedagogy is student-centered and rooted in poststructuralism, postmodernism, and Deweyan progressive education. These theories implicitly imply that knowledge is constructed not by individuals but by society. Dialogues are now thought to be sources of knowledge and data for writing. Another well-known theory that holds this assumption and is in the same group as poststructuralism and postmodernism is the social constructivist theory. Social constructivists believe that "the construction of knowledge is the result of social interaction" (Dueraman, 2012, p. 258).

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

15

Now that the three major approaches in Composition have been reviewed, the table below is given to summarize the main tenets and characteristics of each approach:

Current-traditional	Process	Post-process
Focus on grammar, syntax, mechanics, spelling, punctuation, and modes of writing; cognition-based; individualistic; writer as coherent and center of discourse; knowledge created alone; teacher-centered; suppression of students' writing	Respect for students' autonomy; relationships between writer, audience, purpose, and occasion of writing; division of writing act into stages; dialogic strategies for discovery; liberated writer; writer combines own knowledge and society; student-centered	View of writing as interpretive, indeterminate, and discursive; acceptance of possibilities; emphasis on the functional aspect of writing; writing in the real work; pluralistic; writer as effect of society; knowledge created by society; student-centered

Application of the Post-Process Approach in the Thai EFL Context

This section is for pondering on how to apply post-process pedagogy in Thai EFL writing instruction. This certainly requires the understanding of both ESL and EFL contexts with regard to teaching

writing. Matsuda (2003) points out that ESL instruction has borrowed substantially from Composition Studies in the Western culture. Similarly, EFL instructors should also gain something useful from what has been said about ESL writing. The two contexts, ESL and EFL, are similar; therefore, EFL writing teachers should consider the knowledge from both areas. Below is a little exploration for thinking about how to adopt post-process writing in the Thai EFL writing classroom.

> Xiao (2007, p. 20) describes the EFL writer as follows: Being restricted by their limited linguistic competence, EFL writers are often frustrated and overwhelmed by such problems as lacking appropriate English lexical expressions and struggling with mechanics, grammar, sentence structure, paragraph coherence, rhetorical patterns, revision at both higher and lower ends.

The above excerpt shows that low linguistic competence is a key problem in EFL contexts everywhere. However, problems are related not only to matters of linguistic competence but also to organization, rhetorical situations, and revision, and a lot of theorists still believe that the conscious mind is central to the solution of those problems. For example, Xiao proposes using metacognition to teaching EFL writing. Metacognition is defined as awareness and control of one's cognition (Baker & Brown, 1984; Flavell, 1979, 1987; Gourgey, 2001, as cited in Xiao, 2007). The control of cognition includes regulatory activities of planning, monitoring, testing, revising, and evaluating (Baker and Brown, 1984,

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

17

as cited in Xiao, 2007). It is clear, therefore, that teaching grammar, organization, paragraphing, coherence, etc., and teaching how the mind works to solve writing problems is a big part of EFL writing instruction.

Now, let us look particularly into Thai EFL writing instruction. In Conflicts in Rubrics, Pedagogy, and EFL Writing, Kaewnuch (2014a) argues that we mostly adopt current-traditional rhetoric, or structuralism, and rely on reductionism, objectivity, and reliability, for the instruction is largely connected with psychometric assessment and problems of, for example, large-sized classrooms. As evidence of that claim, Kaewnuch (2014b), in The Modern Subject, the Postmodern Subject, and the Reconstruction of the EFL Student Writer, points out that most English program curriculums of Thai universities fundamentally teach qualities emphasized by current-traditional pedagogy. The Thai EFL writing assessment further assures reliance on current-traditional rhetoric. For example, Puengpipatrakul (2013)'s assessment of Thai EFL undergraduates' writing competence shows an obvious emphasis of current-traditional rhetoric, for the criteria of the assessment included only content, organization, mechanics, grammar, and paragraphing.

It is time now to turn to thinking about designing a course for teaching post-process writing to Thai students. Such a course is worthwhile designing if one thinks of the advantages writing teachers will get. Indeed, just Emig's assertion that writing is a heuristic activity already suffices. Post-process instruction will expose our students to language more than ever, thus getting them closer to natural acquisition, to real use of language. It is student-centered and thus allows them to learn for

themselves. These are just a few of many other benefits of post-process instruction. There are certainly limitations or obstacles of applying post-process theory, including teachers' low English skills, a large class size, insufficient classroom facilities, and more importantly the difficulty in changing teachers' tendency to focus on grammar, syntax, and form. However, as the above table about the principles of the three teaching approaches reveals, the benefits of post-process teaching outweigh traditional teaching. Therefore, devising a course to adopt post-process theory is worth trying.

However, before we have such a course to teach, one important issue that needs considering is the question "Is teaching writing a hopeless endeavor?" This question comes from Thomas Kent, who claims that the act of writing is situated, interpretative, and indeterminate. As said above that post-process pedagogy adopts postmodern tenets, the incoherent act of writing might be well supported by the description of the postmodern subject. According to Faigley (1992), the human subject is the locus of overlapping and competing discourses. In that state, the subject is not a coherent self and by no means can his writing be unified and coherent, or in other words, it is impossible to divide the writing act into clear, unchanging stages. Because of those conditions, Kent believes that writing cannot be taught.

Then, what is the answer to the above question? The answer is "No, it is not hopeless." Post-process proponents who claim that writing is not teachable only focus on the writing act, and one should readily agree that it is indeterminate, discursive, and recursive. However,

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

19

although the writing act cannot be clearly described, the major stages of the writing act can be portrayed. It can be marked as "beginning," "middle," and "ending," of course with the acknowledgement of the little discursive mental activities, such as thinking of the audience and revising, that keep occurring between them. Students can be held totally responsible for those inner activities in their attempt to come up with the required task. With different backgrounds and experiences, one person's inner activities vary from those of another. Meanwhile, basic writing activities can be taught such as how to write a powerful topic sentence, how to support the topic sentence with major and minor details, how to link paragraphs with transitions, etc. These can be taught separately through examples and exercises.

What is more important and useful, however, is the knowledge given by post-process theorists. Postmodernism, the origin of post-process thinking, describes the subject as contingent and incoherent, and located in overlapping and competing discourses. Knowledge is described as unstable. These conditions are useful; in these conditions, students can acquire the language more naturally, become more linguistically competent, obtain more worldly knowledge, and develop more desirable characteristics. Thus, the teaching of writing is not only for students to write effectively but also for them to become worldly knowledgeable and desirable subjects (cf. Faigley, 1992; Harvey, 1990).

Now, when it comes to designing a teaching method, combining teaching methods is a good choice. This paper considers combining post-process concepts with current-traditional rhetoric and the process

approach for teaching Thai EFL writing. On one side, the lack of natural language makes inner-directed methods (current-traditional and process) appropriate for EFL students. In the Thai context, students cannot be naturally exposed to the language, so they need to learn the language consciously and to monitor themselves while using the language. Structuralist or modernist methods that believe in and promote cognition and that focus on grammar, vocabulary, and syntax are useful. The writing classroom should be part of developing students' linguistic competence. On the other hand, students should be supported to acquire the language as much as possible, that is, to learn as much as possible from the outside world. It is believed that outer-directed, postmodernist methods play a larger role in developing students as writers and users of the language. With the two halves of inner-directed and outer-directed methods, problems of limited competence, deficient social awareness, and insufficient exposure to the language of EFL students described above can be alleviated.

Therefore, the ideal teaching method is one that integrates all three major approaches but emphasizes post-process perspectives. Nevertheless, there is a specific formula: the process and the post-process must be reversed. Though it can astound one that "post" comes before, it is the methodology that matters. While current-traditional rhetoric can be placed at the beginning or at the end of a lesson plan, or anywhere, or in any hour to keep students learning the language, the post-process must be placed before the process. Each writing task should end with methods of the process approach, or with features that can be codified or

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

21

taught. The post-process is for students to absorb, attain, accumulate more vocabulary, knowledge about the topic, cultural knowledge, syntactic structure, emotions, motivation, etc., related to the writing task, thereby preparing themselves for the writing. The process is for them to put all they obtain from post-process into writing.

An explanation of a four-week lesson plan that applies all three approaches is shown in the table below. As the teaching of grammar and form in current-traditional rhetoric is flexible and should appear wherever needed, or constantly, it is hard to create a table that reflects the movements, so numbers are used to show the order of teaching activities. The teacher is advised to highlight the activities one-by-one as the teaching goes on.

Post-process	Current-traditional	Process
1. A three-minute video with English subtitles shows a mother duck showing its ducklings how to fly down from a tall tree. Each student has a notebook for noting what he or she thinks about the duck and ducklings. Then they help each other to list the new	4. After students do sufficient post-process activities, which takes the most time, they may do some grammar, syntax, or organization exercises. The grammar, syntax, and vocabulary in the exercises are from the videos, texts, or	5. Then they start writing on ducks and ducklings, or concepts about them, moving from generating ideas (perhaps, via free-writing), mapping ideas, writing the first draft, getting

Post-process	Current-traditional	Process
and important vocabulary they heard from the video and present it to the class.	presentations in 1, 2, and 3.	feedback from friends and teacher, to revising and editing drafts. (Enough time must be given for the discursive and recursive mental activities by having students write as homework.)
2. Students work in groups talking about the meanings hidden, such as risks worth taking, possible dangers or threats in the forest, love of mothers, and love in the family living in limited and dangerous conditions. Each group presents the meanings the members listed.	6. More grammar and syntax exercises related to the topic can be given. 8. A grammar exercise may end the lesson plan by having students correct the errors found in the sample drafts together with the teacher's assistance.	7. Some final drafts of some students are shown to the class. The teacher and students discuss how to improve the drafts.
3. An alternative is each group chooses an area presented and finds more words and details related to ducks and ducklings in books or on the Internet.		

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

23

Post-process	Current-traditional	Process
Students read a reading about how a mother duck feeds and takes care of its ducklings. Or they watch another video with English titles about ducks and ducklings.		9. The final draft is submitted.

Conclusion

The teaching of EFL writing has not actually applied post-process, although Dueraman (2012) claims that the social constructivist approach, which contains poststructuralist and postmodernist perspectives, is a theory in EFL writing. In reality, conversations, especially in the English language, are not used in this context as a way to support writing. Obstacles of the application the post-process approach, as Dueraman points out, might be, for example, the status of English as a foreign language, none or little inclusion of writing in the English curriculum, and the culture of teacher authority deeply ingrained in the classroom. Due to the advent of the communicative approach, some teachers must have tried to use as many real-life teaching materials as possible to facilitate natural linguistic acquisition, but those attempts are not aimed to improve students' writing.

24

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

The author considers the post-process approach a step forward that all EFL writing teachers should try. Despite Dueraman's claim that the social constructionist approach exists in the Thai EFL context, the author agrees with Barkaoui (2007)'s classification of two models in the Thai EFL writing classroom: the process modeling and the text modeling. Even the process modeling, which teaches effective writing strategies, such as generating ideas, planning, and drafting, is not prevalent. The text modeling in our context mostly stresses grammar and form, not the exposure to the target language or the function of the text.

As a result, the author proposes a post-process approach that combines current-traditional and process approaches with the following tenets:

1. Matters that can be codified or taught e.g. grammar, mechanics, syntax, and modes of writing are important and should be taught gradually and constantly.

2. The instruction of codified matters is a long process and should be implicitly mixed with process and post-process activities.

3. Post-process activities, which encourage learning new knowledge, should take the longest time, perhaps up to 70%.

4. Discussions and exchanges of ideas aimed at creating knowledge and desirable subjects are necessary.

5. Process activities come after post-process activities.

6. In the writing process, adequate time must be given for students to cope with the situated, interpretive, and indeterminate nature of writing.

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

25

As those six suggestions imply, the teaching of post-process writing, which involves doing many activities, is a rigorous job, especially in the EFL context, where students need the language (mostly grammar) first. EFL teachers of this teaching project must not get stuck at teaching grammar, mechanics, syntax, and modes of writing, matters generally found in most English language books. Post-process teaching requires the understanding that language learning is a gradual and long process. Teachers of this project, therefore, must not look at language learning in the EFL context as acquiring specific skills and separate grammatical rules but as a natural and holistic process. They should select only the topics in which all their students are interested and have their students explore each topic adequately, so that they have enough time to do all activities of the three theories (post-process, current-traditional, process) in one writing project. In fact, only one or two topics can be explored in one whole semester. The teachers must not rush to teach a new topic in order for their students to acquire the grammar, writing skills, or vocabulary they want their students to acquire.

Many problems can arise that can interrupt the post-process writing project. For example, teachers are usually loaded with responsibilities other than teaching assigned by school administrators, such as disciplining students or visiting students' homes. As a result of such activities, teachers may feel too tired to lead or facilitate the many activities required by the post-process writing project. To overcome such tiredness due to extra duties, teachers should have a strong mind and have a correct understanding about teaching writing. Building writing

ability is a gradual process. Each teacher does only one part in a student's language development. Thinking like this, teachers will do their best on the parts and so be able to adopt the post-process writing project successfully.

References

Barkaoui, K. (2007). Teaching writing to second language learners: Insights from theory and research. *TESL Reporter, 40*(1), 35-48.

Berlin, J. A. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American colleges, 1900-1985.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bressler, C. E. (2003). *Literary criticism: An introduction to theory and practice.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Broad, B. (2003). *What we really value: Beyond rubrics in teaching and assessing writing.* Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.

Brown, H. D. (2014). *Principles of language learning and teaching. A course in second language acquisition.* (6th ed.). New York: Pearson.

Bruffee, K. A. (1997). Collaborative learning and the "conversation of mankind." In Victor Villanueva (ed.), *Cross-talk in comp theory: A reader* (pp. 393-414). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Crowley, S. (1998). *Composition in the university: Historical and polemical essays.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Culler, J. (1997). *Literary theory: A very short introduction. Oxford:* Oxford University Press.

Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and education.* New York: Free Press.

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

27

Dueraman, B. (2012). Teaching EFL writing: Understanding and rethinking the Thai experience. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences, 4*(1), 255-275.

Eagleton, T. (2001). *Literary theory: An introduction.* (2nd ed.). Minnesota: Blackwell Publishers.

Emig, J. (1977). Writing as a mode of learning. *College Composition and Communication, 28*(2), 122-128.

Faigley, L. (1986). Competing theories of process: A critique and a proposal. *College English 18*(6): 527-39.

_____. (1992). *Fragments of rationality: Postmodernity and the subject of composition.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1997). A cognitive process theory of writing. In Victor Villanueva (ed.), *Cross-talk in comp theory: A reader* (pp. 251-275). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English..

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Hairston, M. (1982). The winds of change: Thomas Khun and the revolution of teaching of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 33*(1), 76-88.

Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity: An inquiry of the origins of cultural change.* Cambridge and Oxford: Blackwell.

Kaewnuch, S. (2012). Balancing structuralism and postmodernism in EFL writing instruction and assessment. *Journal of Liberal Arts Prince of Songkla University "Multicultural Lifestyle and Language," 4*(1), 39-57.

_____. (2014a). Conflicts in rubrics, pedagogy, and EFL writing. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Uttaradit Rajabhat University, 1*(2), 15-30.

_____. (2014b). The modern subject, the postmodern subject, and the reconstruction of the EFL student writer. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Mahasarakham University, 33*(6), 386-397.

Kastman Breuch, L. M. (2002). Post-process "pedagogy": A philosophical exercise. *jac, 22*(1), 119-150.

Kennedy, M. L. (1998). (Ed.). *Theorizing composition: A critical sourcebook of theory and scholarship in contemporary composition studies.* The United States: Library of Congress Cataloging.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of second language writing, 12*(2003), 65-83.

McComiskey, B. (2000). Teaching composition as a social process. Logan: Utah State University Press.

Mu, C. (2005). A taxonomy of ESL writing strategies. In *Proceedings Redesigning Pedagogy: Research, Policy, Practice.* 1-10. Accessed from https://eprints.qut.edu.au/secure/00000064/01/congjun-mu_paper.doc.

Murray, D. M. (1997). Teaching writing as a process not product. In Victor Villanueva (ed.), *Cross-talk in comp theory: A reader* (pp. 3-6). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Nieto, S. (1999). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* White Plain, New York: Longman.

Olson G. A. (2002). Toward a post-process composition. In Geraldine DeLuca, Len Fox, Mark-Ameen Johnson, and Myra Kogen. (Eds.). *Dialogue on Writing: Rethinking ESL, Basic Writing, and First-Year Composition* (pp. 233-41). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

วารสารศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่
ปีที่ 11 ฉบับที่ 1 เดือนมกราคม - มิถุนายน 2562
Journal of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Vol.11 , No.1 January - June 2019

29

Polio, C. (2014). The acquisition of second language writing. In S. M. Gass and A. Mackey. *The Routledge handbook of language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. In MLA, *Profession 91* (pp. 33-40). New York: MLA.

Puengpipatrakul, W. (2013). Assessment of Thai EFL undergraduates' writing competence through integrated feedback. *Journal of Institutional Research in South East Asia, 11*(1), 16-27.

Rustipa, K. (2016). The structure and adequate development of English as a foreign language learners' paragraphs: A case study. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 6*(2), 133-139.

Spring, J. (2002). *American education.* Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Varnum, R. (1992). The history of composition: Reclaiming our lost generations. *Journal of Advanced Writing, 12*(1), 39-55.

Xiao, Y. (2007). Applying metacognition in EFL writing instruction in China. *Reflections on English Language Teaching, 6*(1), 19-33.