

ประโยชน์ของการเกิดซ้ำของความคิด การหักเหของความคิดและ
ความไม่ตรงความคิดในการเขียน แนวการสอนแบบผสมผสาน
The Benefits of Recursion, Discursion, and Indeterminacy in Writing:
A Mixed Approach

ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร.สมศักดิ์ แก้วนุช

Assistant Professor Dr.Somsak Kaewnuch

มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏพิบูลสงคราม

Pibulsongkram Rajabhat University

บทคัดย่อ

ในสาขาวิชาการเขียนนั้นมีรูปแบบการสอนที่สำคัญ 3 รูปแบบ คือ การสอนแบบกึ่งเก่าใหม่ (current-traditional) การสอนแบบกระบวนการ (process) และการสอนแบบหลังกระบวนการ (post-process) โดยการสอนแบบกึ่งเก่าใหม่และการสอนแบบกระบวนการนั้น เป็นการสอนที่มุ่งเน้นความสามารถภายในสมองบนความเชื่อที่ว่าผู้เขียนเป็นศูนย์กลางของภาษา และเป็นการสอนที่ให้โครงสร้างและความมีประสิทธิภาพของการเขียน อย่างไรก็ตามการสอนทั้งสองรูปแบบนั้นมีลักษณะบีบให้ผู้เรียนอยู่ในกรอบ ซึ่งถือว่าขัดแย้งกับธรรมชาติของการเขียน ในทางตรงกันข้ามการสอนแบบหลังกระบวนการ เป็นการศึกษาที่มุ่งเน้นการเรียนรู้จากภายนอกบนแนวคิดที่ว่าผู้เขียนเป็นผลมาจากสังคมและไม่บีบผู้เรียนให้อยู่ในกรอบ บทความนี้อธิบายลักษณะธรรมชาติสำคัญ 3 ประการของการเขียน ได้แก่ การเกิดซ้ำของความคิด (recursion) การหักเหของความคิด (discursion) และความไม่ตรงความคิด (indeterminacy) ซึ่งทั้ง 3 ลักษณะนี้จะพบได้ในการสอนแบบหลังกระบวนการมากกว่าในการสอนแบบกึ่งเก่าใหม่ และการสอนแบบกระบวนการ การสอนแบบหลัง

กระบวนการที่เปิดโอกาสให้มีการเกิดซ้ำของความคิด การหักเหของความคิด และความไม่ตรงกับความคิด จะปลดปล่อยผู้เรียน เปิดโอกาสให้ผู้เรียนได้สำรวจความคิดมากขึ้น และค้นหาความรู้จากภายนอกมากขึ้น ยิ่งไปกว่านั้นยังเปิดโอกาสให้เกิดทางเลือก ความคิดสร้างสรรค์ หรือแม้แต่ความความไม่กระจำงที่ต้องอาศัยการตีความ อย่างไรก็ตาม เราควรใช้การสอนทั้ง 3 รูปแบบ เพราะทั้งหมดนั้นมีทั้งจุดแข็งและจุดอ่อน

คำสำคัญ: การเขียน, การเกิดซ้ำของความคิด, การหักเหของความคิด, ความไม่ตรงกับความคิด

Abstract

There are three major approaches in the field of Composition: current-traditional, process, and post-process. Current-traditional and process approaches, based on inner-directed education and the notion that the writer is the center of discourse, exploit the cognitive faculty. They provide writing with structure and effectiveness, but they are thought to be suppressive and to impose unrealistic writing act. Post-process, on the other hand, is outer-directed education that views the writer as the effect of society and that does not suppress students or impose form. The present paper elaborates on recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy, which are natural characteristics of writing that are considered more in the post-process approach than in current-traditional and process approaches. Teaching recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy liberates students, makes them explore what exactly they want to say, and allows them to seek knowledge for themselves. Furthermore, it provides content, and open up possibility, creativity, and even

confusion that needs interpretation. However, the present paper takes a careful stance and suggests that all three approaches be mixed together because they all have both strengths and weaknesses.

Keywords: writing recursion discursion indeterminacy

Introduction

In the field of Composition, post-process pedagogy emerged in the 1990s (Matsuda, 2003) and is now the latest approach in the field. Prior to its appearance, two approaches that had paved the way for its emergence were the current-traditional approach, alias the product approach, and the process approach. Current-traditional rhetoric emphasizes correctness and form, and it divides discourse into exposition, description, narration, and argumentation (Crowley, 1998; Kaewnuch, 2014). By focusing on correctness and form, it is blamed for being teacher-centered and for suppressing students. Process pedagogy, respecting student authority, came out in reaction to the suppressive view of current-traditional rhetoric. This approach attends to the act of writing, demarcating it into stages, such as beginning, middle, and ending. Finally, post-process appeared to attack process instruction for trying to generalize and universalize the writing act.

Post-process theorists, such as Thomas Kent and Gary Olson, argues that the act of writing is situated, interpretative, and indeterminate (Breuch, 2002), and also that the mental activities that occur in one's mind while one is composing, such as generating ideas, evaluating ideas, editing the writing, and revising it, do not occur in a linear fashion or only in certain

stages, but all over. This post-process argument agrees with the postmodern idea that a discourse is a collage. Simply defined, a collage refers to a discourse whose meaning varies from one viewer or reader to another. A viewer can juxtapose a variety of combinations of, for example, images, stories, events, etc., thereby creating many possible meanings (Bressler, 2003). This very same postmodern idea is understood, accepted, and adopted by post-process theorists. However, in writing, it is not the viewer but the writer who encounters the many possibilities of saying something. The exact meaning, now, is viewed as always eluding from the writer, making it hard for the writer to grasp it firm. As a result, many post-process theorists see the division of the writing act into stages as problematic. For them, the writing act is not teachable.

There are still other aspects of post-process theory, but the present paper will focus on three characteristics of the writing act, that is, being recursive, discursive, and indeterminate. Kent (1993)'s assertion that the writing act is situated, interpretative, and indeterminate is correct. One's writing certainly depends on the situation, the audience, the occasion of the writing, the interpretation of ideas, actions of others, events, and so on that come to the one's mind as one undergoes writing. The present paper will not elaborate on being situated and interpretative of the writing act, however. Instead, it will look into being indeterminate, and two other properties of the writing act, being recursive and discursive, which Kent does not mention. In writing, recursion refers to the act of constant prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing in the writing process; that is, the writer does all these activities

all the time, not one after another. Discursion is the constant wandering from one point to another. Indeterminacy refers to the state of being unable to say something accurately. All writers surely encounter these three phenomena while writing. While these phenomena could be seen as obstructing or delaying the writing, they allow many possibilities for the writer to choose to better his or her writing.

In the sections below, we will first examine recursion, discussion, and indeterminacy in theories and approaches of writing instruction. The author will examine how they are related to theories and approaches in the field of Composition. Second, we will take a close look into recursion, discussion, and indeterminacy in the act of writing. After that, based on the knowledge in the previous sections, we will consider how we might apply these three features to teaching writing.

Recursion, Discursion, and Indeterminacy in Theories and Approaches

No research study that explains the states of recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy in writing has been found, except for giving definitions. Perhaps, it is because they are seen as obstacles rather than advantages to writing. This paper looks at them differently; they are beneficial. And the author thinks that we should study these phenomena from the state of the writer's mind, as they occur in the mind. To start from there, we must distinguish between the coherent and the incoherent mind, and also between inner-directed and outer-directed education.

The idea that the mind is capable of being coherent is laid by modern thinkers, such as René Descartes, who believes that knowledge begins with the self and that Reason is thought to be the best guide to life (Bressler, 2003). Reason is, thus, like a filter for the purity of mind, and it makes the mind stay focused and coherent, of course with the ability to get rid of distractions. In addition, this pure, transcendental mind is independent of culture and society. Much of the teaching of writing relies on this rational mind. Students are thought of as equipped with the knowledge to say something aptly. As Bizzell (1997) puts it, "[w]e used to assume that students came to us with ideas and we helped them put those ideas into words. We taught style, explaining the formal properties of model essays and evaluating students' products in the light of these models" (p. 365). Bizzell goes on saying that "[w]e agree that the normal human individual possesses innate mental capacities to learn language and to assemble complex conceptual structures" (p. 366).

Bizzell views such education that relies on mental abilities as inner-directed, and we see that much of writing instruction takes on this kind of education. Inner-directed education is easily found in current-traditional and process approaches. Current-traditional rhetoric, which has predominated other theories for a hundred of years (Berlin, 1987), emphasizes form over content and stresses grammar, syntax, spelling, punctuation, mechanics, and modes of writing (expository, description, narration, and argument) (Crowley, 1998; Kennedy, 1998). There is no attention to the influence of recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy in current-traditional rhetoric. Next, process

instruction also views the writer as coherent and capable of dividing the act of writing into stages and recognizing those stages. Most books that teach the writing process, such as *College Writing* by Zemach and Rumisek (2003) and Zemach and Islam (2005), describe it as a linear process, usually starting from generating ideas, to drafting and writing, and finally to revising and editing. No book has been found that really explains how recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy occur in the writing process. However, Flower and Hayes (1997)'s cognitive model of the writing process is more detailed, showing that while writing, the writer exploits many sources of knowledge. Figure 1 (p. 256) demonstrates that the writer keeps thinking about the topic, writing plan, audience, and exigency. The writer keeps considering the text produced so far and keeps using monitoring devices. Therefore, although the figure displays three separate stages of the writing process (planning, translating, and reviewing), or in other words, although it still illustrates that writing is linear, to some extent it shows that writing involves not just one mental process but many mental processes overlapping each other. Thus, it begins to show that writing is recursive, discursive, and indeterminate, although this approach should pay most attention to these traits of writing.

Both current-traditional and process approaches are inner-directed education, as they rely upon mental abilities and value individual intelligence, and also treat the subject of the locus of discourse. Inner-directed theorists, as Bizzel (1977) points out, try to discover writing processes that are universal, that learners across the globe can emulate. By stressing the power of the mind, they, therefore, overlook or even disavow the effects of culture



and society on writing. Current-traditional rhetoric, we can assume, pays little or no interest in recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy. The process approach is certainly aware of the three qualities, but not in a natural way. It places revising and editing at the end of the writing process, which is wrong. The writer does the two activities as the time as the writing goes on.

Next, post-process theory arose in reaction to the deficiencies of current-traditional rhetoric and process pedagogy. It fully accepts the effect of society and culture and also the contingent and chaotic state of the mind. Faigley (1986) and Matsuda (2003) consider the emergence of post-process pedagogy as "the social turn." For post-process theorists, writing is social, and this characteristic fits well with Kent and Olson's argument that the writing act is situated, interpretative, and indeterminate and as a result, the writer is unfocused, incoherent, and unstable. Theoretically, it could be understood that post-process perspectives are derived from postmodernism, alias poststructuralism, which stipulates that the subject is by no means coherent, that no objective reality exists, and that each person has his or her own concepts of reality (Blessler, 2003; Faigley, 1992). In other words, no one's mind can articulate something accurately, and it is subjective rather than objective. For this theory, the mind cannot be so concentrated that it can use "Reason" to deal with contingent experiences and to reach the ultimate truth of anything. In other words, the mind alone cannot create knowledge.

Theorists who hold this concept, therefore, see that education must be outer-directed. These theorists believe that "universal, fundamental structures can't be taught; thinking and language use can never occur free of



a social context" (Bizzel, 1997, p. 368). In addition, they believe that within a social context there are many discourse communities overlapping each other. Each individual has unequal access to discourse communities. And as Bizzel (1997) puts it, individuals develop their thinking and language use from stepping out of the native, familiar discourse community toward other outside discourse communities. In the field of Composition, we see several out-directed theorists, such as Kenneth Bruffee (1997), who points out that society authorizes knowledge and so supports collaborative learning, and David Bartholomae (2003), who thinks that students coming to university need to acculturate the academic language.

What we also see from post-process perspectives is the fact that writing is recursive, discursive, and indeterminate. These qualities occur because the writer is not stable, and is the effect of society and culture. Now, it is impossible for the writer to say something accurately from the beginning to the end without incorporating others' ideas or feelings. Recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy are, therefore, implied by post-process theorists to be real characteristics of the writing act.

Recursion, Discursion, and Indeterminacy in Writing

Let us now examine recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy closely. The author uses purely his own understanding about how these features occur in the act of writing. Recursion is, as said above, the constant activities, e.g. generating ideas, drafting, editing, and revising, that happen all the time as the writing goes on. It includes thinking about what the next

paragraph will do and how it will relate to the past paragraphs, and vice versa. It involves trying to be precise and getting rid of redundancies. It includes the recalling of ideas that the writer has previously discarded or chosen not to include and using them somewhere in the writing. It certainly comprises the use of new words or ideas to replace those that have been placed. Recursion also contains difficult decisions about whether to keep or leave an idea. Sometimes the writer wants to keep an idea because it is an important supporting detail, but he thinks too that it makes the writing unnecessarily long and that the other ideas he mentioned earlier can readily prove the point. He, therefore, abandons or removes it. Then at another point further in the writing, the abandoned idea appears in his mind again, and this time the writer thinks that it is crucial to keep it. He thus goes back and revises the earlier point where the recurring idea should stay.

That is one example of recursion. Another example is when the writer comes to one point where he thinks it may sound good to say something to support the point. However, he realizes that he has already said it above. It is now the time for the writer to decide whether to remove it from where he mentioned it above and place it where he is now, whether to ignore it where he is now, or whether to have it in both places. These could be difficult decisions. All writers experience removing an idea, then putting it back, then removing it again, and then putting it back again.

Recursion can occur at the word level, too. It can be the recurring of words in the writer's mind that have been used or discarded, and as a consequence, the writer replaces some words or uses the discarded words

somewhere. Sometimes the writer thinks that he uses a word too often and so he wants to use a synonym. Sometimes the writer thinks that he used a wrong word, so he goes back to remove it and use another word instead. Sometimes he wants to use a stronger or a softer word to replace a softer or a stronger one that he used earlier. Meanwhile, the writer considers how the use of the word would create the tone and his relationship with the audience. Recursion of this kind, which leads to replacing words or ideas with more appropriate ones, occurs all the time and makes writing hard for most people.

The next characteristic of the writing act to focus on is discursion. The adjective "discursive" means wandering from one point to another, one place to another place, one word to another word, and so on. With regard to writing, it describes the writer's mind as instable, dispersed, and unfocused, and capable of wandering. Why does it have these states? Post-process theory explains that the mind is affected by the outside world. The mind goes to a home where a husband is hitting a wife. It sees a lion chasing a deer. It goes to a temple where there are many bamboo trees. It goes to a pond where there are many big lotuses. It goes everywhere. The writer can use any of these ideas in writing.

The human mind, if viewed in post-process lens, is the result or effect of the world. It is imprecise and distracted, and keeps wandering off the point. The condition of the world nowadays, especially in big cities where working and travelling consume most of one's day, especially causes the mind to be so. People of these days have more businesses and interact more with other people, and along with economic suppressions, they cannot

be focused. Actually, we are now supposed to live in the age of postmodernity. Faigley (1992) describes this era as contingent, chaotic, ambiguous, random, and missing the sense of manageable reality. Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) claim that in this age advances in information technology cause cultural transformations and thus open new forms of experience and knowledge. We will not go too far from our point, discursion in the writing act. However, theorists of postmodernism describe the conditions of the mind very well. It is not difficult to agree with them that the mind is in an incoherent state, and that results in the discursive nature of writing. Also, the mind contains new forms of experience and knowledge that can be reflected in writing.

Surprisingly, discursion in the mind is a vast entity; the mind is drawn to all times, places, and activities of life. A past event thirty years ago can draw the mind back. A planned trip to a foreign country can arouse the mind to imagine what the country will be like. Upon seeing someone for the first time, we may think of an old friend and an exciting event we witnessed with him. When we pass a place, we may think of another place similar to it. These are just a few of a million incidents the mind can reach. Mental pictures and ideas compete with each other to show up in the writer's mind and so distract the writer. When one of the competing ideas sounds good, the writer may decide to use it.

An example of discursion is an essay about a boy, his grandmother, and a jackfruit tree. The essay describes a jackfruit tree a young boy planted thirty years ago with the suggestion and help of his grandmother who had

been, the boy thought, mean and bad-tempered (The mind goes back to the day the boy planted the tree). In retrospection, the boy, now a successful young man, thinks that his dead grandmother was not bad at all for him. Instead, she taught him many useful lessons (The mind envisions what the boy did that now proves to be useful). At the end of the story, the writer thought of the significance of the jackfruit tree and why he mentions it at the beginning. He used the word "rope" as the connection between the boy and his grandmother, and between the present and the past. A rope is physically used for tying things together or for making a line from one place to another. Words that can be used interchangeably with "rope" are "bridge," "stream," "mirror," or "vehicle," depending on where the writer's mind goes while the writer is writing, or depending on what word emerges. Discursion, therefore, offers so many possibilities.

Finally, we have come to indeterminacy, an important characteristic of writing. Indeterminacy is the state of inaccuracy. Consider the jackfruit essay again. It was written from the main idea that the grandmother was thought to be unkind and not lovable at the beginning but at the end she was adorable. The writer could have chosen a different situation or symbol rather than the jackfruit tree to create the relationship between the boy and the grandmother. And even though the jackfruit tree had been chosen as the symbol, the story could have ended differently and so had a different effect on the reader. In brief, although the main idea is the same, indeterminacy leads the writer to different directions and is an important key of success or failure. Another point about this characteristic is the writer cannot say or

describe accurately what is what. What he says in writing is just some representation of the whole idea he wants to present, half of it, seventy, eighty, or ninety percent of it, but never one hundred percent. If students are informed of this characteristic of writing and encouraged to explore more about the topic, they will have more ideas to write. Therefore, indeterminacy opens up new possibilities or new details for the writer to choose and finally their writing will be more convincing and focused.

Applying Recursion, discursion, and Indeterminacy to Teaching Writing

Possibilities and new forms of experience and culture are key to constructing recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy in writing. However, when thinking about incorporating these qualities with writing instruction, it is advisable that we consider how they relate to theories and pedagogies in Composition. First of all, rethink of the three qualities. The explanations in the two sections above show that there is a struggle between the mind and society. Recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy occur in the mind, and the mind has to overcome or control, or make use of them for better writing. However, it is not easy, for currents of ideas, events, experiences, pictures, etc. from the outside world keep coming into the mind.

In such a situation, how should we benefit from the three qualities? We must create a balance between inner-directed and outer-directed strategies, between the mind on one side and culture and experience on the other. Therefore, when we consider the three major approaches in Composition together, it seems clear that combining all of them is an

intelligent choice. The inner-directed methods, current-traditional rhetoric and process, are useful because writing cannot be effective without structure, especially in the academia and in a society that relies on English for higher education and professions. Without it, the writing is redundant, scattered, circuitous, and unfocused. But it is the outer-directed, post-process approach that provides information for filling the structure. In other words, we should combine the strengths of the two kinds of education. Theorists often fail to look at the strengths of the old method. For example, Dewey (1997) only describes the flaws of traditional education (education from within) and the usefulness of his progressive education (education from without). In writing instruction, however, the traditional education, current-traditional rhetoric, which emphasizes form and linguistic competence, is always demanded by the academic world.

However, there are models to choose. In the English as a foreign language (EFL) context, where students need the language as a tool, they may learn the grammar, spellings, syntax, and mechanics first. These can be codified and teachable (Kent, 1993). And as developing linguistic competence is a necessary element of the EFL writing classroom, current-traditional instruction can be anywhere and as much as the teacher finds it necessary. On the other hand, in an English-speaking context, where students already have the language as the tool, post-process strategies, or education from the outside, should come before the strategies of current-traditional and process approaches. To be more specific, for a writing task, process instruction, which involves mostly generating ideas, sorting ideas, revising, and understanding

the rhetorical situation, should come before current-traditional rhetoric activities, which involves mostly editing. The reverse of approaches—post-process, process, and current-traditional—could be seen as a good method. This model would really benefit from recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy, because it allows the writer to explore the culture, experience, society, and texts related to the topic before putting the content into the last, polished organization.

The principle of making use of recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy is encouraging students to study as many sources for their writing as possible so as to open up new possibilities. It is inadequate then that students use only their private, earliest experiences (Bizzell, 1997). Students would discover many more possibilities from the outside world. Learning from the outside world, such as by reading two or three contradictory texts, watching a few videos on the same topic, interviewing people, chatting on the Internet, discussing with friends, and giving out questionnaires, makes students understand the topic better. They, in addition, have more knowledge, more vocabulary, and more details about the topic. The more knowledge and details about the topic students get from various sources, the more their writing become recursive, discursive, and indeterminate. These should be viewed not as obstacles but as advantages; they allow the writer to revise the writing more effectively throughout the writing process.

However, students are often not good at thinking of details, of finding examples or reasons to support a point, or they are often not critical

enough, and as a result, they cannot fully exploit recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy. The author identifies with Holliday (1987), who claims that writing gains power by its density, but the problem is our students' writing often lacks details, reasons, or examples, or lacks the language that emotionally ties the audience. Recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy are probably three of many other qualities that can solve those problems. The teacher, therefore, should step in and help students increase the three qualities in the processes of their writing.

The clue for incorporating recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy is the connection between the mind and society, because they are caused by society and brought into the mind. Knowledge from theorists is useful in bridging the gap, and teachers can explain it to students. A lot of knowledge that connects the mind and society comes from cognitive linguistics. For example, Bosmajian (1983) points out that words such as "contaminate," "black parasites," and "poison," used metaphorically, can exert more power and so arouse anger. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Evans (2012) points out that language consists of conceptual structures, such as ARGUMENT IS WAR, which leads to the use of words such as *defend*, *die*, *eat*, *kill*, *won*, *attack*, *hit*, and so on. These help students to say more, thus allowing more recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy in their writing processes. Lakoff and Johnson especially focus on personifications that prevail in daily life. Personifications such as "Life has cheated me" and "Inflation is eating up our profits" make writing lively and realistic. Turner (1991) elaborates on imaginary language, for example, how the power of one troop pushes that of

another troop on an imagined line, or how a tree walks to a lake. The language suggested by cognitive linguists denotes unreal events, but it empowers writing because it conveys power endowed by society. For instance, in the real world, parasites, animals or plants, are viewed as taking advantages of others. If someone were metaphorically described as a parasite, they would be hated or scorned. Another example is the word "coldness." It is more often used objectively, as in "Coldness destroys the plants" than abstractly, "Parental coldness made him leave home." The language of cognitive linguistics, as the examples show, enable students to say more and thus helps increase recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy, and also solves the problem of lack of density.

In addition, teachers who believe in the effect of society on writing should accept a new form of writing assessment. As Broad (2003), Huot (2002), and Kaewnuch (2014) point out, conventional writing assessment relies on conformity, reductionism, and reliability. Such assessment would not integrate recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy, because these qualities welcome possibility, creativity, uncertainty, and even confusion. Teachers should accept these because writing is now thought of as an art that, like the work of Picasso, requires interpretation. In fact, we should agree that the success of writing depends more on the content rather than form. Broad (2003) points to the exact textual qualities that writing teachers value, such as *sincerity, effort, moral, mature, elegance, change in author, thinking, and analysis*. These qualities would not be fully supported if the teacher sticks to the conventional assessment. Wilson (2006), too, accepts the social aspect of



writing, claiming that her students' writing would get lower scores if she follows rubrics. Instead, she looks for the emotional engagement in the writing. So, for her, even if a piece of writing is riddled with errors, it is still powerful. By taking a social stance toward writing, these theorists implicitly accommodate recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy in their instruction.

Conclusion

The present article has attempted to say that recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy, features that all writers encounter while writing, are not obstacles to writing. Instead, these qualities are sources of effective writing because they offer many possibilities for saying something and allow the writer to say more and to choose what ideas or words to keep or leave. As a result, the writing is effective.

However, it is advisable that all three approaches (current-traditional, process, and post-process) be mixed in the teaching. On one side, writing is effective because of organization, grammar purity, and sentence structure. Writing that is tight, subtle, and minimalist is often powerful. On the other side, structure needs to fill in, and this must be quality content derived from much thought. Incorporating recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy means encouraging students to think more to come up with quality content. In the meantime, the teacher must be willing to accept creativity, abnormality, possibility, and even confusion in students' writing. Writing must be thought of as an art that awaits interpretation. Finally, to comply with post-process perspectives, the model for combining the three approaches should depend



on the context, but it is preferred that post-process methods aimed at increasing recursion, discursion, and indeterminacy are emphasized and come before process and current-traditional methods.

References

- Bartholomae, D. (2003) Inventing the university. In V. Villanueva (Ed.), **Cross-talk in comp theory: A reader** (2nd ed., pp. 623-653). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Berlin, J. A. (1987). **Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American colleges, 1900-1985**. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.
- Bizzell, P. (1997). Cognition, convention, and certainty: What we need to know about writing. In V. Villanueva (Ed.), **Cross-talk in comp theory: A reader** (pp. 365-389). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Bosmajian, H. (1983). **The language of oppression**. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Bressler, C. E. (2003). **Literary criticism: An introduction to theory and practice**. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Breuch, L. K. (2002). Post-process "pedagogy": A philosophical exercise. **jac**, 22(1), 119-150.
- Broad, B. (2003). **What we really value: Beyond rubrics in teaching and assessing writing**. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.

- Bruffee, K. A. (1997). Collaborative learning and the "conversation of mankind." In V Villanueva (Ed.), **Cross-talk in comp theory: A reader** (393-414). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). **Discourse in the late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis**. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University.
- Crowley, S. (1998). **Composition in the university: Historical and polemical essays**. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.
- Dewey, J. (1997). **Experience and education**. New York: Free Press.
- Evans, V. (2012). Cognitive linguistics. **WIREs Cogn Sci** 2012.
doi:1.1002/wcs.1163
- Faigley, L. (1986). Competing theories of process: A critique and proposal. **College English**, Vol.48, 527-542.
- Faigley, L. (1992). **Fragments of rationality: Postmodernity and the subject of composition**. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1997). A cognitive process theory of writing. In V. Villanueva (Ed.), **Cross-talk in comp theory: A reader** (251-275). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

- Halliday, M. A. K. (1987). Language and the order of nature. In Nigel Fabb et al. (Eds.), *The linguistics of writing: Arguments between language and literature* (135-154). Manchester: Manchester University.
- Huot, B. (2002). *(Re)articulating writing assessment for teaching and learning*. Logan, Utah: Utah State University.
- Kaewnuch, S. (2014). Conflicts in rubrics, pedagogy, and EFL writing. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Uttaradit Rajabhat University*, 1(2), 15-30. (in Thai).
- Kennedy, M. L. (1998). *Theorizing composition: A critical sourcebook of theory and scholarship in contemporary composition studies*. The United States: Library of Congress Cataloging.
- Kent, T. (1993). *Paralogic rhetoric: A theory of communicative interaction*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of second language writing*, 12(2003), 65-83.
- Turner, M. (1991). *Reading minds: The study of English in the age of cognitive science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

- Wilson, M. (2006). **Rethinking rubrics in writing assessment**. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Zemach, D. E. & Islam, C. (2005). **Paragraph writing: From sentence to paragraph**. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Zemach, D. E., & Rumisek, L. A. (2003). **College writing: From paragraph to essay**. Oxford: Macmillan.

