

Reader-Writer Codes and Relationships : Qualities of Power in Current-Traditional and Expressivist Pedagogies

**รหัสเชื่อมโยงความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียน
และกลวิธีสำหรับการสร้างพลังทางการเขียนตามแนวการสอน
แบบกึ่งเก่ากึ่งใหม่และแบบแสดงตัวตน**

Dr. Somsak Kaewnuch

Abstract

This study aims at investigating qualities of power in current-traditional and expressivist pedagogies in Thai students' writing. It focuses on qualities related to writing power that affect relationship building between the reader and the writer as well as its characteristics, reader-writer codes, and strategies and techniques for empowering writing. In addition, a survey of student problems in writing and an investigation of levels of inter-rating correlations concerning writing power in students' writing are conducted. The subjects were 20 students taking a composition course in the first semester of 2010 at Srinakharinwirot University. The research instruments were 1) teaching materials aimed at explaining writing power, reader-writer codes and relationships, and strategies and techniques for empowering writing, 2) an article on writing power, reader-writer codes and relationships, and techniques and strategies for empowering writing for three guest readers, and 3) an evaluation form for the three guest readers and the researcher to assess writing power in the students' writing. Four readers, including the researcher, read 40 papers from the 20 students and looked for the techniques and strategies for empowering writing by using the evaluation form. The researcher also used codes to find more empowering qualities, strategies, techniques, and reader-writer relationships and codes. It was found that students did not express the qualities of power systematically, resulting in unidentifiable or unclear reader-writer relationships. They failed to understand or make use of reader-writer codes in an effective manner. The study found 29 empowering quality techniques related to grammar and sentence skills

(9%), organization (19%), and reader connection (or mental relation) (72%). The study found 13 problems concerning inability to write grammatically and in good sentences (32%), inability to organize ideas (21%), and inability to mentally connect with readers (47%). Finally, the readers gave high levels of inter-rating correlation to qualities related to grammar, sentence skills, and organization and low levels to those related to subjective judgments. While this research implies a possibility of combining current-traditional and expressivist pedagogies, it reveals that teachers and students need to learn more about writing power, reader-writer codes and relationships, and techniques for empowering writing.

Key words Writing Power, Writing Assessment, Reader-Writer Code, Reader-Writer Relationship, Empowering Writing, Current-Traditional Pedagogy, Expressivist Pedagogy

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยชั้นนี้ศึกษาคุณภาพ (qualities) การเขียนตามแนวการสอนแบบ current-traditional และ expressivist ในงานเขียนของนักเรียนไทยในส่วนที่เกี่ยวกับการสร้างความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียน (reader-writer relationship) ลักษณะของความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียน ความเข้าใจรหัสเชื่อมโยงระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียน (reader-writer codes) กลวิธี (strategies) และเทคนิค (techniques) ที่ใช้เพิ่มพลังในการเขียน ปัญหาในการเขียนของนิสิต และความสอดคล้องในการประเมินผลของผู้อ่านหลายคน (inter-rating correlation) กลุ่มตัวอย่างคือนิสิตที่เรียนรายวิชาเรียงความ 1 (Composition I) ในภาคการศึกษาที่ 1 ปีการศึกษา 2553 ที่มหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ จำนวน 20 คน เครื่องมือวิจัยคือ 1) สื่อการสอนเพื่ออธิบายเรื่องพลังในการเขียน ความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียน รหัสเชื่อมโยงระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียน กลวิธีและเทคนิคในการเพิ่มพลังในการเขียน 2) บทความสำหรับผู้อ่านรับเชิญ 3 คนซึ่งเป็นบทความเกี่ยวกับพลังในการเขียน ความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียนรหัสเชื่อมโยงระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียนกลวิธีและเทคนิคในการเพิ่มพลังในการเขียน และ 3) แบบประเมินคุณภาพงานเขียนโดยผู้อ่านรับเชิญร่วมกับผู้วิจัย ผู้อ่านทั้ง 4 คนอ่านงาน 40 ชิ้นจากนิสิต และวิเคราะห์หาเทคนิคและกลวิธีที่ทำให้การเขียนมีพลังโดยใช้แบบประเมิน นอกจากนี้ผู้วิจัยยังใช้รหัส (codes) เพื่อศึกษาลักษณะของพลังในการเขียน ความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียน รหัสเชื่อมโยงระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียน กลวิธี และเทคนิคในการเพิ่มพลังในการเขียนเพิ่มเติม ผลการวิจัยพบว่าโดยส่วนใหญ่นิสิตแสดงคุณภาพที่เกี่ยวข้องกับพลังในการเขียนอย่างไม่เป็นระบบ ดังนั้นงานเขียนของนิสิตส่วนมากจึงไม่สร้างความสัมพันธ์ที่ชัดเจนระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียน นอกจากนี้นิสิตยังมีความเข้าใจเรื่องรหัสเชื่อมโยงระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียนในระดับ

ต่ำ การวิจัยครั้งนี้พบเทคนิคที่ให้พลังของการเขียน 29 เทคนิค คือ ด้านไวยากรณ์และทักษะด้านประโยค (9%) ทักษะการเรียบเรียง (19%) ทักษะการเชื่อมโยงกับผู้อ่าน (72%) และพบปัญหาที่ทำให้งานเขียนขาดพลังของการเขียน 13 ปัญหา คือ ด้านไวยากรณ์และทักษะด้านประโยค (32%) ทักษะการเรียบเรียง (21%) ทักษะการเชื่อมโยงกับผู้อ่าน (47%) ผู้อ่านทั้ง 4 ท่านประเมินผลตรงกันด้านไวยากรณ์ ทักษะประโยคและทักษะการเรียบเรียงในระดับสูง แต่มีความเห็นสอดคล้องกันเกี่ยวกับเกณฑ์การวัดด้านอารมณ์ ความเชื่อและความรู้สึกในระดับต่ำ งานวิจัยชิ้นนี้จึงแสดงให้เห็นว่าควรมีการใช้แนวการสอนแบบ current-traditional และ expressivist ร่วมกัน งานวิจัยชิ้นนี้ยังแสดงให้เห็นว่าทั้งอาจารย์และนิสิตควรได้รับการศึกษาเพิ่มเติมเป็นพิเศษเกี่ยวกับพลังในการเขียน ความสัมพันธ์และรหัสเชื่อมโยงระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียน กลวิธีและเทคนิคที่ใช้เพิ่มพลังในการเขียน

คำสำคัญ พลังในการเขียน การวัดผลประเมินผลทางการเขียน รหัสเชื่อมโยงผู้อ่านและผู้เขียน ความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างผู้อ่านและผู้เขียน การเพิ่มพลังในการเขียน

Introduction

The teaching and evaluating of EFL (English as a foreign language) writing is a paradox between controlling students to write and giving them freedom. We want students to write grammatically and in good organization, yet when we find that they produce plain and dry prose, we long for emotional, passionate writing that allows us to think or share something with them. In this trap, teachers of EFL writing should learn about theories developed in the fields of Pedagogy, Composition, and Writing Assessment in order to find good ways to teach writing. By considering the different theories, teachers will be able to design a course syllabus that fits the philosophy of their own teaching.

This research presents the contradictories of two theories—current-traditional rhetoric and expressivist rhetoric, both of which have their own merits and demerits. The teaching of current-traditional rhetoric emphasizes correctness, organization, and language style. These are apparently inherent advantages of this rhetoric in the EFL writing classroom. At least, the basic requirement of any writing is the reader's understanding of the message conveyed. Correctness, organization, and clear language certainly contribute to the reader's understanding. Current-traditional rhetoric emphasizes grammar teaching. According to Adam Sherman Hill (Crowley, 1998; citing Hill, 1878). "The foundations of [current-traditional] rhetoric rest upon grammar; for grammatical purity is a requisite of good writing" The hidden goal of this pedagogy is, in fact, to teach students to write effectively, as well as powerfully, through the use of good grammar.

In reality, however, when this pedagogy is applied, especially in the EFL context, the teacher usually dominates the classroom, making the student afraid of expressing themselves. The reason is that the teacher knows more grammar than the student. Even in the English-speaking context, the teacher of current-traditional pedagogy makes the student learn what Hill calls “pure English” (Crowley. 1998). Taught in this pedagogy, therefore, the student is more obsessed with producing grammatically correct sentences than with considering whether his or her writing conveys what he or she wants to say.

On the contrary, expressivist pedagogy has been seen as respecting of students’ agency. It could also be said that this pedagogy helps students to understand the rhetorical situation of the writing unconsciously, making them better aware of the basic elements of writing, which are language, context, purpose, audience, and occasion (Reid. 2006). Expressivist practitioners also believe that the contingent nature of writing leads to possibilities, and thus to new knowledge. However, one perceivable disadvantage of this pedagogy might be that it gives so much freedom that the inexperienced student, especially the EFL student who is not fluent in the language, is left not knowing what to do or how to progress, and without guidance, the work of the EFL writer would be so random and discontinuous that the teacher finds it confusing.

Because both current-traditional and expressivist pedagogies have their own advantages and disadvantages, a combination of them must be, therefore, a good alternative in the teaching of EFL writing. It is impossible for students to learn a foreign language without knowing the basic grammar. However, in any classroom part of the time spent teaching should be spent helping students to learn more knowledge, to understand themselves, and to see the connections between themselves and the world, and expressivist methodologies should be able to help teachers accomplish all these.

The literature review of this research will show that recent movements in Pedagogy, Composition, and Writing Assessment are heading towards teaching as a means of creating desirable social subjects, and also towards seeing knowledge as socially constructed. In Composition, the movements from product, process, and post-process pedagogies show this trend clearly. Expressivist practitioners also identify with theorists in other areas that the student is capable of learning new things, sharing information with others, and analyzing information in order to present information worthwhile knowing for others.

This research is based on the assumption that both current-traditional and expressivist pedagogies produce qualities of good writing, that is, qualities that create good relationships between readers and writers. In other words, the research has tried to study what qualities from the two pedagogies contribute to writing power. It was anticipated that the power included attitudes, likes,

or dislikes about the form or organization, grammar, and language competence that are emphasized by current-traditional methodology, and beliefs, values, or mental exchanges stressed by expressivist pedagogy. The research aimed to explore especially reader-writer codes, reader-writer relationships, and strategies and techniques that writers may use to empower their writing, all of which are related to the power shared between the writer and the reader, and all of which are also linked to qualities of both pedagogies.

This paper presents the literature review of related theories, which includes the reasons why this research has been conducted, the methodology, the findings, and the discussion and conclusion respectively.

Literature Review

For the most part, the EFL writing classroom adopts current-traditional rhetoric, which emphasizes correctness, arrangement, and style (Kaewnuch. 2009; Crowley. 1998). The way we teach that focuses on sentence skills and the way we evaluate writing that uses common criteria prove that we apply current-traditional rhetoric. The criteria that we normally use are the same as those adopted by ETS (Educational Testing Service) researchers in order to improve inter-rating correlation; they are *ideas, style, organization, paragraphing, sentence structure, mechanics, and verbal facility* (Broad. 2003; Diederich; French; & Carlton. 1961). These criteria clearly show an emphasis on grammaticality and organization.

There are certainly many consequences of this obsession with current-traditional pedagogy. For example, it takes our time from considering other qualities apart from those related to language and form. The qualities that receive less attention are involved with creating desirable subjectivities. Theorists most fields, for example Education, Pedagogy, Literature, and so on, point out that we need creative, critical, and ethical citizens for the well-being of the society. The teaching that focuses on grammaticality may not very well inculcate those qualities in students. Another disadvantage of this pedagogy is that it has a punitive and pervasive nature (Huot. 2003). Grammar is a vast area, and is about almost anything from the use of *a, an, and the* to the use of noun clauses. When a student uses *a* or *the* wrong, a point may be deducted. In addition, grammatical errors are easy to spot. Current-traditional pedagogy is punitive in that it makes students afraid of making errors, and in that it views students as objects of evaluation. One disadvantage related to students' fear of making errors is that in the classroom, the teacher is often found dominating the students. Students become passive learners and always wait for the teacher to say what they need to do. When the teacher teaches grammatical rules and corrects errors for students, they become even more passive. One more

drawback of this pedagogy is that it sees writing as linear, as if there were certain tasks involved with producing a piece of writing to be done one after another, and not recursively. The pedagogy also sees genres of writing as separated from each other, as if one were better than another and as if no combination among them could be made (Kennedy. 1998; citing Crowley. 1990). To put it differently, practitioners of current-traditional pedagogy forget that by nature writing itself is discursive, random, ambiguous, and chaotic (Faigley. 1992). With those disadvantages, this pedagogy is often accused of suppressing students.

The approaches and practices of current-traditional rhetoric, therefore, are opposed to recent trends in many fields of education. For example, in Literature there is a move from structuralism that views practices and activities of human beings as governed by universal structures to theories of poststructuralism, deconstructionism, and postmodernism that accept differences and new possibilities, thus creating numerous ways of acquiring knowledge (Bressler. 2003). The philosophy of current-traditional pedagogy and structuralism is rooted in the belief that “codes, signs, and rules govern all human social and cultural practices” (Kaewnuch. 2008: 44; Bressler. 2003). Similarly, the movements within the field of Composition reveal that writing was first thought of as static and reproducible and now is thought of as rhetorical and produced through negotiations of different discourses. For example, Berlin (1987) mentions four main groups of practitioners: current-traditional, expressivist, cognitivist, and epistemic. Faigley (1986) identifies three views or trends: expressive, cognitive, and social. McComiskey (2000) points out three levels of writing signifying pedagogical methods: textual, rhetorical, and discursive. Berlin’s current-traditional pedagogy is at the same level as McComiskey’s textual teaching method. First, the writing, or the product, was the focus of teaching and learning writing. Then more attention was given to the writer and finally to how he or she learns or acquires knowledge from society. Expressivist pedagogy is rooted in expressivist rhetoric or expressive view, but to some extent it incorporates rhetorical aspects.

Practitioners of expressivist pedagogy maintain that the writer is the center of the discourse, able to control its own destiny. There are many other theories or theorists that support this notion. For example, Husserl (Eagleton. 1996: 50; citing Husserl. 1964) says that the human subject is believed to be “the source and origin of all meaning”. Rene Descartes believes that the world is what man posits or intends or that the world is to be grasped in relation to man (Bressler. 2003). The modern subject, as opposed to the postmodern subject, is defined as “a sovereign subject taking itself to be the solid guarantor of the meaning” (Readings. 1996: 153), “an end in itself” (Biesta. 1995: 1), and “the locus of intentionality” (Martin. 1992: 93). Holding such beliefs as these, practitioners of expressivist pedagogy give as much freedom as possible to students to express themselves, believing that they can discover knowledge and develop good human qualities by themselves.

However, many theorists in Composition now are supporters of collaborative learning. For instance, Bruffee (1993) believes that different cultures are sources of knowledge, thus students should learn from each other. Jung (2005) points out that a process of delayed convergence (agreement among group members) enables students to hear a *full* range of different voices, and in this way different pieces information are put together, and so new knowledge is created. Connolly and Vilardi (Miller, 1991; citing Connolly; & Vilardi. 1986). suggest that for students to write successfully, the teaching should be involved with 1) student exposure to a variety of ideas from a variety of view points, 2) student exposure to a variety of thematically organized media, and 3) inclusion of research component in writing assignments for students to learn different viewpoints

Recent theorists in the field of Writing Assessment also support the social aspect of teaching and evaluating writing. American modern writing assessment began around the 1960s, influenced by ETS researchers who developed a rubric to improve inter-rating reliability. Before that, Deiderich; French; & Carlton (1961) had been annoyed with the discrepancies of ETS raters and decided to seek for a higher level of inter-rating correlation. To achieve that, the rubric they developed was brief. The seven main headings in their rubric were *ideas, style, organization, paragraphing, sentence structure, mechanics, and verbal facility* (Broad. 2003). Therefore, there were many criteria overlooked. For example, in *What We Really Value: Beyond Rubrics in Teaching and Assessing Writing*, Broad (2003) offers a diagram drawn from his research which shows constellations of qualities that teachers at City University (an imaginary institution) think that good writing should contain. In the diagram there are more constellations concerning students' subjectivity and reader-writer emotional relationships than those concerning grammar and organization. Qualities that are involved with social relationships are, for example, change in student/author, effective/moral effort, agency/power, authority/take charge/serious, aesthetic, texture/richness/artful, lively/creative, etc. Students' writings can definitely be discussed in terms of these criteria.

Many theorists of Composition suggest that we give more attention to creating students' subjectivity, which many EFL writing teachers may overlook. For example, Berlin (Broad. 2003: 6; citing Berlin. 1996) states that at university the field of Rhetoric and Composition "teaches and researches what educators consider to be the preeminent intellectual skills, which are critical and creative thinking, interpretation, revision, negotiation of texts and of the knowledge those texts are used to create." In order to cultivate those skills in students, most theorists in this field agree that we should support Baxter Magolda's calls for teaching students to attain their own authorship, which is defined as "the ability to collect, interpret, and analyze information and reflect on one's own belief in order to form judgments" (Broad. 2003. Baxter Magolda. 2001). Similarly, Emig (1997) quotes

Lev Vygotsky, A. R. Luria, and Jerome Bruner as saying that cognitive functions, such as analysis and synthesis, seem to develop very well in written language. From those theorists we see that if we are too obsessed with grammar and organization, we cannot inculcate those preeminent skills in students.

Theorists in Pedagogy too make us think that giving students freedom in order for them to find knowledge by themselves and to develop desirable qualities is necessary. This field may be roughly divided into two camps: traditional and progressive. Freire (2005) characterized the first kind as a “banking concept,” in which the teacher is depicted as dumping knowledge into the student. Dewey (1983: 17) dubs the second kind as “progressive education.” In this kind, “education is development from without.” That is, students must do research in order to get knowledge. In other words, they must have the freedom to learn or create knowledge by themselves. Considering more recent theorists in education, such as Halasek (1999); Bruffee (1993); and Giroux (1992), we are convinced that students should have more freedom studying. For these theorists, knowledge is socially constructed, created collaboratively and through possibilities. In fact, the current trend of student-centeredness has originated from the concepts of progressive education. In brief, more recent pedagogies give more freedom to students.

The review about the fields of Literature, Rhetoric and Composition, Writing Assessment, and Pedagogy reveals that current-traditional rhetoric may not be the best methodology of teaching EFL writing. While teaching writing, we should also cultivate the qualities or subjectivities that citizens of a society should have. Expressivist pedagogy can be one choice because it respects students’ agency, the source of thinking, which in turn is the source of all desirable qualities mentioned above.

However, the application of expressivist pedagogy leads to considering many textual qualities that we may use to assess writing. Also, students should not be allowed to write freely without considering how their writing may affect their readers. Involved with expressivist pedagogy are matters about exchanges of power, reader-writer relationships, reader-writer codes, and strategies and techniques that writers may use to empower their writing. This research is mainly about these. Therefore, a brief review about these aspects of writing is given below.

First of all, for EFL writing, grammar and organization seem to play a big role in empowering writing. Most handbooks teaching writing such as Struach (1999) and Kennedy; Kennedy; & Holliday (1993) spend a large proportion explaining grammar and steps of writing such as generating ideas, planning, drafting, developing, revising, and editing. Most detailed rubrics too specify that grammar and organizations are key requirements of powerful writing. For example, White (1994)’s holistic scoring guide at California State University for the highest rating (“superior”) include the following qualities:

Addresses the question fully and explores the issues thoughtfully

Shows substantial depth, fullness, and complexity of thought

Demonstrates clear, focused, unified, and coherent organization

Is fully developed and detailed

Evidences superior control of diction, syntactic variety, and transition; may have a few minor

flaws In this description, it is clear that not only grammar and organization but also critical

and analytical thinking is valued for highest rating. This description also shows that self and authorship are valued for highest rating; if the writer does not put himself in the writing, it is unlikely that the writing can be critical and analytical and manifest the depth and fullness of the topic. This guides, therefore, confirms what was said above that theorists in Rhetoric and Composition value critical and analytical thinking and authorship.

Fifty years ago, when Diederich, French, and Carlton developed their rubric, grammar and organization were key grading criteria. Today the Internet-based TOEFL writing rubric still states that a piece of writing for a score of 5 (highest) must be well-organized and if there are occasional grammatical errors, they must not result in accurate or imprecise presentation of content or connections (OnlineEnglish. 2010). In other words, in order to be powerful, writing must be readable. According to Trimble (2000) one characteristic of readability is that the writing must not waste the reader's time to get what the writer has to say. Readability involves good grammar and organization, including the use of transition signals, such as "first," "second," and "however."

Trimble (2000) and Ehrenworth; & Vinton (2005: 6) illustrate how grammar can empower writing. Ehrenworth and Vinton state that fragments "create a more rapid pace [of reading] and imply the fragmented observation and knowledge [of something]". Trimble states that a semicolon can connect two sentences; two sentences joined with a semicolon can become crispy or flowing. These are just a few of numerous ways for empowering writing through grammar. However, it is difficult to create a rulebook that specifically teaches a grammar for empowering writing. The context, the occasion of the reading, and grammar all work together to create power. One particular fragment may be powerful in one text but not in another. Repetitions may sound good in one piece but monotonous in another. But obviously grammar is a main source of writing power.

Writing power, however, can emerge not only from grammar but also from many other elements. One thing involved with organization is reading the mind of the reader. While writing, the writer should know what to and what not to include. Discussions by Porter (1992); Bartholomae (1985); Bizzel (1982) and Ong (1975) revealed three elements of writing: the writer himself, the context of the writing, and other members of the community. To write powerfully, the writer should analyze these

three elements and find the connections among them. If a resident wants to write to the board of a village about a polluted canal inside the village, the resident must consider how the board and other villagers will react to the letter and what information can be used to convince the board and villagers that the polluted canal is an urgent problem. In teaching EFL writing, we do not usually have students consider these elements, and one of the reasons is that we spend so much time teaching grammar and organization.

In terms of connecting with the audience, there are two kinds of reader-writer codes—restricted and elaborated (Hirsch, 1977). The former refers to the idea already known by both the reader and the writer, while the latter refers to the idea that only the writer knows. By these definitions, quotes or songs aimed at drawing a specific audience may be thought of as reader-writer codes. A quote may be used to signal the reader that the writer is going to discuss an issue the reader already knows. Using a thesis statement may be a code between writers and readers who studied essay writing at university. Most writing handbooks such as Hacker (2006) teach students to place their thesis statement at the end of the introductory paragraph. A thesis statement in this position, therefore, is a code between the writer and the reader. However, writing and evaluating writing using reader-writer codes is difficult. It is difficult to decide what idea the reader already knows or does not know and thus needs to know. In addition, it is difficult to decide what is and what is not a reader-writer code. Readers, for example the teacher of a writing class, may not be sure that a student intends to use some specific words in a piece of writing to connect with his or specific reader.

Connecting with the audience or creating a reader-writer relationship may be done through other strategies or techniques. One technique is making the writing interesting and serious, as opposed to plain and informative. Writers should try to find “cool” ideas. Writers should “think deeply and think more.” To say it another way, writers should try to be critical, analytical, and creative, qualities valued by educators and theorists in Composition and Writing Assessment. Barnett; & Bedau (1993) suggest that to be critical, we should look at the topic from all sides, conduct an argument, ask questions, think of ways to say for or against the topic, etc. For instance, smokers can argue that they harm others less than those who throw rubbish or chemicals in canals or who use pesticides on rice and vegetables. This will be interesting for readers. Thinking differently can be powerful too. To say that soap operas helps calm down people who are angry about a political crisis is interesting, and also powerful.

Using metaphors is another technique for empowering writing. According to Lakoff; & Johnson (2003) all languages are heavily embedded with metaphors. There are numerous metaphorical concepts in all languages. For example, the saying “My life is empty” is metaphorical

and there is this idea in both Thai and English. Some concepts are, for example, “Love is war,” as in “I will fight for you” and “Tony finally fled away from Nancy”; “Argument is war,” as in “Nick attacked all my points”; “Life is a container,” as in “Life is empty for Jim now.” Note that for EFL students, the use of such metaphors as these may especially show that the student is a mature thinker and a competent user of language.

Metaphors can exert power and create imagination. A metaphor creates an emotion. For instance, after telling many losses in his life, a writer may end his story with the metaphor “My life is empty,” which can intensify the reader’s sympathy for the writer. Next, metaphors can also create pictures that may affect readers either negatively or positively. Saying that “Death stood by me” can make readers visualize a dark figure standing by a person. The word “death” is personified, and because people are afraid of death, personified death can terrify a reader.

Next, words are powerful because they convey ideologies. There is no clear definition of the term ideology. Eagleton (1991: 1-2) defines this term as “the process of production of meanings, signs, values, in social life,” “ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power,” “false ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power,” “systemically distorted communication,” and “forms of thought motivated by social interests.” As these are broad, it could be said that almost all ideas are part of an ideology. For example, it is culturally unacceptable if someone “beats” their parents. Physically hurting a parent is against a society’s ideology of goodness. The word “beat” in the case of “beating parents,” therefore, has the power to create hatred. Words can also represent iconographies, or pictures that result from associating words with other things, and words have functional categories. For example, the word “parasite” can give an iconography of a man acting like a pimp, and if this word is used to describe a man in a piece of writing, the man can be hated by readers. Bosmajian (1983) discusses words in many functional categories. Metaphorical words or expressions such as “contamination of our people,” “blood poisoning,” and “black parasites” are put under the category of hatred that can be used to arouse anger. Words such as “chick” and “babe” are put under the language of sexism that is used to insult others. Words have functions to create love, respect, trust, sincerity, suspicion, or hatred.

Not only metaphorical words but also personifications or moving objects can create pictures. We can imagine pictures of a mountain standing, love withering, a cow complaining, or a river hugging a mainland. Personifications are metaphorical (Lakoff; & Johnson. 2003). Using personifications is a technique to create pictures, and thus to empower writing. Moving objects create pictures, too. When we say that bamboos’ tips are swaying, the reader uses his or her past experience about bamboos’ tips swaying and imagines the picture of bamboos’ tips swaying in our writing. Pictures

of the past, ten or twenty years ago can come up, and they can intensify the emotion being described in the writing. It is believed that the more we make our readers imagine, the more power our writing has to draw them.

Two more important qualities of writing that writers may use as techniques are ethos and pathos. Ethos is the writer's self; it is the writer's self-representation. A writer may present himself or herself as a good or bad person, a reliable or unreliable person, or a person who can be trusted or should not be trusted. In Broad (2003)'s *What We Really Value*, ethos is a big constellation that includes other qualities such as sincerity, honesty, innocence, and attitude. Therefore, while writing, the writer should consider what kind of person he or she wants to be and how he or she wants the reader to perceive him or her. Most readers want to see the writer as "a good person speaking well," and writers should keep this in mind. Next, pathos refers to a quality that draws readers' pity or sympathy for the writer; pathos is often found in narrative writing. Ethos and pathos can draw readers; they make like, dislike, or sympathize with the writer.

Apart from those qualities and techniques for empowering writing mentioned and discussed above, there are still many other qualities, strategies, or techniques to empower writing. For example, Oshima; & Hogue (2006) explain that synonyms, consistent pronouns, and repeated key words can unify writing, helping the writer to stick to the topic. Moorman (1985) advises that writers should not overuse the construction "make + sb + adj./ v1," as in "He made me cry" because it may sound that the writer does not have power. A website called "Writer's Helper" provides many writing tips, such as "Use strong verbs and nouns instead of the verb to be" (Writing tips. 2011). These may be considered to be trivial tips for empowering writing. In our writing classrooms, however, we do not often talk about them.

The literature review above implies that teachers of EFL writing should not forget the facts that knowledge is socially constructed and that we need to spawn desirable subjectivities, such as being critical, analytical, moral, and ethical. Additionally, there are many textual qualities that we should encourage students to produce such as change, epistemic, aesthetic, and richness. Nevertheless, writing power emerges from qualities emphasized by both current-traditional and expressivist pedagogies. This fact is especially true of the EFL writing classroom. EFL students need grammar and guidelines to produce good writing. But it is necessary that we promote other qualities and desirable subjectivities too. The kind of expressivist pedagogy to apply in the EFL writing classroom is, thus, one that does not completely leave current-traditional teaching behind. Rather, it is a combination of the two approaches. This research, as a result, was aimed at studying how both pedagogies contribute to writing power, focusing on matters about reader-writer relationships, reader-writer codes, and techniques and strategies for empowering writing.

Methodology

The research was aimed at exploring the possibility of combining expressivist and current-traditional pedagogies. While it was designed to be explorative rather than experimental, it included instructions about qualities that empower writing, writer-reader relationships and codes, strategies and techniques for empowering writing, and also concepts about rhetorical situations. The research was conducted in a writing classroom consisting of 20 second-year students majoring in English and languages for careers. The course was Composition I, which aims to teach students to write coherent essays of about 5-10 paragraphs. The students were assigned to write five papers, each consisting three drafts, and were encouraged to use different modes of writing—narrative, descriptive, expository, persuasive, etc. The topics were chosen from five themes: personal experience, recommendation, opinion, primary research, and documentary research. The researcher advised the students to choose topics that would allow them to express themselves easily. After learning about qualities that empower writing, writer-reader relationships and codes, strategies and techniques for empowering writing, and also concepts about rhetorical situations, the students were expected to display all these in their writing. The materials taught in the classroom included short readings and sample writings that allowed the researcher and the students to point out and discuss empowering qualities, strategies, techniques, and reader-writer relationships and codes. For example, the students were asked to discuss a sample writing that contained many descriptive words and metaphors and then identify the reader-writer relationship that the writer had created.

Then forty papers, two from each student, were chosen randomly for analysis. The papers chosen could be Draft 1's, Draft 2's, or Draft 3's. Four readers, including the researcher, read the forty papers to find the qualities of power, reader-writer codes and relationships, and strategies and techniques that the students used to empower their writing. The four readers used a form for checking all these things. See this form in Appendix A. Before reading the forty papers, the invited readers were given an article written by the researcher about writing power, reader-writer relationships, reader-writer codes, and strategies and techniques for empowering writing and were trained to find them. The article was twenty pages long and has now been published in *Manusat Paritat: Journal of humanities* (1/2011). The three invited readers were university teachers who had been teaching writing for years, one from Sripatum University and the others from Srinakharinwirot University. The researcher invited the three readers because one secondary purpose of the research was to study inter-rating correlation. For one thing, the researcher wanted to have certain reliability in the research. For another thing, the writer wanted to disclose the reality about assessing university writing in Thailand, hoping to provide information for further research for the improvement of writing assessment in this country.

As for the data analysis, the researcher used the methodology of qualitative research in which codes are used to represent categories and subcategories in order to understand the meanings and connections between them (Goulding. 2002). In qualitative research, data that are non-mathematical or unquantifiable can be objectified, observed, and discussed through the use of codes. Qualitative research refers to the research about persons' lives, lived experiences, behaviors, emotions, and feelings (Strauss; & Corbin. 1998). The data analysis of this research may be said to have resulted from three steps.

1. The invited readers read the article and checked for the qualities of power, reader-writer relationships, reader-writer codes, and strategies and techniques for empowering writing in the forty papers, using the evaluation form.

2. The researcher did the same things as the invited readers did. However, the researcher looked for more qualities of power, reader-writer relationships, reader-writer codes, and strategies and techniques for empowering writing than those indicated in the evaluation form. In addition, the researcher looked for the problems that hindered the students writing powerfully. (The invited readers were not asked to do these due to their limited time.)

3. The researcher combined his findings and the readers' findings and discussed them.

The research questions were as follows:

1. How do the students express the qualities of power that create a relationship with their readers?
2. What kinds of reader-writer relationship do the students create?
3. Do the students understand the codes between their readers and them?
4. What are some strategies and techniques students might use to empower their writing?
5. What are some problems that weaken students' writing?
6. What are the levels of inter-rating correlation among the readers concerning strategies and techniques for empowering writing they found in the students' papers?

Findings

Most of the findings have been arrived at through observations, or personal judgments. In qualitative research, it is difficult to specify what is what clearly with concrete evidence. The findings have to be discussed mostly in words, not in numbers. Where possible, however, the researcher will give examples. Tables and percentages will be used too. The findings will be presented in accordance with the research questions asked above.

1. The students expressed the qualities of power haphazardly, rather than consciously, rhetorically, or systemically. The students displayed the qualities of power in words, phrases, and sentences randomly and quite unintentionally in different places in the paper without considering how those words, phrases, or sentences would affect the reader. For example, in one paper, although a student wanted to tell university teachers or administrators that they should not force students to wear a uniform, he used many strong opinions that could have annoyed the readers, such as “[Having students wear a uniform] is a selfish idea” and “a conservative idea.” In many papers, the use of qualities of power, especially those related to feelings and emotions, was also not suitable for the context, and errors usually distracted the reader from seeing the writing as powerful. In another paper, a student described her dog Gasby as “the sun shinning up above me,” which may be viewed as exaggerated. After learning that metaphors contain power, the student tried to overused them. It was not a natural use of metaphors. It was found, however, that the students could do well in organization; they wrote their introduction ending with a thesis statement, started their body paragraphs with a topic sentence, and ended their essay with a decent conclusion.

2. Because the students expressed the qualities of power randomly, it was hard for them to create a secure or good reader-writer relationship. The paper about uniforms above contained power, but it was the kind of power that would not help the student to achieve the goal of his writing because he could have made his readers angry. In the paper about the dog Gasby, the student focused on describing her dog and probably did not consider how her readers would feel. Most papers were like these two papers. The main problems of Thai students concerning reader-writer relationships, therefore, are the inability to read the reader’s mind and the inability to use the language naturally. They should be able to create better reader-writer relationships if they are trained more to read readers’ mind and to use the language appropriately, which are unfortunately difficult.

In addition, in most papers, it was difficult to decide what kind of relationship a paper had created. One reason was that most papers were written in poor grammar. But the main reason was that most of them were so general, not specifically directed to a particular reader; thus, they could not make a weak or strong relationship. A “weak” relationship refers to a relationship in which the reader does not like or does not agree with the writer, while a strong relationship is a relationship in which the reader agrees with or likes the writer. Most of the papers were general and informative. For instance, one paper was about a student’s adapting herself to Bangkok. Mostly, the student talked about herself alone—getting into university, having many problems, living with friends, missing home, feeling lonely, being disappointed with a classmate, and having high expenses. In most places, the student showed her weakness. Only in two points, she showed her strength—when she said she could leave her friend, who cheated her, and when she said in the end that she would do her best

living in Bangkok. These could have made readers see the student as strong and thus like her. Some good relationship was made, but it was not strong. It was not a person to person relationship, either. So, most reader-writer relationships the students made were ones distant from readers, not close or strong.

3. The concept of reader-writer codes was hard to grasp even for the experienced readers. This is because many things can be taken as a reader-writer code. For example, a thesis statement can be a code between a teacher and a student in the classroom that emphasizes organization; a thesis statement makes reading quick. Codes can keep the writer and the reader intact. Quotes and questions may be considered to be codes; they can urge the reader to think about an issue both the writer and the reader are currently interested in. For example, a student may arouse readers who are severely affected by the 2011 big flood in Bangkok with a question such as “What do you think if we moved the capital city to another place?” However, it is difficult to decide what is a code and what is not. The students probably did not understand reader-writer codes; the readers could have identified many words or ideas used as codes had they understood more clearly about reader-writer codes. Table 2 below shows that the readers probably did not understand reader-codes in the same way.

4. The students employed 29 strategies or techniques to empower their writing. These qualities were found by the researcher, and some of them were from the evaluation form. Table 1 below shows 29 empowering qualities that EFL students may apply, ordered from the most to the least found. The time given for each quality is the time each quality was identified while reading, not the number of the papers. A comment or example of each quality is given. Of the first ten qualities, four qualities (no. 2, 4, 7 and 10) are the qualities of current-traditional teaching and the rest fall under the expressivist paradigm. This proves that qualities of both approaches can empower students’ writing.

Table 1: Empowering qualities for EFL writing

No	Empower Quality	Examples/Comments	Times identified
1	Word power	Conservative idea. She ended my bitterness and put happiness into my heart	35
2	Organization	Contained clear major and minor supporting details	30

No	Empower Quality	Examples/Comments	Times identified
3	Self	Expressed opinions	29
4	Transitional device	First, after that, however	27
5	Metaphor	My life is empty.	25
6	PI/MT (Powerful idea and mature thinking)	Power or “cool” ideas make readers feel that the writer is smart and knowledgeable. If the reader thinks that the writer is mature, the reader respects or appreciates the writer, or thinks that the writer is a responsible person.	25
7	Grammar and sentence skills	Easy to read sentences, complex sentences	25
8	Ethos	Made me learn what kind of person the writer was	22
9	SME (Small detail or example)	Mentioned a variety of Korean goods that influenced Thais	22
10	Development of ideas	Logic in movements of ideas	16
11	Q (Quote or question)	Quotes and questions that appear everywhere draw readers to think about something.	15
12	IOR (Information from research)	Information from research helps support the point.	13
13	IQ (Introductory quote /saying/question)	A quote or question at the beginning of the introduction draws readers and makes them think.	13
14	L (Language)	The writer was fluent in the language and used good vocabulary.	8
15	Seriousness/interestingness	Critical, engaged the reader	8
16	IMT (Ideas that make readers think)	Urged me to think whether it is really true that Western cultures change Thai people’s eating ability	7
17	Ideology	Some values I agreed with	7

No	Empower Quality	Examples/Comments	Times identified
18*	DA (Detail that is arguable.)	The writing exerts power if the reader wants to argue against it. It may cause the writer to fail, or to succeed.	6
19	SU (Specific and unified)	Writing that does not go from the focus or that is not broad is unified.	6
20	Understanding reader's code	Questions and quotes	5
21	AA (Audience addressed)	Using "you" or mentioning readers directly may draw readers and make them think more carefully about the writing.	5
22	AL (Audience link)	The writer thinks about the audience, for example, by asking questions.	5
23	TSA (Take side with the audience)	The reader will be likely to agree with the writer if the writer tries to be on the same side as the reader.	5
24	DWOI (Different ways to start new ideas)	The writer did not use the traditional way of starting a new paragraph. The writer did not use the common transitional words. The writer used a sentence, a clause, a synonym, etc. to link ideas or start a new idea. That was powerful.	4
25	Pathos	I sympathized with the writer.	4
26*	SO (Strong opinion)	The haircut is a criminal haircut.	3
27*	A (Attack)	It's a silly idea that adults think that haircut shows responsibility.	3
28	Sentences that create emotions	The first day ended. (After talking about long activities done all day long, this sentence made it feel like a great relief.)	1
29	Understanding reader's mind	Understood what parents wanted their children to do	1

* These qualities can exert either positive or negative power.

Next, all four readers read the forty papers in order to find fourteen empowering qualities in the evaluation form. The researcher, one of the readers, wrote an article on empowering qualities and these fourteen qualities were some of them. The three readers were briefly trained, in one-to-one conversations, to look for these qualities and were given the article to understand these qualities better. Table 2 shows the frequencies these qualities were found by the four readers. Note that the researcher counted each quality every time it was found, so that one quality might have been counted more than once in a particular paper, while the numbers given by the other three readers are the numbers of the papers in which each quality was found. Some examples of each quality are given in this table too. Readers should notice that qualities emphasized by current-traditional rhetoric rank the first four and have higher inter-rating correlations than those of expressivist paradigms. Organization and grammar are key empowering qualities and are easier to spot than those emphasized expressivist teaching.

Table 2: Frequencies of fourteen empowering qualities

No	Quality	Examples/Comments	Times found by the researcher	Papers found by Teacher A	Papers found by Teacher B	Papers found by Teacher C
1	Organization	Used transitional words, stated topics clearly	30	35	37	39
2	Transitional devices	First, second, third, therefore, etc.	27	37	34	34
3	Grammar and sentence skills	Used a variety of sentences—simple, compound, complex, used words to show similarities and contrasts	25	33	30	37
4	Development of ideas	Two sides of opinion supporting the thesis statement	16	38	36	27
5	Self	In my opinion..., At that time, I felt so...	29	27	35	19
6	Ideology	1. Some idols are good, but some are bad. Some are too sexy. 2. Nowadays, the telephone is one of life's necessities, but most of us more than necessary.	7	28	29	29

No	Quality	Examples/Comments	Times found by the researcher	Papers found by Teacher A	Papers found by Teacher B	Papers found by Teacher C
7	Ethos	I think the best way is to inform people of how to use telephone...(Showing writer as a socially responsible person.)	22	35	22	2
8*	Word power	Used a wide range of adverbs such as unkindly, totally, accidentally, and vitally	35	19	21	3
9*	Understanding reader's mind	Recognized the reader's expectation by giving enough examples to clarify the point	1	30	19	17
10	Seriousness/interestingness	Provided examples, repeated words	8	23	17	23
11*	Sentences that create emotions	Uniform is a good thing in adult idea, but it is a terrible thing for children.	1	26	22	4
12	Understanding reader's code	Attracted readers using questions in the introductions	5	20	5	1
13*	Metaphors	Life is empty. She is my heart.	25	0	2	4
14	Pathos	After that, she started to steal some things of her friends. She was very wicked for me. She could do everything just to get the money.	4	12	0	7

*These qualities show low levels of inter-rating correlation.

Table 1 illustrates that 29 qualities can be used as strategies or techniques for empowering writing. The number of all occurrences of all qualities added together is 375. The empowering qualities can be divided into three categories: grammar (7, 14, 28), organization (2, 4, and 10), and emotional or mental relation (all the rest). The first group is approximately 9%, the second 19%, and the third 72%. While it is true to say that the third group constitutes the largest percentage because there are more qualities related to this group, readers should notice that many high-ranking qualities (no. 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9) fall under this group. This proves, as all rubrics indicate, that qualities of both current-traditional and expressivist pedagogies must be combined to produce powerful writing.

Table 2 shows that all readers found all empowering qualities they were asked to find in the evaluation form (Appendix A). The table shows that there are both high and low levels of inter-rating correlation. Qualities in relation to grammar and organization, emphasized by current-traditional teaching, had high levels of inter-rating correlation. This might have been because these qualities are easy to identify and because most teachers tend to look for them. They were qualities ETS researchers used for achieving high levels of reliability. In Table 2, qualities of expressivist teaching fall lower in terms of inter-rating correlation because they are more difficult to identify; they are more subjective. For some qualities, readers must specifically be trained to look for them.

5. Thirteen problems were found that may prevent EFL students from writing powerfully. Table 3 shows these 13 problems, all of which were found by the researcher.

Table 3: Problems that may prevent EFL students from writing powerfully

No	Problem/Empower Quality	Examples/Comments	Times identified
1	FI (false or wrong information)	Said that Thai culture and languages are valueless	25
2	OS (Overstated information)	Said that <i>all</i> classmates lose attention while a student is talking on the phone	13
3	NURC/M (Not understanding readers' codes or mind)	Repeated what readers already knew. Using false information or overstating information can be thought of as not understanding the reader's mind.	6
4	UGF (Ungrammaticality leads to confusion)	Money is not real happiness, it is deceived.	44
5	PL (Poor logic)	The students used ideas that seemed unbelievable. An illogical idea may be one that is wrong or overstated.	10

No	Problem/Empower Quality	Examples/Comments	Times identified
6	NSF (Not staying focused)	Went away from the topic, talked about several things	10
7	US (Ungrammatical sentence structure)	I feel afraid strange visit, afraid the deceits, afraid getting lose.	4
8	RWWP (Writing without plan)	Although freedom may be the source of creativity and power, writing that is plain and poorly organized is not powerful.	5
9	IA (Insincere acclamation)	Some acclamations sound insincere and may strike readers as pretending.	3
10	NsCI (Information that jumps and is not continuous)	The reader may not understand the text or get lost if the writer jumps from one idea to another with a connection.	11
11	I (Informative)	Writing that gives only information does not draw readers.	7
12	NOW (Not organized well)	Didn't use good details to support the topic sentence	5
13	IDD (Information that readers disagree)	If disagreed, the writer does not have the power to help the writer succeed in the goal of the writing.	7

Again, the problems can be divided into three groups: those about grammar, those about organization, and those about inability to connect with the reader mentally. The number of occurrences of all problems is 150. Problems about grammar (4 and 7) add up to 32%, in accordance with the fact that Thai students are poor at grammar. Problems about organization (6, 8, 10, and 12) are 21%, confirming that Thai students do better in organization. Learning to organize writing is easier than learning grammar. Problems about not understanding readers (1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 11, and 13) are 47%. Looking at number 4 (UGF), one can see that poor grammar is the biggest problem of Thai students. However, when the occurrences of all problems are added up together, most problems are about not understanding the audience. It is then right to say that Thai students in general cannot produce texts that allow them to have a good relationship with their readers.

6. All four readers identified with each other, at high levels of correlation, about the power obtained through grammar and organization. There were both high and low levels of agreement about the mental qualities. Table 4 below shows high and low levels of inter-rating correlation. Qualities 1, 3, 4, and 5 have high levels of inter-rating correlation because it is easy to spot qualities related

to grammar and organization. Qualities concerning grammar and organization are objective. However, when emotions are involved, high levels of inter-rating correlation are hard to achieve. Qualities related to emotions, beliefs, or values—qualities of expressivist teaching—are subjective. Table 4, nevertheless, shows that it is easy for readers to perceive whether a piece of writing is serious or interesting (quality 8), or whether the writer deserves a pity (quality 14).

Table 4: Inter-rating correlation

No	Quality	*Number found by				Level of correlation
		Researcher	A	B	C	
1	Grammar and sentence skills	25	33	30	37	High
2	Sentences that create emotions	1	26	22	4	Low
3	Organization	30	35	37	39	High
4	Transitional devices	27	37	34	34	High
5	Development of ideas	16	38	36	27	High
6	Understanding reader's mind	1	30	19	17	Low
7	Understanding reader's code	5	20	5	1	Low
8	Seriousness/interestingness	8	23	17	23	quite high
9	Metaphors	25	0	2	4	Low
10	Word power	35	19	21	3	Low
11	Self	29	27	35	19	High
12	Ideology	7	28	29	29	Low
13	Ethos	22	35	22	2	Low
14	Pathos	4	12	0	7	High

*The researcher counted the occurrences of each quality while the teachers counted the papers in which each quality was found.

However, the numbers in the four columns show correlations.

Discussion and conclusion

The discussion about the findings of this research may be divided into two parts. The first part is about power, reader-writer relationship, reader-writer codes, and techniques and strategies that students may use to empower their writing. The second part is about theories and the implication of the findings with relation to the theories.

First, as it was found that the students expressed many empowering qualities, but randomly and not purposefully, students in our EFL context, thus, must learn to express empowering more strategically. They must learn that writing is a medium of shared power between the writer and the reader. Their writing should contain characteristics of power such as richness, aesthetic, and lively (Broad. 2003). Right now, our students' writing, as discovered in this research, is plain, distant, and disengaging. They must also learn about the importance of audience, and how they can relate the power that they have in their writing with their readers so that they can achieve the purpose of their writing. The students should learn to analyze their audience in depth. They should learn to think more carefully how the use of some words affects the power of the writing. In practice, for a piece of writing, they may make a list of powerful words or ideas, try using some of them in different places, and consider their effect. In addition, they may be assigned to analyze the reader-writer relationship of their writing. In advanced writing courses, students may be assigned to write to particular readers. On the same topic, students may be asked to write to different audiences. By doing so, students will understand rhetorical situations better, which will in turn make them more skillful in creating desirable reader-writer relationships.

Next, understanding reader-writer codes is important. Using codes refers to employing appropriate lexical and grammatical conventions (Hirsch. 1977) and those who use them should be able to connect their readers well and thus create better relationships. However, it is difficult for students as well as teachers to decipher the complexity of reader-writer codes. The findings in Table 3 show that it is hard even for experienced teachers to grasp the concept of codes. A transitional word such as "first" may be thought of as a restricted code shared between people who learn essay writing. (Bernstein. 1962). Most of the time, however, people think of transitional words as transitional words, not as codes. It becomes more difficult to deal with elaborated codes; any word can be an elaborated code. Thus, it is difficult to be sure whether the writer intends to use a word as a code to trigger the reader's interest. There should be special training about codes for both teachers and students in the EFL writing classroom. Studying reader-writer codes may be done in a more advanced writing course in which the students learn to choose a particular reader and a particular writer, analyze both of them carefully and make a list of words or ideas that can link the reader and the writer together. Such words and ideas are reader-writer codes. By studying codes, students will understand rhetorical situations better, which will result in their ability to create good reader-writer relationships.

The findings also show that there are more strategies or techniques for empowering writing than those related to grammar and organization. Grammar and organization are certainly two important elements of powerful writing, and they are taught in all levels of English education. Teaching

organization is much easier than teaching grammar because grammar is so vast an area. Teachers, however, should look at grammar as an ongoing process and teach it gradually. In fact, emphases on grammar are viewed by critics of current-traditional pedagogy as suppressing students. In addition, theorists in the field of Error Analysis, such as Selinker (1984), state that only 5% of adults learning English can achieve native-speaker competence, and that there is a psycholinguistic structure latent in the brain that allows only a few people to succeed in learning a second language. Theorists such as Shaughnessy (1977) and Wilson (2006) state that even native students still produce uncountable errors. As Table 1 illustrates, the writing power acquired from grammar is just about 9%. Table 2 is contradictory to Table 1, for it shows high frequencies of qualities of grammar and organization. Readers must understand, however, that EFL students receive much more practice in grammar and organization. If they get more practice on other qualities, their writing will be more powerful. This is certainly not an absolute rejection of grammar and organization. They are undeniably important, but they should be less emphasized.

However, the findings show that the students expressed the empowering qualities haphazardly, or unintentionally. It might have been because the research was conducted in a writing classroom that had to teach many other things; that is, the students did not learn about power, reader-writer relationship, reader-writer codes, and techniques and strategies for empowering writing sufficiently and explicitly. The teaching of empowering qualities or techniques, therefore, should be made more sufficient and explicit, especially in our EFL context. It is expected that after students learn about rhetorical situations, they will be able to express empowering qualities or techniques systematically and effectively. In the future they will write more effectively and skillfully use their writing in whatever way that they want to use it.

The second part of the discussion is about how the findings are related to the theories mentioned. The findings illustrate that our students have the ability to produce many empowering qualities emphasized by both current-traditional and expressivist pedagogies. This is supported by the fact that all high-rating categories in all rubrics contain both kinds of qualities, as White (1994)'s scoring guide shows. However, we do not usually evaluate writing using criteria other than those related to grammar, language competence, and organization, that is, qualities of current-traditional teaching. Tables 1 and 2 show that our students can produce many empowering qualities, techniques, or strategies, such as ethos, IMT (idea that makes reader think), and PI/MT (powerful idea or mature thinking) that are valued by educators and theorists in Pedagogy, Composition, and Writing Assessment. In other words, our students have the ability to produce textual qualities valued by expressivist pedagogy. Therefore, we should adopt expressivist pedagogy in our teaching. Using

expressivist pedagogy means that we respect students' agency, which is the main source of power (Kaewnuch. 2008), and also that we accept concepts about learning collaboratively (Bruffee. 1993) and liberating students (Freire; 2005), as well as the fact that knowledge is socially constructed (Giroux. 1992). Expressivist pedagogy can make those notions come true.

The findings, however, show that we cannot move away from the traditional rubric that emphasizes form. The problems shown in Table 3 may be divided into two groups—those about grammar and organization in one (32% + 21% = 53%) and those about connecting readers mentally in the other (47%). The percentages do not differ greatly. This means that in order to help our students improve their writing we cannot leave behind either current-traditional teaching or expressivist teaching. Grammar and organization are two primary textual qualities, especially in our EFL context, that empower students' writing. Thus, the new method of teaching EFL writing should be a combination of current-traditional rhetoric and expressivist rhetoric. The stress on grammar and form makes students know where to go and what to expect in and from their own writing. Expressivist pedagogy, however, allows students to learn by themselves what is right and wrong in their writing. More importantly, by adopting expressivist pedagogy, we really encourage students to use writing as a means for learning, which is a teacher's mission all of us should try to achieve.

Finally, the combination of the two approaches can be done at all levels, from elementary to tertiary, but preferably when the student is quite competent in the language. The secondary school may be the best place to try out this project. Students of this level have learned enough lexicon and grammar for expressing themselves. Their age is also suitable for learning how language works and, specifically, how writing affects readers. Language acquisition is more successful in early ages, but may not be the case with EFL elementary students who have not acquired the language sufficiently. The teaching which combines the two approaches should be divided into two equal parts; the first part deals with grammar and organization, and the second part with discussing different issues and expressing opinions in writing. To inculcate skills such as negotiating, reflecting, analyzing, and interpreting (Broad. 2003; Baxter Magolda, 2001; Berlin, 1987), teachers should include the reading and discussing of texts. Most important of all, when evaluating EFL writing, teachers should look for textual qualities of both current-traditional and expressivist pedagogies.

References

- Barnet, S.; & Bedau, H. (1993). **Critical Thinking: Reading and Writing. A Brief Guide to Argument.** Boston: Bedford Books of Martin's Press.
- Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the university. In M. Rose (Ed.). **When a Writer Can't Write.** New York: Guilford, pp. 134-65.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2001). **Making Their Own Way: Narratives for Transforming Higher Education to Promote Self-development.** Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Berlin, J. A. (1987). **Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges 1900-1985.** Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.
- _____. (1996). **Rhetorics, Poetics, and Cultures.** Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Bernstein, B. (1962, January-March). Linguistic Codes, Hesitation Phenomena, and Intelligence. **Language and Speech.** 5(1): 31-46.
- Biesta, G. J. (1995). **From Manipulation to Communication: Communicative Pedagogy and the Postmodern Crisis of the Subject.** Paper Presented at the 1995 AERA Annual Meeting. San Francisco, California.
- Bizzel, P. (1982, Fall). Cognition, Convention, and Certainty: What we Need to Know about Writing. **Pre/Text: A Journal of Rhetorical Theory.** 3(3): 213-43.
- Bosmajian, H. A. (1983). **The Language of Oppression.** Lanham: UP of America.
- Bressler, C. (2003). **Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice.** 3rd ed. River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Broad, B. (2003). **What we really value: Beyond Rubrics in Teaching and Assessing Writing.** Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1993). **Collaborative Learning: Higher Education, Interdependence, and the Authority of Knowledge.** Baltimore: The John Hopkins UP.
- Connolly, Paul; & Vilardi, Teresa. (1986). **New Methods in College Writing Programs: Theories in Practice.** New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- Crowley, S. (1990). **The Methodical Memory.** Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- _____. (1998). **Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays.** Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Dewey, J. (1983). **Experience & Education.** New York: Touchstone.

- Diederich, P. B.; French, J.W.; & Carlton, S.T. (1961). **Factors in Judgments of Writing Ability (ETS Research Bulletin 61-15)**. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). **Ideology: An Introduction**. New York: Verso.
- _____. (1996). **Literary Theory: An Introduction**. 2nd ed. Minnesota: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Ehrenworth, M. & Vinton, V. (2005). **The Power of Grammar: Unconventional Approaches to Conventions of Language**. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Emig, J. (1997). Writing as a Mode of Learning. In **Victor Villanueva (Ed.), Cross-talk in Comp Theory: A Reader**. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Faigley, L. (1986). Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal. **College English**. 18(6): 527-39.
- _____. (1992). **Fragments of Rationality: Post-modernity and the Subject of Composition**. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Freire, P. (2005). **Pedagogy of the Oppressed**. New York: Continuum.
- Giroux, H. A. (1992). **Border Crossing**. NY: Routledge.
- Goulding, C. (2002). **Grounded Theory: A Practice Guide for Management, Business, and Market Researchers**. London: SAID Publishers.
- Hacker, D. (2006). **The Bedford Handbook**. 7th ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Halasek, K. (1999). **A pedagogy of Possibility: Bakhtinian perspectives in Composition Studies**. Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois UP.
- Hirsch, E.D. (1977). **The Philosophy of Composition**. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Huot, B. (2003). **(Re)articulating Writing Assessment for Teaching and Learning**. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.
- Jung, J. (2005). **Revisionary Rhetoric, Feminist Pedagogy, and Multigenre Texts**. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.
- Kaewnuch, Somsak. (2009, Semester 1). Socialism in English Studies: Perspectives, Pedagogy, and Research topics. **Manusat Paritat: Journal of Humanities**. 31(Semester 1): 6-28.
- _____. (2008). **Teaching Agency and Power as Social: Creating Transformative Subjects in the Clashes of Modernity and Postmodernity in Thai EFL Writing Classrooms**. Ph.D. (English Studies). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3353102).
- Kennedy, M. L. (1998). **Theorizing Composition: A Critical Sourcebook of Theory and Scholarship in Contemporary Composition Studies**. Connecticut: Library of Congress Cataloging.

- Kennedy, X. J.; Kennedy, D. M.; & Holliday, S. A. (1993). **The Bedford Guide for College Writers with Reader, Research Manual, and Handbook**. Boston: Martin's Press.
- Lakoff, G.; & Johnson, M. (2003). **Metaphors we Live by**. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Martin, B. (1992). **Matrix and line: Derrida and the Possibilities of Postmodern Social Theory**. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- McComiskey, B. (2000). **Teaching Composition as a Social Process**. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.
- Miller, S. (1991). **Textual Carnivals: The Politics of Composition**. Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern UP.
- Moorman, C. (1985). **Talk Sense to Yourself: The Language of Personal Power**. Merrill, MI: Personal Power Press.
- OnlineEnglish. (2010, March 13). iBT Assessment Rubric–Integrated Writing. Retrieved from http://www.onlinenglish.net/iBT/Writing__rubric__Integrated__English.html
- Oshima, A.; & Hogue, A. (2006). **Writing Academic English**. 4th ed. New York: Pearson.
- Porter, J. (1992). **Audience and Rhetoric: An Archaeological Composition of the Discourse Community**.
- Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Readings, B. (1996). **The University in Ruins**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Reid, S. (2006). **The Prentice Hall Guide for College Writers**. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Selinker, L. (1984). Interlanguage. In J. C. Richards (Ed.). **Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition**. London and New York: Longman.
- Shaughnessy, M. P. (1977). **Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing**. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Strauch, A. O. (1999). **Bridges to Academic Writing**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, A.; & Corbin, J. (1998). **Basic Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory**. Thousand Oaks, London: SAGE.
- Trimble, J. (2000). **Writing with Style: Conversations on the Art of Writing**. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- White, E. M. (1994). **Teaching and Assessing Writing**. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilson, M. (2006). **Rethinking Rubrics in Writing Assessment**. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Writing tips. (2011, November). **Writer's Helper**. Retrieved from <http://www.writershelper.com/writingtips.html>

Appendix A: Evaluation Form Techniques and Strategies for Creating Reader-Writer Relationships: Ways to Empower Writing

Please read the article on strategies and techniques for creating reader-writer relationships attached with this evaluation form. Please check (✓) and give comments or examples where possible.

S1A	Strategies/Techniques	✓	Examples/Comments
	Grammar/Sentence skills		
	Sentences that create emotions		
	Organization		
	Transitional devices(Transitional words/ pronoun references, etc.)		
	Development of ideas		
	Understanding reader's mind		
	Understanding reader-writer codes		
	Seriousness/interestingness		
	Metaphors		
	Word power		
	Self		
	Ideology		
	Ethos		
	Pathos		
	Other qualities		