CHAPTER FIVE
Analysis and Findings

5.0 Introduction
This chapter presents the researcher's analysis of students' perception of how the three criteria (responsivity, intersubjectivity, and dialogicality) were approached and taught in the previous writing courses taught to the students. A questionnaire was used for the purpose. Then, the students' written responses to three tasks were analysed after an intervention from the researcher. The analysis targets the dialogicality of the three criteria and their effect (along with that of non- and local audience) on meaning/knowledge making that is culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic. The chapter consists of three main sections: the analysis of the questionnaire, the analysis of the tasks, and a conclusion.

5.1 The Analysis of the Students' Responses to the Questionnaire

5.1.0 Introduction
The following section presents the researcher's analysis of the questionnaire which is both descriptive and interpretive. The analysis consists of five sections. The first four sections carry the same division name as in the questionnaire (i.e., A, B, C, and D) as well as the main idea got from the analysis. The fifth section includes a general conclusion to the first four sections and a discussion of the findings.

5.1.1 Section A: A gap between personal writing and scholastic definition of writing
The first section of the questionnaire, A, apart from the first question (which asked about the number of writing courses taught to the students) investigated the students' aptitudes for writing. The second question, for example, asked about the

22 The two words 'student' and 'participant'/research participants are simultaneously used to mean the research participants. This occurred because the researcher also played the role of the teacher. Therefore, both the words were used by her to mean the same group of research participants.
students' overall grade of writing in the five courses. The third question asked about whether students liked or disliked writing and the reasons for that. The two questions (i.e. the second and the third) were an attempt on the researcher's behalf to predict whether there was a connection between the grades got and whether the students liked or disliked writing generally.

The students' responses proved a positive connection between grades and aptitudes for writing. All the students got overall grades from "good" to "excellent". All the fourteen students except one (93%) said that they liked writing as a response to the third question. The only student who gave a negative response (i.e. no) was the one who thought she was not good enough. This particular student got excellent as an overall grade for the five courses (Writing 1, Writing 2, Writing 3, Writing 4, and Advanced Writing Skills/ AWS). The researcher predicted that maybe the student did not like writing because she did not like the way writing was taught in the five courses. The following extract from one of the interactions with Mayasah, the student who responded negatively to the question in the questionnaire, supports this interpretation.

M: Yes, now if I want to write uh I think I have the ability to think the *the correct na, you know, to think correctly rea [;] to know
R: What do you mean by thinking correctly?
M: Um if you ask me to write about something now, I
R: hm
M: will sit and think and I'll uuu, may be, I have the ability to know how to write about it, you
R: before that you didn’t you didn’t do that, the same thing?
M: NO, because n we didn’t write anything. We didn’t think, you mean, about writing?
R: From your own?
M: Yes.
R: You wrote many things.
M: Yes, but it it was, I wrote it for u for marks not not uh. I memorized it and I wrote it. I didn't think about it. I didn't, I never think to write or read to write.
The above extract captures a moment of reflection and comparison by Mayasah between what she thinks she has learned in the study and how she has done writing in the previous writing courses. The main thing that she perceived was that in the previous writing course she was not thinking or reading to write. She was unsatisfied with that. This could be seen from the way she responded to the researcher’s question: before that you didn’t you didn’t do that (the researcher meant thinking and reading to write), the same thing? Her response was a stressed “no” followed by a justification “because . . . We didn’t write anything. We didn’t think . . . about writing.” She followed that by a comment on why she wrote and the way she used to do writing: “I wrote for marks . . . I memorized it and I wrote it. I didn’t think about it.”

However, from the above evidence, it is possible to conclude that those who have aptitude for writing, those who liked writing, had the ability to obtain good grades in the courses.

Moreover, there was also a connection between the third and the fourth questions in this section. The third question in addition to asking whether students liked or disliked writing also asked about the reasons for that. The fourth question required students’ definitions of writing; see the list of the section-wise arranged questions of the questionnaire in the subsection 4.5.1.1 on questionnaire in Chapter Four. The responses to the two questions were compared by the researcher. The students’ responses apparently revealed that the reasons which the students gave for liking writing were not necessarily matching to the way they formally defined writing. This, the researcher believed, revealed that the students feel the gap between what writing meant to them and between the ways it was taught to them. For example, eleven out of the fourteen students (79%) stated that they liked writing because it helped them to express themselves, their ideas, opinions, and thoughts. Five of the eleven students added the following reasons: writing helps freely express the ideas. The reasons given by the students showed that writing for the students was something which was attached to their ability to produce and share some thoughts, ideas, and opinions of their own. When they gave the responses for the last question (the one for which they were asked to provide the definitions for writing), seven of the fourteen students (50%) gave one of the following responses as answers to the question: “[It is] one of the four skills/ a skill”. Two of the fourteen said
that writing was a "course" and a "subject". This indicated to the researcher that the students thought that the researcher might have wanted the formal, school institution, definition of writing. As a result, it seemed to the researcher, they tried to either visualize what writing was like through their previous study or they attempted to recall some of the definitions given to them in the courses.

The researcher argues, through comparing the students' responses to the third and the fourth questions, that there was a gap between what the students felt was the job of writing and between the ways it was perceived through the previous writing courses. Only one of them expressed that writing was a way to express thoughts and ideas. She was the same one (Mayasah) who said that she found writing difficult to be done. For her, the formal and the self-definition of writing were the same. She was one of two who were allotted "excellent" as the overall grade for all the five writing courses exams. The researcher perceived from this that for one to be successful in writing, it has first to be for him/her a way of self-expression. The researcher infers from the students' overall responses to the first section of the questionnaire that there is a connection between the aptitude for writing and the success in writing. She also predicted that the five writing courses have not worked on this aptitude for the students to see writing as a way to create personal meanings/knowledge. These courses, it seems from the students' definitions, also did not worked on the idea of writing as a way to express and exchange the ideas and thoughts.

5.1.2 Section B: Academic writing courses are mostly seen as irrelevant and non-beneficial

Section B of the questionnaire consisted of three questions. The first question explored whether the writing courses taught at the undergraduate level were viewed by the students as relevant in content and methodology to the students' field of study. It also explored the ways in which students saw this relevance. The second question explored further whether the relevance was taken by the courses into the realm of students' local culture. The third question connected two important elements, the relevance and the benefit as seen by the research participants. If the writing courses were seen as relevant, were they also seen as beneficial to the students' community practice (including the
academic community), cultural values, or cultural interests? It specified the cultural interests by giving three choices: economic, industrial, and social. By the above three questions the researcher wanted to investigate whether the writing courses enabled students connect between their academic culture and the general culture or not. She examined the relevance and its benefit to both the specific academic community and the general community.

To the first question, nine of the fourteen (64%) students responded that the content and methodology of the writing courses were not relevant to their field of study. The most common reason they gave for their response was that the topics given for writing were often too general. They made their answers specific by giving examples of the kinds of topics given in the writing courses. These, they wrote, ranged from how to apply for advertisements, letter writing, writing invitations, writing about TV, writing about college, etc. One of this group of the students objected that they were taught about the "basics of writing" and encouraged to memorize the topics. Another from the above group explained that such general topics did not help them in their field of study – i.e. becoming an ELE teacher. Another from the same group further explained that they were not trained to face future problems, problems that they may face in schools. One from the same group mentioned that the nature of the topics given "help[s] us to teach" but "not to develop our skills and knowledge". She angrily objected: "they don't help us know the objectives" "of the subject". This student was from the "excellent grade" category. Her response reflected her awareness of the role that the writing courses should play in the development of students' skills and knowledge. She was aware that the writing courses they studied lacked this element which might trigger development in the students.

On the other hand, three of the students (21%) responded positively to the question of the relevance of content and methodology to their field of study. They wrote that the writing courses were relevant in content and methodology to their field of study. The reason they gave for such a response was that the courses helped them know how to write paragraphs, dialogues, and letters according to the rules. Thus, the reason given by this group of the students was that these courses gave them the mechanics of writing. The researcher took it for granted from this answer that the students believed that as teachers they needed to know about the mechanic rules of how to write. This was how they saw
the writing courses as relevant to their field of study. However, the researcher argues that this is a superficial relevance. This is because there is much more than to the relevance of the field than teaching the mechanics of writing.

The last two students (14%) chose to hold the stick from the middle, by seeing similarity between college and school teaching English. They said that the content of the academic writing courses was relevant but its methodology was not relevant for the professional field of the students. One of them, a female student, gave the reason for the relevance of the content. It is, she writes, “related to the course book of schools”. She has given two examples: writing an invitation and writing a letter to a friend. These are actually two topics in the Crescent English, the book that is taught to children in the schools in Yemen. The other student, a male student, justified the relevance again in the fact that in these writing courses they were taught the structure, punctuation, writing main points into a paragraph, and how to write a summary. However, he found the methodology as irrelevant. He justified the lack of the relevance of the methodology to the fact that the teachers who taught them the writing courses were not specialized in writing. Thus, the researcher felt, the relevance which the students believed that it existed between the previous writing courses and their field of study was an artificial one. Being an English teacher who would be responsible for the cultural development of the country and able to initiate an intercultural dialogue must know more than this.

To the second question (Beyond you area of specialization, do you think the courses are useful and relevant to your culture?), seven students out of the fourteen students (50%) responded negatively. Three of them wrote that the content of the courses was more relevant to the American and British cultures or Western culture than it was to the culture of the country. One of the students gave an example from one of the courses. She wrote that when they were taught how to write an invitation they were taught that in the “American and British method”. The other expressed the need for “authentic materials related to learners’ real life”. The third wrote that the topics taught had “no direct connections with our thoughts and actions”. She added: “teachers take from British and American books and its [sic] content does [sic] not serve our needs to ... express our thought according to our culture”. One of the students gave the reason for his negative response that the professors were not native. Some of the teachers were Indians and of
course they did not know the local culture of the students. The student’s answer apparently implies the fact that foreigners will not be able to make the writing courses they teach relevant to the students’ native culture. Another student commented that they “rarely [got] chance to write about topics related to [their own] culture”. On similar veins, four of the students used expressions like “somehow”, “not much”, “sometimes”, and phrases like “only one course [was] relevant and useful” to reflect the rarity they perceived of the occurrence of such cases. The remaining three students who responded positively to the question followed their “yes” with phrases such as “not in all aspects but in some aspects” and expressions like “sometimes”. This indicates that the students are hesitant in their answers. They are like others feel that the relevance and usefulness are rare.

The only student, from the group who responded positively, wrote “yes” followed with no doubt or hesitance expression gave the following reason for her answer: “we write paragraphs about our habits, traditions, [and] ceremonies. In this sense the courses are useful and relevant to our culture”. The researcher, however, sees the relevance not the usefulness in the student’s answer. Moreover, the researcher does not see the reason given by one student as evidence that the writing courses may lead to cultural development. The students’ writing of some paragraphs about the ceremonies, habits, and traditions is not enough.

The students’ responses to the third question (If the writing courses useful or relevant to your culture, are they relevant and beneficial for community practice (including the academic community), cultural values, or cultural interests (economic, industrial, or social)) came as no surprise to the researcher. Again, seven out of the fourteen (50%) students found the courses not useful or relevant to the community practices including those of the academic community. They saw them as far away from the values and interests of the community in all their aspects (economic, industrial, and social). Their comments reflected their yearning for writing courses that relate their studies to their culture and community practices.

For example, one more student suggested topics such as writing to the school manager, to the minister of education, to a friend to replace her in work. She also
suggested topics that could have more cultural relevance such as forgiveness, morality, and faithfulness.

Two students' of the above seven students' responses shocked the researcher because of the sense of rejection for the other culture. One of the two wrote: "we are taught another culture not relevant to our community". The other one argued: "the courses belong to another culture, so they don't have the thoughts and values of our cultural interests". She added: "they don't have relevance to our economic, industrial, and social needs. They don't play rule [sic] in our specific and general cultures". This celebration of monoculturalism, the researcher reiterates, may blind students' eyes to the possibilities that cultural development may emerge through intercultural dialogue. Yemeni student teachers who live in the post revolution period (see the researcher's argument concerning the developmental and dialogic role expected from student teachers in her country in subsection 1.1.2 in Chapter One), the researcher argues, need to get involved into the process of dialogue with other cultures so that they will play their rules in the cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

A group of students, three (22%), however, responded positively but they did not give any reason for their responses like the above students.

Apart from the above three students, one student identified one course AWS (Advanced Writing Skills) as relevant because it offered some topics like the "Swine Flu" and "mobiles as blessing or curse". He explained that writing about a topic like the Swine Flu could help protect selves and societies. The researcher does not question the value of this topic for the society. But, she argues that the students need to be aware of the way to relate such topics to an English teacher's mission in society.

One student said that the courses were relevant but not beneficial without justifying her answer. The last student of the fourteen gave a conditional sentence: "if the courses were relevant, they will [sic] be beneficial". The researcher took the sentence as responding negatively to the question because this particular student already gave negative responses to the first (Do you find the content and methodology of teaching in writing courses related to your field of study as an English teacher; if "yes", how; if "no", why?) and the second (Beyond you area of specialization, do you think the courses are useful and relevant to your culture?) questions. Thus, the researcher concludes that many
students do not see relevancy and benefits of the previous writing courses. Furthermore, the researcher observed that the students did not include or mention development (both personal and professional) as one of the possible cultural benefits of the courses.

5.1.3 Section C: Rare justification, personalising responses to rich and complex reading, professional orientation

Section C was an attempt on behalf of the researcher to explore whether the previous writing courses studied by the students enabled them to be deliberately dialogically responsive to views of others. The first question (Were you required to provide academic responses of the sort that you encounter in content courses (i.e. defining, justifying, explaining, etc.)?) asked about whether the students were required to provide academic responses. These academic responses were identified in the question to be like defining, justifying, explaining, etc. the students’ own positions in the academic writing that was done in these courses.

The second question (Were you instructed to provide justified substantiated opinions in any of the courses? Were they generalized, specific, or personalized?), which consisted of two questions, the first asked about whether justified opinions were required or not, the second one required an answer for whether the justified opinions, if required from the students in the courses, were generalized, specific, or personalized. The second question specified responses as value-laden ones, opinions. Generalized, specific, or personalized was an attempt to inquire about the natures of the opinions expresses, general (not related to field or self), specific (related to the field), or personalized (related to personal experience).

The third question explores writing as responsive to reading and whether the nature of the reading done was exploratory, interpretive, or informative.

The fourth question investigates into whether the previous writing courses enabled students make a connection between the practices of the academic community and their duties and responsibilities towards it as responsive.

To the first question, nine of the fourteen students (64%) wrote “no” as a response. They wrote that definitions, explanations, and justifications of the sort that they encountered in the content courses were not required from them in the writing courses.
One of the students connected justifications, explanations, and definitions with personal writing. She commented: “Our personal writing does not exist in the courses and in the subject itself.” One student, aware that such definitions, explanations, and justification are related to a teacher’s future need, wrote: “the teacher gives us topics [that] are not related or relevant to our future needs”. Disappointedly she adds: “He just asks us to write”.

The five remaining students out of the fourteen (12%) responded positively to the question but their “yes” was not a determined one. For example, one of the students reflected that only definitions have been given and these have been “limited”. She gave an example to support her reflection. She wrote that for defining they were asked to define single words, identify its category and details, and where this word was used. This way of writing definitions, the researcher claims, can be easily done by consulting any dictionary. That is, the students have been taught how to use the dictionary to write definitions. The researcher argues that this does not help the students to make their own definitions. In this way in which they have been taught they will be dependent on the dictionary. They will not be able to construct definitions in case they are encountered with phenomenon or concepts for which they need new definitions. Even the above mentioned student seems to be aware of this. She ended her comment saying: “But, this [sic] definitions are not profound”. This comment shows that the student feels that this way of teaching how to define does not properly prepare them to construct definitions.

Two of the students answered that such kind of academic responses were asked for in only one course, Advanced Writing Course. One of them answered that only justifying was taught without providing any example to support her answers. The other wrote that justifying and explaining were taught and gave examples. He also said that such academic responses were asked for “at the beginning” of the course. This meant that these were not given the time to grow and develop as part of the students’ communicative skill in academic writing. He explained that for justification they were given two paragraphs or opinions to choose from and justify the choice. He also wrote that they were also given “some events, instruments, etc., to explain them”. The first example, given by the student, showed that the student meant argumentation. The argumentation was based on “two or more than two paragraphs” from which the student had to choose
and support/justify the choice. This, the researcher argues, will narrow down the possibilities available for the students. In argumentation, justification is required but do they have to choose from only available choices provided by the teacher. The students need to be given the chance to search for additional choices for themselves and justify them. They need to be given enough time and practice to develop the academic skill of justification that is germane to seeing more possibilities. The second example given by the student was that they were given some events, instruments, etc, to explain. Instruments cannot be explained. They can be described. So, it was not clear whether the student meant description or explanation.

For the last two students who replied affirmatively to the question, one jotted down a “yes” without giving a support for her answer and the second provided an example. The second student wrote that they were asked to apply for a driving license. However, she expressed her regret by saying “but at that time the information of how to apply existed as points and we make [sic] them as [sic] paragraph”. It seems that the student thought of this particular task as explanation. The student herself regretted that they were not given the chance to explain how to apply. They were, rather, given all the information and they were to write them in a paragraph form. However, the researcher argues that the aim of the task described by the student was not to enable them explain. Rather, it was designed to help them develop a paragraph from outlines. This was also stated in the objectives of one of the writing courses in the appendix 8. Thus, it was clear - from the students’ responses, that most of the students were not aware they were taught how to make academic responses. For those to them this awareness occurred, they felt they were not provided with enough packages of tasks for helping students do so.

To the second question, all except two of the fourteen students (86%) responded positively. However, there was variation, in the participants’ responses, about the frequency of the occurrence of the demands for justified academic responses and the nature of the academic responses that occurred; in other words, whether they were generalized, personalized, or specific.

Two of the twelve students noted down that justified responses were “rarely” demanded. One of them specified that in addition to the rarity of their occurrence, the justified opinions were asked for in only one course. She did not provide the name of the
course. About the nature of the academic responses demanded from the students she has written that they were generalized. The other student's response came as a surprise for the researcher. She inscribed: “we were rarely asked but we were alone [sic] writing justified opinions”. This meant that students themselves were aware of the value of justified opinions but they were rarely required to do so. She added that sometimes the responses/opinions were generalized and sometimes they were specific or personalized. This response was similar to another student’s. This last referred to student wrote: “I have been asked to write answers to questions, paragraphs, and essays, but not to express my opinion”. She continued: “However, I used to write my personal opinion without being instructed from the teachers or the doctors”. This supports the point made by the researcher above that the students are aware of the importance of writing justified opinions but this is rarely required.

Three other students gave similar answers to the question. They jotted down that in only one course they were required to provide justified responses. One of them gave the name of the course which was AWS (Advanced Writing Skills); and the other two did not identify the name of the course. Moreover, the three participants provided different answers concerning the nature of the response demanded from them. Two stated that personalized opinions were asked for and the other noted that specific responses were required.

One more student answered in a way similar to these two students. She recalled that in second year they were instructed to “provide justified opinion”. She mentioned only one example the thing which meant that it might happened only once in that course.

The remaining five students who have answered positively to the question did identify a particular course like the two students above. They did not also express awareness of the importance of expressing an academic opinion of their own like the second and the third students above. Three of the five students noted that they provided justified opinions but did not mention whether they were instructed to do so or not. One of the three mentioned that she provided generalized opinions; the second noted down that she sometimes wrote generalized opinions and sometimes personalized opinions; and the third one wrote that she provided a personalized opinion when she was asked to write about one topic about women education.
The remaining two of the five who positively answered said that they were instructed to provide justified opinions. One of them jotted down that she provided personalized or specific or generalized opinions "in some course"; the other did not specify whether the opinions were provided in all the courses or in some of the courses. He wrote that most of the responses provided by him were personalized.

Only two of the fourteen students (5%) responded negatively to the question and they did not specify the nature of the responses.

To conclude, the researcher claims that in spite of the fact that the majority of the students provided positive responses (i.e. yes) to the question, their responses shed light on the rarity of its occurrence. Some of them obviously wrote that it was rarely demanded and others wrote that it occurred in only one course. Some of them clearly stated that they were not required to do so and the others simply gave the answer "justified responses" without making it clear whether they were instructed to do so. Thus, from this explanation of the researcher and the two negative responses to the question, the researcher concludes that the previous writing courses taught to the students have rarely tackled the issue of enabling students to provide academic responses. When it has been required, there has been no attempt to enable students to personalize the field knowledge (i.e. the specific) and generalize them in terms of finding relevant use for the social cultural. Each one, it seems from the students' responses to the question, has occurred in isolation from the others.

For the third question of section C of the questionnaire (Did you read to write? Was the reading done in the writing courses exploratory, interpretive, or informative?), twelve out of the fourteen students (86%) responded positively to the question. Ten of the twelve read to write but their reading was only informative; i.e. in the sense that they did not mention in their answers that they read for exploration or interpretation. The remaining two students made different responses. One of the two did exploratory reading and the other did informative, exploratory, and interpretive reading in the writing courses.

Two students out of the fourteen (14%) noted down that they never read to write.

From the above evidence it is clear to the researcher that the majority of the students read to write but their reading was just to look for information to use in writing in the writing courses. It was not exploratory or interpretive except in the two cases
mentioned above. The researcher believes that for reading to lead to responsive writing, a balance between exploratory, interpretive, and informative reading should be there to inform a culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic academic writing.

To the fourth question (Did the writing tasks and methodology in the writing courses orient you to the responsibilities, duties, and practices of your academic community?), ten out of the fourteen (71%) gave "no" and "never" as a response.

Four of the fourteen (29%) responded positively but their responses varied to the type of orientation felt by them to be given in the courses. Two of the four who responded with "yes" answered that they were oriented only to the practices of their academic community. The last two of the four varied in their responses. One wrote that she was oriented to the responsibilities of her academic community and the other answered that he was oriented to the duties of his academic community. This last mentioned one identified the duties of the academic community as knowing "how to write to your friend and parents". This, the researcher believes, is not one of the duties of the academic community. It is a basic duty of a friend towards another and a son towards his/her parents. Thus, the researcher concludes that the previous writing courses taught to students did not orient them to the larger academic practices, duties, and responsibilities of their academic community.

-5.1.4 Section D: No much learning, professional, and/or international community

Section D of the questionnaire addressed dialogic intersubjectivity at three levels, the classroom level, outside the classroom, and outside the national level. This was presented in the first and the fourth questions of the questionnaire (1. Have you been asked to discuss your writing with a teacher, peer, a friend, or a parent? 4. Were you asked to write something in response to a theorist from another culture?). These two mentioned questions enquired about whether an interaction between students and their classmates and between them and their friends/parents/teachers/theorists from other cultures took place. The second and the fifth questions (i.e. what attitude did you develop during discussion; enmity, friendliness, membership, or indifference?) and (when
you respond to the foreign theorist, do you feel that both of you belong to an international academic community or to two different communities?) addressed the issues of how this interaction contributed into the building of the sense of community (both academic and national) membership. The last question (i.e. the third question; did you change the "what", "why", or the "how" of your writing after the discussion?) dealt with the idea of how interaction affected the quality of the writing. Hence, the five questions presented an attempt to investigate how the previous writing courses enabled the students be dialogically intersubjective. They examined how the courses dealt with issues related to dialogic intersubjectivity such as intercultural dialogue and development.

To **the first question**, all the participants except one (93%) gave a positive answer. The selection of the category interacted with (i.e. whether the discussion was with a friend, peer, teacher, or parent) varied. Four chose the word "friend(s)" but from the remaining parts of the responses it was clear to the researcher that students thought that the two words (peer and friend) meant the same thing. For example, one of the four students wrote: "I have been asked to discuss my writing with a friend and it was [sic] twice in only one course".

Another student noted down that she was asked to discuss her writing with a friend. Then in explaining how the discussion went on she used the word [sic] "classmates". Thus, the researcher took the word "friend" to mean "peer" in the students' responses and deduced that the four students also discussed with peers. This enabled the researcher to add one to the four students (making them into five students). He used the word classmates and thus can be considered another one to be added to the group of students who wrote they interacted with peers.

Other five students replied that they discussed with both peers and teachers.

Other three students provided varied responses. One said that she discussed only with the teacher, the other with the teacher, friend, and peer; and the third gave a "yes, I had" answer without specifying the category with which she interacted. This made the researcher infer that the last referred to participant interacted with all the categories mentioned in the question.

Therefore, from the students' choice of the categories with which they discussed, the researcher generalized that the previous writing courses did not encourage students to
take the discussions outside the classroom. This might mean that there were no obvious objectives of making connection between the class as representative of the larger academic community and the larger social community outside. Though it was not asked for in the question, three of the above students from the second five students mentioned the frequency of the occurrence of the discussions. They used the following words and phrases: "sometimes", "just for [sic] once", and "rarely". This implied that the interaction was not regular. It, at the least, told us that some of the students were not satisfied with the frequency of the interaction. Another two of the above second five students clarified the nature of such called discussions. One of them used the word "edit" to talk about the nature of the discussions. The other student wrote: "it was not a kind of discussion but a kind of correction". She used this sentence to describe a situation in which her teacher found that she did not leave a space between the article and the noun. And this, it seems, happened once to the student. These above two responses from the participants told us that the discussions that took place were not of high quality. They occurred for correcting structural mistakes. However, this aspect will be made clearer from their answers to the third question which asks about the nature of changes made after discussions.

There has been only one student who responded negatively to the question. The participant said that she was not asked by the teacher to discuss. It was her friend who asked her for discussion. For this reason, the researcher considered this particular student's response also as a positive answer for the occurrence of the discussion whatever its quality was. The researcher, thus, concluded that the discussions occurred and were asked for. Nonetheless, there was evidence that they did not taken place regularly and their quality for a change that may lead to cultural development and intercultural dialogue would thus be doubtful.

For question number two, eight of the fourteen students (57%) wrote that the attitude that they developed during their discussions in class was friendliness. This supported the observation made by the researcher in her analysis of the responses to the first question. That is, they considered peers as friends. As they considered their peers as friends, the natural response to the second question was friendliness. What attitude could a friend develop toward another friend other than friendliness? This meant that the attitude was originally there without its being initiated by the discussions. This in turn
indicated that founding a sense of community was not aimed for in the courses. Two more students chose two attitudes. The first opted for friendliness and membership and the other developed along with her peers friendliness and indifference. The mixture of the attitudes of the first student is reasonable but the other one's came as a surprise for the researcher. She, the student, used the term indifference to describe the feeling of the less able students. She wrote: “especially the students of the lower level. [The] best students don’t allow them to discuss Dr [so] they don’t want to share”. Therefore, she described the attitude of the less able students with indifference.

This also meant that there was no sense of community developed in the students. Three other students selected membership as their attitude but they did not mention whether this particular attitude was developed after or during discussions. Moreover, one can judge this attitude as the one that arises naturally when a group of people work with each other for a long time. The last student, it seemed to the researcher, was unable to bond in any way. She wrote: “I couldn’t develop any attitude during the discussion”. This particular student stated above that she had only one discussion and obviously was talking about this particular discussion. She added: “my classmate copied the topics from another book, she didn’t write her own thoughts”. This meant that there was no direct supervision on the nature of such discussions and emphasis on their fruitfulness for the students.

To conclude the analysis of the participants’ responses to question number two, the researcher inferred from the fact that only two students opted for membership as their choice that the writing courses did not explicitly address the issue of community membership. They did not prepare the students to be members of a community through encouraging positive interaction that strengthens such attitudes.

To the third question, ten out of the fourteen students (71%) responded positively and four (29%) responded negatively. As the question offered choices for the change that occurred during discussion, four of the ten students who responded positively chose the how or the way of writing to be the focus of the change that occurred. They have used sentences and phrases like “they understand how they write in correct way”, “I changed the way of writing”, “I did, when I find [sic] that I forget [sic] something or [if] there is [sic] a better way to write”, “in most times I change ‘how’[or] the way of
writing”. The nature of such changes, it seemed from one of the responses above, and from two other students, was mechanistic. The latter, though did not state explicitly that they changed the way like the four students above, their answers gave a clue to the nature of change that occurred. One of the two wrote: “we correct the mistakes and rewrite them”; and the other, talking about the nature of help got from her classmate, noted down: “She also helped correct the grammar of my writing”.

From the previous responses of the two students and from first of the four responses above, it was clear that the focus of the change after discussion was correcting structural mistakes. This supported the findings made by the researcher in analyzing students' responses to the first question in section D above. The discussions made in the class were not of high quality. The changes that occurred were not frequent. Two of the four students who wrote that they changed the way of writing used the adverb “sometimes” to express about the scarcity of the occasions in which the change took place. One more student used the conditional “if” to talk about her opinion. She noted down: “if I noted that need for my writing [sic] I change [sic]”.

The researcher claims, following Bakhtin’s insight, that after meaningful dialogue, there should be a change. This implies that the discussions have not been dialogic in general. Two other students made their responses open. That is, they have given a “yes, I did” response without choosing in which category the change has occurred. Thus, the researcher deduced from their responses that a particular change occurred but the student could not describe it. One more student mentioned that she changed the “what”, the “how”, and the “why” of her writing. But, since she was a single case, the researcher could predict that the change was rare.

The remaining four students were those who said that they did not change their writing after the discussions. They expressed their negative responses differently. Two of them have written a flat “no”. They wrote that they did not change anything. The other last two from the four who responded negatively expressed their negative responses differently. One regretted: “I wanted to change my way of writing but I did not know how”. The other said that she usually did not change.

All in all, the researcher concludes from the students’ responses that students usually changed the “how” of writing mechanics. In support of the conclusion made by
the researcher in analyzing responses to question one in section D, the "how" of writing that was changed by the students was at the mechanistic level. They, it seems from their responses, have changed the grammar of their writing. This also did not happen frequently. This also supports the conclusion made by the researcher in analyzing the above referred to question, i.e. question number one.

To question number four, all the students (100%) wrote that they were not asked to write a response to a theorist from another culture. Though there were not a lot of special things to mention about students' responses, the writer found three responses said more than the negation. Two students emphasized that they were not asked to respond to any theorist neither from their culture nor from other cultures. The last student wrote that she wished such thing to happen "but didn't happen at all". Hence, the researcher concludes that there has been no attempt to address intercultural dialogue in the writing courses taught to students.

To the last question of this section which asked about whether students felt they belonged to an international academic community or to two different communities when they read foreign theorists, five of the fourteen (36%) gave a flat "no". These five did not provide any detail about how they have felt. Two more students gave the reason that they were not in the first place asked to respond to other theorists, so they did not develop any opinion toward the idea. So, half of the respondents (50%) negatively responded to the question. Two participants did not provide any response for the question.

The responses of the remaining five students varied between feeling that they belonged to an international community and to two different communities. However, the way they expressed their feelings varied. Two of them put it in a direct way. One of the two said that she felt that she belonged to an international community and the other said that she felt that she, along with the theorist that she read for, belonged to two different communities. This confusion between the responses of these two students and the other seven students who responded negatively to the question could be explained from the responses of two more students. Both of these two students used a condition to express about a suppositional situation. The first wrote: "if I read for any theorist [.] I feel [sic] that [sic] an international academic community if some of his idea [sic] agree with our [sic]". The other student jotted down: "if I respond to a theorist, I will feel that we belong
to an international academic writing”. These two responses could be used to explain that the above two responses was built on the students’ supposition that if they were given the chance to read for a foreign theorist, they would either feel they belong to an international academic community or to two different communities.

The last one gave again a conditional sentence using “when”. She wrote: “when I read something, I feel as if both belong to an international academic community, I wish I could be like him”. From the answer of the last student, it was clear that this was based on a general assumption that if it happened that we read for a theorist, we would feel like this.

Therefore, the researcher concludes that the students have not developed the sense for belonging to both an international community and a community that has a different identity which belongs to their culture. Thus, the researcher predicts that the writing courses have not given the students the chance to have a dialogue between the academic community inside their country and the international academic community.

5.1.5 Conclusion

From Section A, it has been concluded that students who had aptitude for writing, gained high scores. This to some extent supports the criterion for choosing the students who got good average grades in the writing courses for the study. Those who liked writing were chosen for the study. Moreover, it has been confirmed that students liked writing as it helped them express themselves and exchange ideas. However, it seems from the students’ formal definitions of writing, that the role of writing for self-expression and exchange of ideas was not explicitly made clear to students in the previous writing courses.

From Section B, it was seen that there was no relevance seen between content and methodology on the one hand and the academic community practices, values, or interests on the other hand by the majority of the students. The relevance that was perceived by the students was in terms of learning mechanics of writing. Furthermore, the relevance to the national community was not conceived by most of the students as rare.

From Section C, it was found, because of the rarity of their occurrence, a large number of students (9) were unaware of the provision of academic tasks for defining.
explaining, justifying, etc., in the previous writing courses. Those who were aware found them not sufficient. The researcher takes this as an indication that the previous writing courses have not enabled frequent formulation of justified academic opinions that involves explanation and definitions. Furthermore, the rare occasions in which justified academic opinions were demanded were generalized, specific, or personalized. That is, there was a gap between the academic field and the national culture of the students. Furthermore, students read mainly to look for information. Reading for exploration and interpretation was almost not attempted for. This means that the tasks and methodologies for teaching writing in the previous writing courses did not properly orient them to the practices, duties, and responsibilities of the academic community.

To conclude, the researcher claims, based on students’ perception of the previous writing courses, that they (the previous writing courses), like mainstream EAP courses, do not view writing as a tool for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. Students are not enabled to produce meaning/knowledge that transcends existing academic meanings for cultural development of the self, the field culture, and the national culture. Besides, the courses did not prepare them for intercultural dialogue that may (be) a precursor for and lead to cultural development through dialogic interaction. This, the researcher infers, is due to the monologic way in which the criteria of situatedness, intersubjectivity, and responsivity for meaning/knowledge making were addressed in the courses.

Therefore, the researcher intervened by teaching the above criteria dialogically for meaning/knowledge making that is culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic. For the purpose, she selected some texts and designed three tasks, and interacted dialogically with the students after writing the first draft of the first task (cf. Chapter Four on the rationale and aims of texts’ selection, tasks’ design, and talk with the students).

The following section presents written tasks’ analysis of students’ written drafts. The analysis sheds light on how dialogic situatedness, responsivity, and intersubjectivity realized in the fourteen students’ writings and their effect along with the effect of the audience on cultural development and intercultural dialogue in students’ academic writing.
5.2 Analysis of the Students’ Written Drafts

This section consists of two main subsections. The first subsection involves the analysis of the students’ first and last drafts of the first task. The second subsection is a comparative analysis of the students’ last drafts of the second and the third tasks.

5.2.1 Analysis of the first task

This subsection has two main subsections. The first part is an analysis of the students’ performance before the teacher-students dialogue. The second part is an analysis of the students’ post talk last drafts of the first task.

5.2.1.1 Analysis and interpretation of the first drafts of the first task

The analysis of the first drafts is an extension of the questionnaire’s analysis in the sense that it sheds light on students’ written performance. So, the analysis of the questionnaire and the analysis of the first drafts of the first task give two-dimensional picture of the perception and the performance of the students. The aim from this analysis is to evaluate students’ written performance under the influence of two interventions: first, the choice of texts presenting ideas by scholars from other field (philosophy) and from different cultures than that of the students; second, the design of a task that demands a situated, responsive, and intersubjective essayist writing. The researcher explained to the students that they are expected to write responses to the philosophers’ ideas about morality that clearly shows who they are (personally, professionally, and culturally). The idea to see whether they would reflect dialogic intersubjectivity in their interaction with the philosophers’ ideas; whether they would express an opinion (authorial or authoritative); and whether they would (re-)contextualize their responses. Then, the effect of the (non-) dialogicality of using the criteria on making meaning/knowledge would be gauged. Therefore, the main parts of this analysis reflect this consciousness on the part of the researcher. These two parts are gauging the dialogicality of the criteria in the students’ discourse and the scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

23 Samples of students’ first drafts of the first task are relevant in appendix 5
The first difficulty that the researcher faced was how to demarcate the use of the three criteria in students' responses. In the criteria framework presented by the researcher in Chapter Three, the criteria have been perceived to mean the following: dialogic/positive intersubjectivity means the tendency to not control the other's discourse; responsivity means formulating an idea showing an active understanding in relation to another’s; and situatedness means showing outsideness/ re-contextualizing one’s idea(s). For the purpose, she began by looking for students' opinions about morality (the theme of the selected texts) because in expressing and explaining them the dynamics of interaction, the response, and the context would be perceived. She began with the introductory paragraphs but could not come up with a pattern. For this reason, the researcher looked for more evidence in the concluding paragraphs written by the students in their first drafts. The researcher looked for the opinions in the concluding paragraphs because the question itself was directed in such a way that might have had led students to do so. The question was: read the following summaries about morality, summarise, explain, and respond to the theories. When the students asked about what the researcher meant by the word respond, she answered that they should provide their opinions. Consequently, as the word ‘respond’ was the last in the question, it might have had been allotted the last place in the students’ essays. Another justification is that it is a tendency in the Arabic rhetoric to provide the opinion at the end. This, the researcher found true through her personal experience as an Arab. So, both the justifications were relevant and reasonable for the researcher to begin looking at the concluding paragraphs.

By relating the concluding paragraphs to the opening paragraphs the researcher detected some similarities in the students’ responses. These similarities the researcher took to reveal a culturally assimilated opinion. Table 5.1 presents examples taken from both the students’ opening paragraphs and the concluding paragraphs. The words (‘treatment’, ‘dealing’, and ‘relationship’) that were detected by the researcher to carry similar meanings and connotations concerning the culturally assimilated meaning of morality were underlined in table 5.1 below. These words with their cultural connotations and meanings were related to other phrases and sentences from the students’ concluding paragraphs presented in table 5.2 below. The phrases showed a strong Islamic meaning of morality. These phrases are underlined also in table 5.2 to highlight them from other non-
Islamic ones in students' writings. The researcher provided an explanation of why she found these words and phrases as related to each other and reflecting culturally assimilated meanings in students' writings.

(Table 5.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The participant</th>
<th>The sentences and phrases(24) which reflect cultural meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mayasah(25)</td>
<td>I think being morale means honesty, straightfulness and respectful treatment for others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Ameera</td>
<td>. . . morals improve the relationship of the person with his God, family, and society to live in the society without causing harm others as well as he is not the cause in harm the other person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Asma’a</td>
<td>We should treat each other respectfully. So life takes its straight path peacefully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Ekram</td>
<td>Morality calls human beings to kind, fine and good treatment with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Basmah</td>
<td>The major for morality is treatment that you should treat people and respect their freedom and opinions, so you should treat people as you like them to treat you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Abdullah</td>
<td>To achieve this harmony, one should treat people according to their minds, social levels, cultures, ages and kind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sana’a</td>
<td>I think a person can behave morally if he deals with others as he wants from them to deal to him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Haifa’a</td>
<td>In my opinion morality means that good dealing with all people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Samar</td>
<td>In my opinion morality is a behaviour which prove by how you can deal with the other people who surround you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(24\) All the phrases and sentences presented in this table and all the following tables are cited by the researcher as they have occurred in the students' writings. All the mistakes committed by the students are not corrected. The rationale is that the reader might interpret them differently if the researcher interferes into correcting them.

\(25\) The names used here are pseudonyms. These are not the real names of the students. The researcher has promised students that she will not use their names so that they can express their opinions in the questionnaire and in writing freely.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The participant</th>
<th>The sentences and phrases which reflect cultural meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Samar</td>
<td>I think we must deal with the other as prophet Mohammed as us to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Ameera</td>
<td>Morality is a group of behaviours that grow up from a religious social principles and become in complete picture when all individuals of the society apply it. The summary of the topic, morals improve the relationship of the person with his God, . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mayasah</td>
<td>Also to make a morale decision we should follow our Islamic rules and maxims. If we obey Allah we won't cause bad consequences. If the person wants to act morally, he won't care about anything but doing the right things according to our Islamic rules and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Asma’a</td>
<td>. . . our religion Islam offers the solution as the righteousness is clear and there is nothing vague about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ekram</td>
<td>If human being is moral he will get heaven immediately; and if he is not moral, he will be asked by his lord and may get heaven by the mercy of Allah or may get hell. although/ in spite of all good things he did . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Basmah</td>
<td>Morality is the light that comes from religion servour messanger which makes people near to God. Another major for morality is remorse that make person feeling sorrow and pain about his sin and doing. So a person return about his doing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 This sentence, though does not explicitly indicate religious affiliation, it is one of the principles of the Islamic Shariah. If you commit a sin, he/she has to repent. One of the conditions/measures (to use the
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Abdullah</td>
<td>According to me, morality in generally, means to be in harmony with yourself and others, but this harmony should not contradict the directions of Islam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Thakiah</td>
<td>. . .there are certain rules that determine the kind or moral: such as Islamic principles . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Haifa’a</td>
<td>And if we want to reach the top of morality we must follow the holy Qora’an and our Islamic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Balqis</td>
<td>Our religion have a lot of moral meanings. That make you feel with satisfaction to any good act and have rules and base which It describes with moderate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1.1.1 Gauging the criteria

The above two tables, as they represent students’ responses on the topic, will be used by the researcher to demonstrate how their responsivity has been reflected. All the students’ responses in tables 5.1 and 5.2 are inseparable from their cultural background. The points of view are assimilated from the students’ culture. The students represented in the first table perceive morality as respectful treatment of others and good dealings and relationships. These two principles of morality can be extracted from the Islamic Shariah as follows. Prophet Mohammed (Peace and prayer be upon him) has said that he was sent by God to complement the best of morality (As cited in Al-Albani (2008), p. 75). There is also a well-known proverb which states that *religion is treatment*. That religion is treatment is considered a widely accepted religious rule. Al-Otheimeen (2007/1428) in his book *Makarem Al-Akhlaq* acknowledged this to be an Islamic rule. That is, good treatment means to deal with people according to the teachings of Islam. These two, the Hadith by Prophet Mohammed (Peace and prayer be upon him) and the proverb that has turned into an Islamic rule, can be related in the following way. Religion is the best of morality. Morality means good treatment. Hence, morality in the Islamic perspective

---

*girl’s word though she has misspelled it as “major”)* for the acceptance of repentance is the person’s feeling of regret. The girl above has used the word “remorse”.

27 Here the reader should not mix between the words response and responsivity. Response in this analysis and throughout all the analyses will mean students’ answers taken from their written documents. Responsivity refers to the criterion which means the process of active understanding and the formulation of relational and meaningful personal understanding of something.
means good and respectful treatment according to Islamic rules. Consequently, it is possible to relate the second table to the first table. In the second table, participants described morality as dealing with people enlightened by what Prophet Mohammed instruct us; see Samar’s sentence in the second table. All the sentences in table two boil down into this interpretation. Morality means following the guidance of the Holy Quran, Islamic principles and rules, not to contradict the directions of Islam, etc. Even the two responses which look different from the others, namely those by Ekram and the second sentence by Basmah can also be interpreted in the same way. Basamh has expressed that remorse is one of the measures of morality. She thinks of immorality in the light of the Islamic perspective as a sin. In consequence, an immoral person needs repentance to be accepted by God according to the Islamic Shariah. Ekram’s response confirms the researcher’s interpretation of Basmah’s response. According to her, moral persons will go to heaven and immoral persons will go to hell. This is because being moral is predicted as being religious and vice versa. Thus, from here comes Ekram’s apparently logical conclusion that these (the moral and the immoral persons) will go to heaven and hell accordingly.

The researcher concludes from analysing the first two tables that students’ responsivity does not reflect a surplus of seeing in the sense that each student does not have his/her own personal perspective. They reflect rather than refract their cultural perspective. The concluding paragraphs have not reflected students’ effort to come up with their own understanding of morality.

However, in table 5.3 the students have represented opinions that show a personal view of morality.

(Table 5.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>The participant</th>
<th>The sentences and phrases which reflect personal meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ameera</td>
<td>The behaviour is a group of movements and external and feeling expressions through which the person tries to achieve agreement between himself and the society in which she/he lives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The summary of the topic, morals improve the relationship of the person with his God, family, and society to live in the society without causing harm others as well as he is not the cause in harm the other person. If any person commit by good morals as far as he/she can, he/she will feel content, satisfied and happy in all his/her life.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mayasah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Asma'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Mohammed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ekram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Basmah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Morality is not an easy word to be defined. This term has a general and specific meaning. The general definition is related to our society but the specific one is related to ourselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Morality is an abstract concept. In my opinion, morality is doing what is supposed to be right, reacting to what the situation demands. Though what can be considered as right for one person may be exactly the opposite for another...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>but in my opinion morality is growing with a person from childhood to the end but it's different form person to another, because it depends on his/her parents, society... etc everyone has morality even the bad person the crimer, the murder but they loss it sometimes. Morality has not specific definition, but it's like a weapon with two ways for protect you self or kill it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>With regard to my opinion, morality is a best quality that human beings should possess in his life, because morality includes all good and cultural values, virtue and all the best qualities that every human wish to find them in him and in others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My opinion about morality is that it is principles, concepts, values and virtue that guide person to act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
moral in his action and doing. It is abstract thing, inside person which appear in his behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thakiah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My opinion about morality is: morality is an abstract word appears in human actions through his acting and that expresses about the feelings in his inside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Ameera, for example, morality is a tool for achieving harmony between a person and his/her society. Mayasah has remarked that it has general and specific meanings related to both society and the person respectively. Asma’a has pointed out that morality is a concept that means doing what is supposed to be correct according to the situation. Thus, morality for her depends on the demands of the situations which the person faces in his/her life. Mohammed focuses on the developmental aspect of morality. To him morality grows and differs from one person to another and may disappear or appear in several stages of a person’s life. He identifies it as a two-edged weapon that may hurt or protect according to the way it is used. Ekram sees morality as good quality that reflects the best cultural values adopted by the person. Basmah believes that morality is both internal (values and principles) and external (action and behaviour). Thakiah presents morality as an abstract word that reflects feelings which shows itself in term of actions. These opinions of the students reveal personal interpretations of the topic (morality). However, there is no attempt from the students’ behalf to relate with the cultural opinions represented by them about their culture or to the cultural interpretations of the thinkers.

This highlights the absence of dialogue between the three reflected positions represented consciously or unconsciously by the students in their writings: the cultural, the personal, and that of the thinkers’.

The researcher, after analysing responsivity, examines intersubjectivity and situatedness in students’ writings. For the purpose, the researcher has found the paragraphs in which the students have summarized and explained the theories the most suitable. This is because the researcher believes that they may tend to be context-oriented when giving opinions about others’ (the thinkers’) opinions because as they belong to different cultures. And, this has been the case with the students. As the paragraphs they
have written about the thinkers are many, the researcher finds it time- and space-consuming to reproduce them here for the reader. Hence, the researcher presents only the sentences and phrases that show students' interaction with the thinkers in table 5.4. The students who have not provided their opinions of the theories are not included here.

( Table 5.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The participant</th>
<th>Students' positions to Kant’s</th>
<th>Students' positions to Mill’s</th>
<th>Students' positions to Aristotle’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mayasah</td>
<td>I agree with him because, our religion teaches us to say the truth always whatever happened.</td>
<td>In my opinion, being morale doesn’t always make people happy. Sometimes, suffering has a great deal with morality especially these days.</td>
<td>For Aristotle, I don’t think that if we have good health, we'll be morale people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Basmah</td>
<td>I am with Immanuel Kant ... we must never lie, we must respect people and their freedom and we must use the rule personal to act morally. I am disagree that there is no an absolutist man, human nature is not absolute. In 3rd point ... lying</td>
<td>Some what Mill's view is acceptable that we must look at consequences ... But, in my view is that morality of an action is not weigh in terms of its utility to greatest number of people ... sometimes ... our action ... bring happiness to the most of the people</td>
<td>I totally agree with Aristotle because his view related with real situation that we should put an exampleable (the kind of person that we want to become) to live in ethical life. Then we can moral choices to become that person that we want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is allowed in some cases which are necessary to use it.</td>
<td>but, it is not condition that this happiness including ourselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mohammed</td>
<td>I am against Kant’s theory . . . when he says that the person should tell the murderer when his victim was. This is not reable especially in our religion Islam.</td>
<td>In second theory it’s not as the first or the next, but it’s logical.</td>
<td>While in the last theory, I am with it in all it aspects that Aristotle says: “you should ask you self what kind of person you want to become. Because:. If you want to choose a good way you will get the morality and if you want to choose a bad way you will loss morality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Abdullah</td>
<td>It means that there is no flexibility and variety in treating the people whereas different people and circumstances required flexibility and variety.</td>
<td>It is a good theory but sometimes we cannot expect the results of our acts. This way required a big thinking before doing any act.</td>
<td>Aristotle’s theory is a selfish theory. It means to think only about our needs and wishes, and not about other’s needs and wishes also. It says that we should not care about others, we should only do what will help us in our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>growth and development, even if it is wrong act.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Asma’a</td>
<td>I believe in considering the consequences of actions and in the concept of utility but only if it goes hand by hand and serves the greatest good. We should not be selfish and do whatever we want to accomplish our goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Thakiah</td>
<td>From my point of view about his theory is good but I contradict him in a point that “there is no concept of sometimes.” I think there is for everythings in life exception and there is no something absolute. Also when he said “Because we can’t predict</td>
<td>In my opinion his view of morality is better than Kant’s view’s because he cares with consequences but when he said “you act morally if the consequences bring happiness to the greatest number of people including yourself and if people suffer you shouldn’t do the</td>
<td>In my opinion his view in this point is not always correct because sometimes bad thing make you grow and flourish. Also he said according to what you are to be your morals are and then you can live ethical life. In this point he makes a man is the core and he marginalizes the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consequences. we must ignore them”. I don’t agree with him because consequences of actions sometimes bring sadness or harm to greatest number of people so in this case the action is not moral. action” is not always true/correct because sometimes saying true upsets including yourself but finally you will feel content. effect of society, and actions and environment on his morals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Haifa’a</td>
<td>Kant made an exaggration in his maxims Cause for us lying sometimes help to do something good, and the absolutist never help us in our life and it is so difficult to practice it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ebtisam</td>
<td>I contradict him because our personal role is not always wise. Also the word (sometimes) is not exist in his theory. The world changed as well as people the middle solutions For my point of view. I am with him to bring happiest to people because thats more good for me than sadness. If all people do like him we will be in heaven not in earth, because in heaven I agree with him that everyone should ask himself “what kind of person want to be”. That’s make everyone choose the life that he wants her without painful making the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nasmah</td>
<td>My opinion about thinker Kant, I contradict him in concept of morals which were absolute in his view. But morals in my view are all high qualities as deposit, generosity, humbleness etc. But I agree him in people must give other people respect and honor and their treatment as human and not as tools.</td>
<td>All people do the things which bring the happiness. My opinion about John Mill, I agree him in things that bring happiness to people are regard morals, but sometimes these things do not regard morals for example if person gave liar Joke to bring happiness or laughing to people. I contradict him in things that bring suffering and hardship to people do not regard morals which sometimes these things regard morals e.g. If person orders people to build house for for tired human and so he also take from other people money to light by the environment and society.</td>
<td>According to Aristotle, I agree him in all what he say it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ameera²⁸</td>
<td>He did not care for the consequences or the result of doing some thing. He did not care for other people who may get endangered of behaviour. The important thing in this theory is the consistency. For example, the academic person, especially the teacher, should be consistent in his speech and acting. For example, In the time of exam, teacher should specify the time of exam according of quality, quantity of question. In this example, the teacher should be consistent.</td>
<td>She/ He [teacher], according to this theory, must think what he will teach and present the lesson in the best way and in simple way that must be suitable for all levels. He/ she must presents the lesson step by step to reach the mind of students and this will be beneficial for both students and teacher.</td>
<td>The last philosopher . . . focused on the consequence. For example, if you treat other well, you will get good friendly relation. Teacher must advice his/ her students to make their school cleaner, healthier, and more beautiful by growing up trees. Teacher can advise students by saying (health mind in health body). . . . This will give them healthy, fit growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁸ Unlike other students in this table who has been selected by the researcher as giving clearly stated opinions (for example, agreement/disagreement, explicitly stated opinion such as “logical”, “selfish”, etc) bout the three theorists, Ameera’s opinion is manifesting in the provision of examples to support what she believes is good in every theory.
and doesn’t permit of any increasing in time for any student. Also, in the class, teacher should deal with all students by the same way regardless of their mental levels and social situation. When the teacher puts a particular mark for every question, he should be consistent and any thing such as his relationship with students should not effect grading.

In the sentences presented in the table above students have agreed, disagreed, refuted, half-agreed, and half-rejected the thinkers’ opinions. For example, Mayasah and Mohammed above have used their understanding for their religion (cultural understanding) to agree and disagree with Kant. Mayasah (like Kant) has rejected lying because Islam rejects it and Mohammed (in opposition to Kant) has rejected the example given by Kant on the basis that this is not Islamic. Nasmah has interpretively used her religious background to refute Mill’s idea of relating happiness to morality. She has used an example of a person who is telling lie to make people laugh. This is an adaptation of a well-known Hadith by Prophet Mohammed which says: ‘Wail29 for those who tell lies to

29 Wail is a name of a valley in hell. In this Hadith Prophet Mohammed (Peace and Prayer be upon him says that this valley will be the punishment for those who do in this.
make people laugh'; cited in Al-Manawi (1972), p. 425. As lying is immoral in Islam and as there is a warning of using it to make people happy, Nesmah might have used the connotation of the Hadith to predict that not everything that makes people happy is necessarily moral. Probably having similar associations, Mayasah has rejected Mill's idea of relating happiness to morality. However, she has chosen to use her daily experience to refute Mill's idea. Mayasah comments that 'suffering has a great deal with morality these days.' Thakiah believes that 'saying true upsets including yourself but finally you will feel content.' Though both of the girls agree that morality is not necessarily related to happiness, Thakiah's position is a little bit different from that of Mayasah. She believes that finally morality will bring content. Her interpretation of Mill's position comes from a deeper understanding of the meaning of sadness that morality sometimes causes. It is the sad moral condolence that ends in content which is spiritually at a higher emotional level than instant and expected personal happiness. Content comes out of satisfaction that is based on a belief, may be the belief that morality has its own reward. Basmah (on the same line with Mayasah) believes that morality and happiness are not related in the way Mill explains. Based on Islamic conviction that we need sometimes to sacrifice our happiness for the others, she points out that 'it is not condition that this happiness [includes us].'

On the same vein, Haifa'a and Basmah have rejected Kant's maxim that we should never lie on the basis that 'lying helps to do something good' and that 'lying is allowed in some cases which [make it] necessary to use it'. Because of the two students' use of the adverb 'sometimes' and the adjective 'necessary', the researcher predicts that they must oppose the absolutist meaning embedded in Kant's example based on Islamic rules. In this example, Kant tells out of his conviction that one should never lie that even if a murderer asks him where the victim is hiding, he will tell the murderer. The two girls retract that sometimes lying is useful and in some cases it is necessary. In Islam Lying is permitted sometimes (not always) when you can bring a benefit to someone who is in need of it or when it is necessary to lie and there is a great need for it.

Apart from drawing upon their cultural Islamic tradition, students have also used their reasoning to accept or reject the theorists' opinions. For example, Basmah, Abdullah, and Ebtisam have used their reasoning ability to reject Kant's absolutism. They used the following to support their opinions: 'human nature is not absolute'; 'this
means that there is no flexibility and variety in treating people'; and 'the world [changes]'. Abdullah continues using his reasoning in interpreting Mill's theory. He hesitantly accepts Mill's theory and insistently rejects Aristotle's reckoning that the first requires 'big thinking' as 'we cannot expect the results of our acts'; and the second is a 'selfish' theory because '[it] says that we should not care about others, we should only do what will help us in our growth and development, even if it is wrong act.' Of course, this is not exactly what Aristotle has said but the student's interpretation about what the theory entails from his perspective. Thakiah also uses her reasoning skill to contradict Aristotle. She remarks that not only good things help us grow and flourish but also bad things. She objects that Aristotle's centralizes man and marginalizes the effect of environment, actions, and society on Man's moral.

Other responses do reflect neither the effort to use reasoning skills nor cultural background. For example, Nasmah, Basmah, and Mohammed have agreed with Aristotle by repeating what he has said. Mohammed has considered Mill's theory illogical without giving a clear reason for that. Ebtisam has given unconvincing reason for accepting Mill's theory: 'If all people do like him we will be in heaven not in earth, because in heaven all people do the things which bring the [happiness].’ Ameera has accepted some opinions from each theory and provided examples from her field to support her understanding.

The researcher, on the basis of the evidence from the table above, predicts that students have not got engaged into a dialogic intersubjectivity and situatedness with the theorists. Each participant has dealt with each theory in isolation from the other theories as if each theory is dealing with a different topic. It seems that they have not appreciated the intersubjectivity between the theorists or the idea that each theory may be a counter thought for the other. For example, Basmah has refused the idea of absolutism in Kant's thinking about morality and utilitarianism in Mill's thinking but accepted Aristotle's idea of growth and development. She has not involved herself into questioning why and how she could see absolutism as a counter thought to utilitarianism and development-oriented thought.

Students have been unable to exhibit the necessary outsideness that makes their meaning making dialogic. In other words, they, based on Islamic principles and values, have
accepted and rejected some of ideas presented by the thinkers but have not reflected the outsideness that makes their situatedness dialogic. There has been no attempt to transgress one’s cultural position seeing other possibilities in the thinkers’ views. They have stuck to their Islamic and personal positions (rigid situatedness) without re-contextualizing their understanding and that of the others. They have used their reasoning skills to object to or express consent to some of the ideas and used their Islamic background knowledge to agree with and reject some other ideas. But, there has been no attempt on the part of the students to bridge the gap between the two authoritative discourses. Moreover, they have also approved some of the ideas of the theorists without providing a reason for that. That is, they have accepted others’ cultural perspective without a dialogue with their own cultural perspective. See, for example, Nasmah, Basmah, and Mohammed’s unconditioned agreement with Aristotle above.

5.2.1.1.2 The scope for intercultural development and intercultural dialogue

The absence of the dialogic aspect of the criteria (intersubjectivity, situatedness, and responsivity) in students’ writing, the researcher claims, will be an obstacle in the way of the emergence of cultural development and intercultural dialogue. For example, Basmah has unconsciously used her Islamic convictions to unarguably accept part of Kant’s theory (namely the part concerning the respect of men’s dignity; see researcher’s comment on tables one and two concerning the relation between this part of Kant’s theory and Islamic belief.) and have consciously used Islam to object to the idea of absolute rejection of lying; see the researcher’s discussion of the relation between students rejection of absolutism in rejection of lying based on Islamic rules. She has written: ‘lying is allowed in some cases which are necessary to use it.’ She is relying on the authority of Islam to refuse the idea of extreme rejection. What she really, it seems to the researcher, accepts in his theory is its respect for the dignity of Man and what she really is unable to let go is Kant’s absolutism. The researcher argues that the student has not managed to have a dialogue with Kant as an absolutist from an Islamic perspective. This is also evident in almost all the students’ discourse. The researcher argues based on this evidence that the scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue is limited.
5.2.1.3 Conclusion

All in all, from the first drafts of the first task it has been seen that students’ meaning/knowledge making has been to a large extent monologic. Their discourse with the others (thinkers) showed reliance on predetermined meanings (mainly religious) of morality. Their written discourse reflected three positions on morality: their own personal opinions, their religious convictions, and the thinkers’ views. There has been no serious attempt by the students to make each perspective question, use, or re-contextualize the other. The three criteria have been used to trace the aspects of dialogic discourse that in the students’ discourse: the responsive/active understanding, the positive interaction with others, and the outsideness of the discourse. It has been found that these criteria have been absent in the students’ discourse. The absence of dialogicality of these criteria in most of the students’ discourse led to a limited scope in meaning making for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. In other words, new understanding did not occur. Consequently, the researcher decided to use the students’ written drafts as the base for her interaction with the students on how the criteria could be made dialogic. On the bases of this dialogue, the students wrote several drafts. The last drafts of five students were selected for analysis in the following section.

5.2.1.2 Analysis of five students’ first and last drafts of task

The following analysis is a comparative, descriptive, and interpretive analysis of the first and the first and last drafts of five of the fourteen students. They are Asma’a, Abdullah, Thakiah, Ameera, and Mayasah. The rationale for selecting five students out of the fourteen is that the analysis becomes more focused and detailed. Because of the scope and time limits of the present thesis the researcher chose only five from among the fourteen students. Beside the scope and the time limitation, the five selected students have been more dedicated, sincere, and committed than others. The analysis consists of

---

30 It is difficult to give a pattern of how this was achieved as it varied from one student to another. However, the researcher was using her dialogic sociocultural interpretation of the criteria to direct questions to students to make them aware of the monologic aspects in their discourse and direct them to the dialogic use of the criteria.

31 The five students’ written drafts will be found in appendix 5.

32 These are pseudonyms. These will be used to refer to these particular five selected students throughout the analysis.
five main parts corresponding to the number of the students. Each part consists of two secondary parts: gauging the dialogicality of their discourse using the criteria and evaluating the scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue in meaning/knowledge making.

5.2.1.2.1 Student no. 1 (Asma'a)

The following table represents the researcher's attempt to present in a brief way a parallel relation between Asma'a's opinion in the first draft and the second draft. The table helps the reader see how the researcher has skimmed the long paragraphs in the second draft into sketches that show the most important shifts in Asma'a's thinking. For example, the first column reveals the four different opinions perceived by the researcher in the student's first draft already presented in tables 1 through 4 above. In the second column, she presents how these opinions are elaborated and developed in the second draft. First, parallel to the student's first draft opinion about morality as treatment presented in column 2, she presents student's elaboration of the opinion in draft two as a codified social activity that is turned into a belief of what is right and wrong. The researcher justifies this choice of such a parallel in Asma'a's opinion from the student's repeated use of the phrases that indicate her adoption of this position (morality as a social quality) in her first and second drafts. She has used phrases such as "serve the greatest good", "give the priority to the whole society over the individual interest", and "we . . . live . . . as parts in large groups that constitute the whole society". Second, against the first draft opinion in which the student adopts a modified version of Mill's opinion (the student does not present utility as happiness), the researcher presents a summary of the student's opinions about the theories and her consent to Mill's theory. In addition, the researcher presents an account of two examples used by the student through which the student shows the gap in Mill's theory. The student attempts to explain through the first

33 The way in which the researcher has skimmed the students' second drafts can be described in the following lines. The researcher has chosen the parts which include the student's definitions, characteristics, and features of morality. Anecdotes are summarized by the researcher to be able to make the tables brief. For the same reasons she has avoided repeated examples and elaborations from the student on the same idea. She has not selected the irrelevant information presented by the students. Other than this small written intervention by the researcher, the students' writing are presented in the table (this and the ones to come) as they have been written by the students (as has pointed out above) without any attempt from the researcher to correct any grammar, spelling, punctuation mistakes.
example that one should do what is useful for the student (i.e. by advising him in a proper way so that he/she will not hate school) but, in the second example, she attempts to argue that sometimes such effort on behalf of the teacher might encourage the student to insist on cheating and that in Asma’a’s opinion is not right. For this, Asma’a believes, we need the concept of righteousness. Asma’a appears to say, though she does not explicitly put it, that the concept of righteousness is in demand when the overall interest of the society is in focus. The last two opinions of the student that occurred in the first draft are situated in the end of column two to be in parallel with the student’s argument for the superiority of Islam, as “the religion of morality”, to the theories of the thinkers.

(Table 5-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asma’a’s responses (first draft)</th>
<th>Asma’a’s response (second draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Table 1): We should treat each other respectfully. So life takes its straight path peacefully.</td>
<td><strong>Opening paragraph:</strong> It [morality] is concerned with the standards of what one believes to be right or wrong, the manners and codes that one develops as a social activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (Table 4): I believe in considering the consequences of actions and in the concept of utility but only if it goes hand by hand and serves the greatest good. We should not be selfish and do whatever we want to accomplish our goals. | **Second paragraph:** It [Aristotle’s theory] is a selfish view point, that is based on self-judgment. What suits one person and accomplishes his adjectives may simply not suit another. One should consider the consequences of his actions and if any one will suffer because of his deed, he should not do it. This is the philosophy of John Stuart Mill . . . If a large number of people will get benefits out of one’s actions, then that person acts morally. Unlike Mill, Immanuel Kant believes that people cannot predict consequences and for that we must ignore them. I personally agree with Mill. [She gives an example of a teacher who sees a student cheating in class. She recommends that a student should be talked to privately so that we can avoid bad
(Table 3): In my opinion, morality is doing what is supposed to be right, reacting to what the situation demands. Though what can be considered as right for one person may be exactly the opposite for another...

(Table 2): ...our religion Islam offers the solution as the righteousness is clear and there is nothing vague about it.

Third paragraph: Islam has completed Arab’s good qualities by considering one’s life and property sacred. The right [in Islam] is clear and there is nothing vague about it. Islam is the religion of morality. Unlike Aristotle’s philosophy, Islam urges Muslims to act morally and to give priority to the whole society over individual interests. The concept of utility, then, does exist in Islam, like Mill’s philosophy. As Muslims, we react mostly to the situation demands, taking into consideration that we do not break any of the Islamic rules. One can find that Kant’s philosophy is to a great extent similar to the Islamic concept of morality-Morality is a set of maxims or rules in which one is not allowed to insult others or make fun of them because people are not tools, they have dignity and for that one should treat other people as he wishes to be treated. Respect is one of the most important pillars of morality. Kant says that one should never lie, lying is also forbidden in Islam.

Fourth paragraph: Morality makes life meaningful as well as purposeful. One can enjoy physical and spiritual satisfaction when he follows a direct path and when he is straight in his consequences.] She continues: Morality, therefore, is doing what is supposed to be right. But what can be considered as correct for one person may be exactly the opposite for another. [She gives an example of a student who insists on cheating in spite of repeated advice from the teacher.] She, thus, raises the following question: How can we judge the righteousness of actions and choices. Apparently, Islam has the solution and offers them.
We do not live alone but as parts in larger groups that constitute the whole society. Thus, we should live morally, treating each other respectfully, so life goes on peacefully.

The researcher perceives from the above table that the student's responsivity has improved. It has improved upon two levels: in giving a justified opinion on the nature of morality as a theme, and in responding to the literature on the theme of morality. Asma'a, in the second draft, adopts a more elaborate and developed view about morality than that presented in the first draft and is able to negotiate it with the theorists'. In the first draft, she does not explain the relation between treatment and the straight path. In the second draft, it is clear that what she means by the straight path is following the standards of morality as codified in Islamic rules. This can be seen from the first and the last paragraphs in her second draft. Figure 5.2 below shows this relation between the first and the second draft.

(Figure 5.1)

draft 1, last paragraph: We should treat each other respectfully. So life takes its straight path peacefully.

draft 2, opening paragraph: It [morality] is concerned with the standards of what one believes to be right or wrong, the manners and codes that one develops as a social activity.

draft 2, last paragraph: Morality makes life meaningful as well as purposeful. . . . Thus, we should live morally, treating each other respectfully, so life goes on peacefully.

In the figure above, the researcher presents a containment relation through which she attempts to explain how the vague relation that the student makes, in the first draft, among three elements: respectful treatment, straight path, and peaceful living; and how it has developed into a containment relation in the second draft. In the second draft first paragraph, the student defines morality as something related to one's belief system of right and wrong as related to the codes that people develop as they act in society. In

---

A containment relation is perceived to occur in the student's discourse in the last draft. Asma'a attempted to make the rudimentary ideas in the first draft into a full-fledged, developed thought. One idea has been made to contain two or more different other ideas.
the last paragraph of the same draft, she presents the benefits of morality as meaningfulness and purposefulness. Coming back to the table (5-5) above we find that the student has written in the last paragraph of the second draft the following sentence: “We do not live alone but as parts in larger groups that constitute the whole society.” This means that what she means by purposefulness and meaningfulness is living for the group. This can be supported by her following sentence in the figure above: “Thus, we should live morally, treating each other respectfully, so life goes on peacefully.”

5.2.1.2.1.1 Interpreting the nature of the criteria in the last draft

Using the following figure, the researcher makes an endeavour to present the opinions adopted by Asma’a in the first draft in a containment relationship with the thought shifts of the students in the second drafts. The purpose from such an attempt by the researcher is to make apparent how the student has managed to negotiate the responsivity that has been sparingly and non-dialogically scattering in the first draft. The figure presents a three-levelled containment relationship of the three main shifts in the student’s thinking as perceived by the researcher in the second draft based by the student’s three opinions in the first draft. In each level lines in large font present the major idea/view from the first draft; and the texts presented in vertical or horizontal order below the large font present the elaboration and development of the idea in the large font lines (from the first draft) in texts from the second draft. In the first level, the researcher presents what she has taken as Asma’a’s responsivity present in table (5.5) above. This the researcher has perceived as the student’s opinion that appears to differ from her cultural position and the thinkers’ position. It reads: “In my opinion, morality is doing what is supposed to be right, reacting to what the situation demands. Though what can be considered as right for one person may be exactly the opposite for another.” The student seems to mean here that morality is an act of consciousness that responds to a situation but she is hesitant about this opinion. Following her opinion with the word “though” reflects her hesitance. In the second draft second paragraph, she rejects Aristotle’s theme of morality as it is “based on self-judgment”. She accepts Mill’s adherence to morality as the conscious evaluation of the consequences of an action depending on the “benefit” that will come out of it. For the same reason she does not ally with Kant as his theme does not
acknowledge intentional consideration of consequences. Unlike the first draft, her second draft makes clear the deliberateness in her response. For the same reason she accepts a theory that is consistent with her personal opinion and rejects others. The second level in the containment relationship, shown in the figure below, discloses the student's partially successful effort to link her personal opinion to that of Mill in an elaborated way. Asma'a, rather than the unexplained conditional acceptance of Mill’s view in the first draft, uses examples to show that the benefit of an action goes beyond individual interest. The two examples given by the student depict two situations in which a moral decision should be taken by the teacher concerning a cheating case by a student. In the first case the student does the cheating for the first time and in the second he/she continues cheating. In the first case, Asma'a uses her conviction of doing what is beneficial for the student's ability to continue in his studies and not causing him a complex which is to gently convince him/her out of this bad habit. In the second case, she gives an account of a student who intentionally insists on cheating in spite of the teacher's desperate attempts at resisting and rejecting his/her behaviour. This account reveals the Asma'a's conscious use of examples to refract her opinion from that of Mill. She presents her consciousness in its attempt to judge bad consciousness which is the dilemma it seems the student has predicted in Mill's theory. His theory makes happiness the base for the benefit of a moral action. In the case presented by the student, if the teacher does not act by talking the student off cheating, the student will be happy continuing with cheating but that will not serve "the greatest good"; that is that of society and the individual. Thus, the student is careful in what to choose from the theory that she has adopted as similar to her opinion.

In the third level of the containment relationship, the researcher relates Asma'a's cultural view in which she adopts an Islamic point of view about morality to the theories. Asma'a's sentence from the first draft "... our religion Islam offers the solution as the righteousness is clear and there is nothing vague about it" shows what she particularly likes in the Islamic view of morality. It is its concern for the righteousness. She does not explain this in the first draft. In the second draft, Asma'a uses the theories to argue for the presence of such a concept in Islam and how it is absent in the theories. Islam, in her opinion, rather than clutching to the personal choice as in Aristotle’s opinion, prefers the societal good over the individual good. Islam, in her opinion, fares well Mill's view
because it does not depend on the personal judgment of the consequences of the action. It has its rules for judgment of the behaviour. These rules of Islam are rules that respect human dignity and lay the basis for treatment among individuals and in this aspect it is similar to Kant's view. The three-levelled containment relationship presented by the researcher shows how the student, in the second draft, has been able to dialogically fuse the three different views adopted by her in the first draft (her personal opinion, her culturally-rooted opinion, and her agreement with Mill) to come up with an internally persuasive discourse on the issue of morality.
Draft 1, last paragraph: I believe in considering the consequences of actions and in the concept of utility but only if it goes hand by hand and serves the greatest good. We should not be selfish and do whatever we want to accomplish our goals.

Draft 1, last paragraph: . . . our religion Islam offers the solution as the righteousness is clear and there is nothing vague about it.

draft 2, paragraph 2: Unlike Mill, Immanuel Kant believes that people cannot predict consequences and for that we must ignore them.

draft 2, paragraph 2: One should consider the consequences of his actions and if any one will suffer because of his deed, he should not do it. This is the philosophy of John Stuart Mill. . . . If a large number of people will get benefits out of one's actions, then that person acts morally.

draft 2, paragraph 2: [She gives an example of a teacher who sees a student cheating in class. She recommends that a student should be talked to privately so that we can avoid bad consequences.] She continues: Morality, therefore, is doing what is supposed to be personally agree with Mill. [She gives an example of a teacher who sees a student cheating in class. She recommends that a student should be talked to privately so that we can avoid bad consequences.] She continues: Morality, therefore, is doing what is supposed to be.

Draft 1, last paragraph: In my opinion, morality is doing what is supposed to be right, reacting to what the situation demands. Though what can be considered as right for one person may be exactly the opposite for another . . . .
As far as **intersubjectivity** is concerned, the researcher has the following to say. The student, in the second draft, has managed to use the texts in which the views of the virtual channel between her and the thinkers. Comparing the kind of interaction that she has been able to do in the first draft and that in the second draft, one can say that the student, in the first draft, has not got involved into interaction with theorists at all. She has just explained two theorists and conditionally agreed with the third. This shows that she has not undergone dialogic/positive intersubjectivity with the theorists. On the other hand, in the second draft, she has managed to relate to others through arguing for her own idea which has acquired additional shades of meaning at every attempt on the part of the student to interact with each theorist. Thus, the student’s intersubjectivity is a **positive intersubjectivity**. Her thought shifts reflect her awareness that if she accepts Mill’s and Islamic views, she has to find something that exists in both the views. She has found it; it is judging morality as a conscious act that brings benefit to the society and at the same time is confined by rules. The intersubjectivity with theorists in the second draft can be summarized in the student’s escalating argument for presenting Mill’s position as better than that of Aristotle’s and Kant’s; and in her related argument for revealing the similarity between Mill’s and Islamic views, the differences between Islamic and the Aristotle’s views, and Islam’s inclusion of the good aspect of Kant’s view. Here the agreement is not for agreement sake but for forging a new shade of meaning. The disagreement also serves a dialogical function. It forms the base on which the student argues for her own view.

As for **situatedness**, the researcher has already illustrated in her analysis of the first draft that all the students, including Asma’a, have been unable to reflect outsideness in their discourse. The thinkers represent a cultural position of their own and the students reflected another cultural convictions as well as their own personal understanding. The students in the first draft, including Asma’a, have not forged a situated position for their own self that is dialogic. They have presented a personal opinion, a culturally-rooted opinion or a culturally religious opinion, and/or adopted the thinkers’ position. In the second draft, Asma’a has identified a situation for her that is not necessarily sticking to one cultural position. The position of Mill has gone deep into her Islamic culturally-acquired convictions and made her stretch her cultural position into an intercultural one.
Her situational shifts in the first draft (her situation as a person, her situation as a Muslim, and adapting the foreign position of Mill) have been bridged dialogically through her discourse. It has grown into outsideness. Besides, she has been able to use examples from her own field to identify the gap in Mill's theory. Thus, there is a meeting point of two fields. And this is another level of outsideness.

5.2.1.2.1.2 The scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue

In terms of potential cultural development and intercultural dialogue, the researcher has the following to say. Asma'a's effort to forge a response that is her own has resulted into a fruitful dialogic intersubjectivity with the theorists, a more elaborated response, and into outsideness. The three criteria have fruitfully interacted to what the researcher calls a minute cultural development (a qualitative growth) in the student's view. The growth of the criteria in Asma'a's discourse towards the dialogic side reflects that the two cultural positions are no longer separate in her mind. The two cultural perspectives (the narrow (the two fields) and the wide (the social cultures)) have been dialogically activated through dialogic use of the criteria in her discourse. They might get activated in her mind when Asma'a faces similar situations. She might, using the criteria dialogically, be able to solve cultural problems of either side. This might result in future intercultural dialogue.

5.2.1.2.2 Student no. 2 (Abdullah)

In table (5-6) the researcher will present Abdullah's opinions expressed in the first draft and those expressed by him in the second draft. She will, in this section, present, based on the table below, a description of the relation she perceived among Abdullah's opinions in the two drafts. Against the opinion about morality expressed by Abdullah in the first draft, a parallel sketch from his opening paragraph in the second draft has been presented. The second draft reveals a shift in his opinion on morality from being in harmony with self and others to "being in accord with standards of right or good conduct or a system of ideas that fall into the same categories". Then, against his opinions about the three theories in the first draft, his attempt to describe and collate the three theories to deduce adjectives and principles for use in education has been placed using sketches from
paragraphs 2 through 6. The last opinion that is related to the meaning of morality in education in the first draft has been put opposite the seventh paragraph from the second draft in which Abdullah talks about the application of morality theories in education.

Such a parallel relationship presented in the table below also reveals the change that has occurred in Abdullah’s writing. For example, such a shift in definition of morality is not without intentionality on the part of Abdullah. He is preparing the stage for his coming response. In the first draft, his opinion has been expressed in relation to following a particular code system of conduct which is the Islamic one. The only one conduct system that is mentioned in the first draft has changed to be “a system of ideas that fall into those same categories”. By the same categories he means the right and wrong. Thus, he wants to prepare the reader for the idea that there are different systems of ideas [like Islam] that standardize some conducts as moral. These are the theories that he will use later in his response. Unlike in the first draft in which Abdullah formulate an opinion on each theory in isolation from the other, in the second draft such a response changed into an attempt on his part to define the morality theories as presenting “accounts of the essential characteristics of rational persons and in their specifications of the conditions under which all rational persons would endorse a code of conduct as a moral code.” The morality theories are in one way similar to Islam in being systems for specifying codes of conducts. In another way, they are also systems for “rational persons”. Abdullah here, it seems, prepares the reader for his coming idea in which he relates morality to rationality. But, before coming to this point let’s see how he describes the theories in both the drafts; and how his description in the second draft is different. In the first draft, he accuses Kant’s of being inflexible and detrimental for variety. In the second draft, as he wants to accept the theory, he shifts his thought to the positive side that consistency could produce. He lists “discipline, exactness, honesty and faithfulness” to be the fruits of following the rules of moral conduct in this theory.

(Tables 5-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abdullah’s responses (first draft)</th>
<th>Abdullah’s responses (second draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 2:</strong> According to me, morality in generally, means to be in harmony with yourself and others, but this harmony should not contradict the directions of Islam.</td>
<td><strong>Opening paragraph:</strong> Of course, morality has become a complicated issue in modern times, primarily because of the greater mixing of cultures and religions, each with its own ideas about good and evil. . . . To define morality, a person will use the rules or habits with regard to right and wrong that he or she follows. Morality is the quality of being in accord with standards of right or good conduct or a system of ideas that fall into those same categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 1:</strong> To achieve this harmony, one should treat people according to their minds, social levels, cultures, ages and kind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second paragraph:</strong> . . . moral theories differ in their accounts of the essential characteristics of rational persons and in their specifications of the conditions under which all rational persons would endorse a code of conduct as a moral code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third paragraph:</strong> . . . Kant’s theory. . . says that morality means the use of maxims and consistent personal rules as a constant behavior with ignoring the consequences. We should put consistent and clear behavior systems and rules which make our life an example for discipline, exactness, honesty and faithfulness. Contradiction should not be a behavior for the person. It causes an unappeared weakness in the personality of the person. . . . This case pushes the person to the relapsing in the swamp of satisfaction and courtesy. Here people become as tools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On Mill’s theory:</strong> It is a good theory but sometimes we cannot expect the results of</td>
<td><strong>Fourth paragraph:</strong> John Mill’s theory. . . believed that morality means doing things that bring happiness to the greatest number of people including the actor of the behaviour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
our acts. This way required a big thinking before doing any act. 

We judge about the morality throughout the consequences. Utilitarianism or usefulness is the standard or the base of morality. Throughout this theory the person should make his/her life an example for exactness, methodically, proper consciousness and thinking in all what he does or want to do before doing it.

**On Aristotle's theory:**

Aristotle's theory is a selfish theory. It means to think only about our needs and wishes, and not about other's needs and wishes also. It says that we should not care about others, we should only do what will help us in our growth and development, even if it is wrong act.

**Fifth paragraph:** The third theory is Aristotle's theory in which morality means doing things that help us to grow and develop. This growth includes physical and social development. . . Also, consequences or the result of the behavior is the standard of the choice. If the behavior will help him to grow, it is moral and he should do. I think this theory is like the second, only there is one difference that it determined the usefulness in two things which are physical and social growth.

**Sixth paragraph:** I think all these theories are good and aimed to the same thing which is how to live as a useful person and agreeable with the society in all the different circumstances. They seem to say: the moral person is one who offers something benefit his society, is person who live his life successfully or who is successful in his life.

**Additional response from draft 1:**

Morality in education means making students like the subject or the course which one teaches it and achieving the goals.

**Seventh paragraph:** Unquestionably, all the theories are very important for all people specially teachers. Because, throughout history, morality transmission has been present in education. Furthermore, many people believe that there is a connection between learning academically and the development of mental power, and the learning of moral values and the development

---

1 The above response has not been listed along with the responses in tables 1 through 4. The reason for that is that the researcher wants to maintain the uniformity of presenting general tendencies that have emerged in the responses of the students. Therefore, the researcher has not presented this response with the other responses. However, the researcher has found it relevant to present it in table (5-6) as it will help predict the similarities and differences in this particular student's first and second drafts.
The teacher should furnish students' needs, supply their interests and consider their levels and ages. He/She should be fair with all the students. He/She should not prefer one from the others etc.

of strength of character. The development of the intellect and of moral character are intimately related. According to the first theory, the teacher should be honest, fair and faithful. He should treat all the student by the same thing. . . According to the second theory, the teacher should think before he teach, should know what he teach, what is the benefit method to use and is that thing is useful for students (planning before doing). . . It draws a complete logical picture for the teacher to know his relationship with learners (to bring benefit for them and him). . . . For the third theory gathered between the social and physical growth. It is said that "the correct mind is in the correct body." So, the physical growth is very important for the teacher and the learner. . . . This theory says that the person should choice the personality which he like to become and then do the things which help him to become that personality. Of course, every teacher wants to be a successful teacher, so he must do things that make him so. He should be flexible. Variety and knowing learners' need should be there. Also, he should determine what kind of person he wants his learner to become and according to that he must do things and choice what will help his learner to become that person. . . . As a summary, these theories are clear guidelines for teachers so they can understand how to be character educators the creation of societal and cultural atmosphere that support moral behavior.

Eighth paragraph: Finally, no one can give complete description for morality, everyone describe it according to his opinion, culture and knowledge. But, at the end, only it is a measure for human beings' behaviors in terms of good and evil; right and wrong.
The same happens with the other two theories. Previously conceived by Abdullah as a theory that demands “big thinking” as we sometimes “cannot expect the results of our acts”, Mill’s has become, due to the new role it has in Abdullah’s upcoming design, a theory that endorses “exactness, methodically, proper consciousness and thinking in all what [one] does or [wants] to do before doing it” as its code of moral conduct. Aristotle’s theory, which has been severely attacked by him as “a selfish theory” in the first draft, has been perceived in the second draft in alignment with Mill’s in its care for the consequences. Abdullah has skilfully merged Aristotle’s emphasis on the personal choice for development, which he has rejected in the first draft because he senses it implies that “we should only do what will help us in our growth and development, even if it is wrong act”, with consideration of consequences. Through this he has avoided the implications of “selfish” self-judgment as it is now related to consideration of consequences. In the sixth and seventh paragraphs in the second draft which are parallel to Abdullah’s opinion about morality in education in the first draft, Abdullah addresses the theories in a new way. He finds them “good” theories which aim at describing a moral conduct that makes the person “successful”, “useful”, and “agreeable with the society in all the different circumstances”. Here Abdullah relates his opinion about morality as being “in harmony with [self] and others” in the first draft to how he, in the second draft, perceives the code of conduct in the three morality theories to mean. The researcher uses figure three below to present what she has conceived to be done by Abdullah in the paragraphs second through seventh. He has attempted to deduce the uses of morality theories as codes of moral conduct for teachers. He justifies the relation between education and morality theories as follows:

[All] the theories are very important for all people specially teachers [because] throughout history, [sic] morality transmission has been present in education. Furthermore, many people believe that there is a connection between learning academically and the development of mental power, and the learning of moral values and the development of strength of character. The development of the intellect and of moral character are [sic] intimately related.
Beginning the paragraph with this justification, he moves to explain how each theory can contribute into furnishing the codes of moral behaviour for teachers. From this description above, the researcher has shown how Abdullah has managed to develop the sketches of his opinion that has been scattering in the first draft into a well-developed thought. His perception of the theorists which has been built on unjustified opinion has turned into a new perception of the potential of the theories as codes of moral conducts for teachers. His narrow awareness of only one possible code of conduct has broadened into awareness of different possible systems of conduct. In addition, his under-developed idea of the meaning of morality in education in the first draft has grown into articulating the nature of the relation between morality and the mission of education.

(Figure 5.3)

5.2.1.2.2.1 Interpreting the nature of the criteria

Beginning with responsivity, the researcher has found that Abdullah has attempted to refract a personal opinion from his culturally-based one. His conception of morality as being in harmony with self and others has been thought of in terms of usefulness, agreeability, and successfulness in the second draft. That is, to be in harmony means for him to be agreeable, successful, and useful for self and others. His responsivity
is reflected in the following steps: in the way he has managed to see theories as systems whose function is to provide different codes of moral conduct, in seeing the function of education in developing personality which has two aspects (rationality and character) with the later being the function of morality, and in merging the aspects of good character that can be deduced from each theory based on what each theory focuses on as code for conduct. His responsivity in the second draft reflects an agentive self in its attempt to develop its ideas using others' ideas.

Concerning dialogic intersubjectivity, Abdullah has escaped the unjustified agreement-disagreement intersubjective relation with theorists into another unjustified complete agreement with all the theories for the sake of deducing characteristics of moral character of educator. For example, though it can be explained how the consistency will produce an exact and disciplinary character, it is unclear to the researcher how faithful and honest character will come from consistency. His eagerness to deduce from each theory the proper characteristics of a useful and successful teacher has blinded him to the necessity of being cautious in his choice of all the proper personality characteristics from each theory. To give another example, when he chooses flexibility and variation and knowing the students' needs as the characteristics to be chosen by a successful teacher in the seventh paragraph depending on Aristotle's theory, the relation between the choice of these characteristics is perceived as arbitrary by the researcher. There is nothing in the theory that supports such a choice on the part of Abdullah other than his announcement that if the teacher wants to be successful then these are the characteristics that make him/her so. Thus, he has imposed his own interpretation on a theory without providing proper reason to do so. To conclude, his intersubjectivity is not dialogic in the sense that the agreement has been based on his own purpose without considering the purpose of the theory developer. Of course, a person can, to use Bakhtin's (1981) words, make the word of others his own, but the effort for making the word of the other serves his own purpose needs more than the effort put to it by Abdullah. From here the discourse in the seventh paragraph has become double discourse serving two masters (Abdullah and Aristotle) at the same time. The main aim of the theory is growth or development that is physical and social and is based on choice. Abdullah uses an Arabic proverb "the correct mind [is] in the correct body" to justify for the need of the two types of growth in education but does
not explain or hint to how this is going to be achieved. This absence of provision for support for the whole theory application makes the researcher judges that Abdullah has built his agreement with the theorists on partial understanding of the purposes and application of the theories. The theories of morality are artefacts created by the theorists to serve as descriptions for proper moral conducts from particular points of view (absolutism, utilitarianism, and human development). Making them serve another purpose (moral conduct for achieving harmony, Abdullah’s definition of morality), needs first to found the work on the basics of each theory and removing the essential contradiction between them (like for example the contradiction between Mill and Kant in the first care for consequences and the other’s non-care for consequences) to use them for a new purpose. Therefore, the intersubjectivity is not dialogic in two ways. First, it is based on imposed agreement on the purpose of the theorists that is unidirectional. Next, Abdullah does not consider the dialogic relation between theories as responsive to each other.

With relevance to situatedness, the researcher will look for it in two levels: the broad cultural level and the field level. At the cultural level, Abdullah, though has adopted meanings of morality as perceived in the theories (morality as being consistent, morality as looking for utilitarianism, and morality as seeking development), he has been unable to negotiate his cultural position with that of the theorists to achieve a state of outsideness. Being in harmony with the self and the others, which has been identified to be Abdullah’s own cultural conviction, has also been mentioned in the second draft beside his adoption of the three theorists’ convictions. There is no attempt from Abdullah’s side to negotiate his cultural conviction (in the sense that the achievement of harmony is restricted by not contradicting the rules of Islam) with that of the theorists. That has made his cultural situatedness a narrow one. No outsideness has resulted in terms of seeing his broad cultural opinion in a new light. On the second level, his field (teaching) as a culture has used the artefacts (the three morality theories) produced for another field (philosophy) to argue for the role of education as a field for both character and intellect development. Here, his re-contextualizing (i.e. providing a new context) of the morality theories in the field of education has resulted in dialogic situatedness or
outsideness. To conclude, the outsideness has been achieved at the narrow level, not at the broad level.

5.2.1.2.2 The scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue

From the above explanation of the nature of the realization of the three criteria in Abdullah’s second draft, the researcher can argue as the intercultural dialogue has occurred at the narrow level, first, between two fields of study (teaching and philosophy), there is a potential for its occurrence in future contexts. It might also trigger dialogic interaction at the broad context (the second level/the broad cultural level) if Abdullah thinks deeper on it. Concerning the cultural development, the researcher can argue that it has happened at the level of the field of teaching (the narrow level) as a culture. Abdullah’s attempt can be considered an original attempt at deducing characteristics of a moral teacher from the three theories of morality. The same argument for the potential for future occurrence of intercultural dialogue in Abdullah’s discourse can be applied for the potentiality of the cultural development occurrence in his discourse.

5.2.1.2.3 Student no. 3 (Thakiah)

In table (5-7), the researcher presents the opinions expressed by Thakiah in the first draft and those expressed by her in the second draft. Her opinion on Kant’s theory in the first draft is put against the second paragraph on the same theory in the second draft. The same has been done with Thakiah’s opinions about Mill’s and Aristotle’s theories in the two drafts. Thakiah’s personal and Islamic opinions about morality from tables three and two in the first draft have been put opposite the part of the fourth paragraph in the second draft in which she sets a suggestion for integrating Islam and morality theories. This is how the researcher has managed to set a parallel relation between the two drafts.

In the following lines, the researcher attempts to describe the change between the first and the second drafts. In the first draft, Thakiah has been selective in choosing the parts to be explained from Kant’s view in order to argue against them. But, in the second draft, she has become more elaborate in presenting almost all the parts of the theory; its being based on maxims, its admission of the role of the other as a measure for morality, its assertion of consequences negligence, its belief in absolutism, and its adherence to
respecting the dignity of Man. Beside listing all the aspects of the theory, she has repeated her rejection for the part of the theory that she has rejected in the first draft, provided an example that justifies the immorality of not caring for the consequences, and related Kant’s care for the dignity of Man to a verse in the Holy Qur’an which expresses similar meaning. This change in Thakiah’s account of Kant’s theory reflects a general tendency she has adopted in the second draft for presenting more elaborate accounts for all the theories. She has also provided examples to illustrate her responsive attitude to two theories in the second draft, Kant’s and Mill’s. She ends her account of Kant’s theory by stating that it has “some defects”. Moving to Mill’s theory, she begins by claiming that “Mill’s view of morality completes Kant’s view because Mill cares with consequences”. However, she provides no explanation for her claim. Except the taken for granted supposition that Mill’s cares for consequences could replicate the part of Kant’s theory that advocates the consequences negligence. Then, she summarizes the main points in the theory: caring for consequences, predictability of results through imagination, the centrality of the concept of utilitarianism in the theory, and interpreting utility by Mill as happiness. She rejects happiness as the only moral entailment of utility.

To illustrate her rejection, she provides an example in which a doctor is giving cure which causes pain that accompanies the processes on recovery. She wants to say that utility is not necessarily happiness. She also uses an Islamic principle to support her claim from Islamic perspective. This Islamic principle states: “avoiding spoilings are presented before bringing sakeness or benefit”. It means that what we should care for first is to avoid damage if we have to choose between avoiding damage and bringing benefit in one situation. It seems that she wants to say that benefit sometimes is entailed in avoiding damage not only in bringing happiness. Her attempt to argue for the same point in the first draft has been brief and unrelated to Islamic perspective. The fourth paragraph in the second draft is parallel to three points in her first draft: account for Aristotle’s theory, her perspective of morality, and her Islamic perspective. The difference between these three aspects in both the drafts can be seen as follows. There is a shift perceived in Thakia’s focus from conceiving only defects in Aristotle’s view to seeing its potential for completing the other two theories of morality. The theory, which, for her, sees only good things as the source for development, makes
man the centre, and marginalizes "the effect of society, and actions and environment on [man's] morals," has become, in the second draft, a theory that cares for growth and development. She finds no defect in it. For her, "[the] concept of growth in [Aristotle's] view is the comprehensive growth that" includes physical, emotional, social and intellectual developments". Then, she claims that Aristotle talks about "self-actualization that makes a man whole man" and makes him/her "live an ethical life". She, in addition, claims that this theory is the best and will be perfect if "integrated with the two previous views and with the presence of the predominant Islamic morality". In the first draft, she has presented her view in isolation from the three theories and has attempted no integration between them.

The researcher has not found a smart shape to represent the relation that Thakia has attempted to draw between the different theories of morality and "Islamic morality" as the predominant one. Thakia's proposal seems to suggest that the unwanted part from Kant's theory (not caring for consequences) is to be deleted and replaced by the care for consequences in Mill's theory. Considering happiness as the only beneficial result from a moral act is supposed to be replaced with Thakia's insight that both happiness and misery can be considered beneficial. Aristotle's theory is to be more open to two more types of growth (spiritual and emotional) beside physical and social. The following is excerpt from a conversation between the researcher and Thakiah in her reflection on the difference between the first and second drafts. It confirms the researcher's above prediction.

T: (In Arabic) when I criticized everyone.
R: Hmhu
T: I meant that what is criticized is to be deleted. The good aspect of every theory, then, is taken for granted as the part of a complete theory of morality) I I
R: (In Arabic) how a whole thing could be built?
T: (Laughs.)
R: (In Arabic) how did you make them complementary to each other is unclear to me.
T: (In Arabic) we will take, for example, the the maxims, for example, from Kant
R: (In Arabic) ok?

T: (In Arabic) along with the care for consequence in Mill’s,

R: Hmhu

T: with the the care for personality or the human, I mean, he has to self-actualize in order to be a straightforward a straightforward person and upright, and necessarily Islam should be the monitor

R: Hmhu

T: (In Arabic) to be dominant. For what? For them that they will not, for example, deviate. For example, if sometimes

From the above extract from the conversation between the researcher and Thakiah, it is clear that Thakia proposes that the three theories need to be integrated with considering the deletion of unwanted parts and adding her insights. The synthesis between theories, she proposes, is to be calibrated with/"dominated by" Islamic morality.

(Table 5-7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thakia’s responses (first draft)</th>
<th>Thakiah’s response (second draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening paragraph</strong>: Three theories about morality by three thinkers about morality. They are Kant, Mill and Aristotle. All of them wrote about morality through their point of view.</td>
<td><strong>Second paragraph</strong>: From point of Kant’s view, morality is a kind of maxims and through these maxims we can say that actions are moral. He said in his view that “if you want to know if the action is moral or not, ask yourself a question “what if everyone act this way””; He might mean if you measure this action on others in this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 4: On Kant’s theory</strong>: From my point of view about his theory is good but I contradict him in a point that “there is no concept of sometimes.” I think there is for everythings in life exception and there is no something absolute. Also when he said “Because we can’t predict consequences. We must ignore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
them”. I don’t agree with him because consequences of actions sometimes bring sadness or harm to greatest number of people so in this case the action is not moral.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On Mill’s theory: In my opinion his view of morality is better than Kant’s view’s because he cares with consequences but when he said “you act morally if the case you know if this action is moral or not. He has an idea that there is no concept of “sometimes” and he was absolutist, but this is not always true because there are exceptions for the things that are absolute. He said “because we can’t predict consequences, so we can ignore them”. From my point of view this idea is not correct because the person through his action can predict the consequences. [She gives an example of a teacher who knows that his students’ levels are not high. In spite of his knowledge, he gives them a very difficult exam. Based on this example, she argues that the consequences of the students’ unavoidable failure in the exam can be predicted and therefore we need to care for consequences.] She adds: He has an idea that regardless religion, class, originality, people must respect each other because human possess dignity. This idea is taken from Holly Qur’an. Allah said in the meaning of verse “We are bestodeing human beings the dignity”. Therefore, we can’t use humans as a tool to do our actions. His view is good but isn’t perfect and it has some defects.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third paragraph:</strong> Mill’s view of morality completes Kant’s view because Mill cares with consequences. He said “you must use your imagination and try to predict the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consequences bring happiness to the
greatest number of people including
yourself and if people suffer you shouldn’t
do the action” is not always true/correct
because sometimes saying true upsets
including yourself but finally you will feel
content.

On Aristotle’s theory: In my opinion his
view in this point is not always correct
because sometimes bad thing make you
grow and flourish.
Also he said according to what you are to
be your morals are and then you can live
ethical life. In this point he makes a man is
the core and he marginalizes the effect of
society, and actions and environment on
his morals.

results of your actions”. This point of view
is good but when he said “you are acting
morally if the consequences of your action
bring happiness to the greatest number of
people including yourself” that is centralized
on the notion of “utilitarianism,” he didn’t
state that happiness caused by utilitarianism
can have pain. [She gives an example of a
doctor who, while treating the patient, the
patient feels the pain that accompanies
recovery. Through this example, she
argues: The morality of an action in terms
of its utility is not always necessarily true.
This is because, she says: ‘avoiding
spoiling are presented before bringing
sakeness or benefit. Therefore, his view has
some defects.’]

Fourth paragraph: Aristotle’s view of
morality completes Kant’s and Mill’s
views. Aristotle’s view of morality focused
on growth and development. He said “the
things that help you to grow are moral and
vice versa”. The concept of growth in his
view is the comprehensive growth that is
physical, emotional, social and intellectual
developments. He stated the things that
help these four kinds of development to
develop. Finally, he talks about self-
actualization that makes a man whole man
then he can live an ethical life. In my point
of view Aristotle’s view of morality is the
Table 3: My opinion about morality is: morality is an abstract word appears in human actions through his acting and that expresses about the feelings in his inside.

Table 2: ...there are certain rules that determine the kind or moral: such as Islamic principles ...

5.2.1.2.3.1 Interpreting the nature of the criteria

The responsive understanding of Thakiah, which has emerged in the second draft, is an attempt to develop her idea in the first draft. Her idea of considering the theories as complementary in the second draft can be traced in her attempt to argue against not wholes but some parts of the theories in the first draft. For example, she has used the part which presents Mill’s care for consequences to supplement Kant’s non-care for them in both the drafts. This has further been supported by the example she has provided about how the non-care for consequences on the part of the teacher may result in the failure of his students. Her definition of morality as abstract feelings that appear through actions has resulted in the addition of one type of growth in Aristotle’s theory, the emotional growth. Her culturally-rooted opinion that states that morality has to be guided by the rules of Islam in the first draft has resulted in the addition of even one more type of growth in Aristotle’s theory, the spiritual type. Again, her care for making Islamic rules the guide for deciding about the morality of an action has consequently realized in the use of a verse from the Holy Qur’an to agree with Kant on the necessity of respecting the dignity of man. Another outcome of her culturally-rooted opinion in the first draft is the use of an Islamic rule (i.e. avoiding damage is preferred to bringing benefits) to support her argument against Mill’s view that happiness is the result from the moral act. Her use of the Islamic rule means that she wants to reflect her adoption of Islam as the main source for judging the morality of an action. That is why in the end of the last paragraph in the second draft she states that the integration of the morality theories should be guided by the Islamic morality. To conclude, her responsivity in the last draft is...
becoming deliberate. In the first draft, it has been scattering all over the written document and there has been no connection between them. Here she rejects some part of Mill’s and Kant’s theories, there she writes few lines about her personal opinion of morality, and there she states that morality should be guided by Islamic rules. There is nothing that connects all her scattering responses. In the second draft she merges two authoritative opinions (her Islamic point of view and that of the theorists). She does not only do that but also submerges one under the other. She states that the theories need to be guided by the Islamic rules of morality. But, she does not provide any justification for this. To summarize, her responsivity is not dialogic as she submerges one view to the other. Her provision of no justification for this submersion gives evidence that her discourse has not become internally persuasive.

With regard to **intersubjectivity**, her interaction with the theorists reflects that her main ideas, those which spring from her personal experience and those that come from her culturally-rooted belief system (Islamic conviction), control her interaction. There has been no dialogic shift in the way she sees her opinions in the light of others’ opinions. For example, she has seen Islam as the last judgment for morality without showing how it is superior to the theories. She, in addition, has dealt with others’ ideas as if she is dealing with inanimate beings that can be arranged and rearranged in different ways to produce what she wants. She has not considered the fact that ideas are not neutral objects. They reflect the ideology of their creators. For example, she has no idea, it seems, that deleting something like the not care for consequences from Kant’s theory to be replaced by the care for them from Mill’s has ethical obligations on her part. Not caring for consequences is crucial in Kant’s absolutist ideology as for him what determines morality is something internal not external. Therefore, consequences have no rule to play in his theory. She, out of personal interest, forwards the idea of the complementary role that each theory can play in the other without meaningfully arguing for how this can be done without ignoring the ideological base of each theory. Consequently, her ideological interest, the researcher can predict, is predominant and that has caused her intersubjectivity to be not dialogic.

With regard to **situatedness**, the researcher perceives Thakia’s situatedness as rigid and inflexible. She sees herself as Muslim and sees the others as inferior. She gives Islam a superior position over the theories without the effort to prove or argue for the
reason for such superiority. She has not tried to move outside the boundaries of Islam to judge it and question her belief system. She has not also attempted to meaningfully interpret the ideological orientation of each theory in order to compare it with other theories and with Islam. Thus, her situatedness has not resulted in outsideness.

5.2.1.2.3.2 The scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue

In spite of the rigidity of her culturally-rooted perspective, Thakiah has been able to be open up for new ideas from other culturally-rooted views on morality. She has subdued these ideas to the control of her culturally-rooted view of morality. One can say that her culturally-rooted position has not developed as it still looks at itself as superior to others.

As far as intercultural dialogue is concerned, one can say that not a very meaningful dialogue has occurred. The culturally-rooted Islamic perspective of hers authoritatively controls Thakia's interaction with others. Though, it seems, she has accepted some parts of the others' opinion, the control of her culturally-rooted view is so rigid that she could not make her dialogue takes its natural turns to lead her differently. Thus, one can say that her intercultural dialogue is not developmental.

5.2.1.2.4 Student no. 4 (Ameera)

The following table (5.8) presents Ameera's opinions from the first draft as presented in tables 1 through four above and her parallel opinions in the second draft. Ameera's personal opinion about morality in the first draft has been put against her opening paragraph in which she expresses somehow similar opinion. The opinion about Kant's theory in the first draft is situated against the second paragraph and some parts of the fifth paragraph in the second draft which talk about the same thing. Her opinion about Mill’s theory in the first draft is written opposite the third paragraph, some sentences from the fifth paragraph, and the sixth paragraph. The reason for this arrangement is that Ameera has made extra comments about Mill, Kant, and Aristotle in the fifth paragraph. Her opinion about Aristotle’s theory in the first draft is parallel to the fourth paragraph, some sentences from the fifth paragraph, and the sixth paragraph. The reason for this arrangement is that Ameera has added some sentences about Mill and Aristotle in the
The opinions from tables two and one which reveal her culturally-rooted opinions are put opposite to her seventh paragraph in the second draft which to a large extent reflects a similar opinion.

The researcher attempts here to capture the change that has taken place in the second draft through comparing it to the first draft. Ameera’s opinion about morality has become brief and more forcefully articulated from a culturally-rooted perspective. She precisely says: “For me, I am mosilim [sic], the good moral is all Islamic. Good morals result from strong Islam.” Concerning her interaction with the theorists, she has changed her opinion about Kant. In the first draft, she has implicitly accepted his view using her concept of consistency. This can be seen in the examples that indicate her application of the theory. A teacher, she deduces depending on Kant’s theory, needs to be consistent in his speech and actions. In the second draft, she describes Kant’s theory as nonsensical and adds: “Also, I think if he put [sic] himself in the place of the person who will be killed, he will change his opinion.” Concerning Aristotle’s and Mill’s theories, she has grouped them together under the main theme of caring for the consequences or results in both the drafts. However, in the second draft she makes it clear that the difference between the two theorists is Mill’s care for emotional consequences such as happiness, content, and satisfaction; and Aristotle’s care for the “non-morale” consequences such as friendship and clean air. She declares that both of the theorists care for material usefulness and do not care for the moral usefulness. For her, both the theories are not suitable for moral judgment. She ends up her essay by clarifying that good morals are Islamic. From the Islamic perspective, she writes, morality means being polite to God, Prophet Mohammed, parents, and all people Muslims and non-Muslims. Ameera’s response can be represented using figure 5.4 below.

---

2 Here Thakiah criticises the example given in the summary given to clarify Kant’s absolutism. If a criminal asks him about where the victim is hiding he will tell him about it because he does not want to lie.
From figure 5.4 above one can say that Ameera has discussed the morality theories in isolation from the culturally-rooted perspective she adopts on morality. She has not deliberately used neither her convictions to discuss the theories nor used the theories to see her conviction from a different angle.

(1Table 5.8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ameera’s opinions (first draft)</th>
<th>Ameera’s opinions (second draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 3:</strong> The behaviour is a group of movements and external and feeling expressions through which the person tries to achieve agreement between himself and the society in which she/he lives. The summary of the topic, morals improve the relationship of the person with his God, family, and society to live in the society without causing harm others as well as he is not the cause in harm the other person. If eny person commit by good morals as far as he/she can, he/she will feel content, satisfied and happy in all his/her life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening paragraph:</strong> the behaviour is a group of movements and external and feeling expressions through which the person tries to achieve agreement between himself and the society in which he lives. Morality is the some of qualities either good or bad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: On Kant's theory: He did not care for the consequences or the result of doing some thing. He did not care for other people who may get endangered of behaviour.

The important thing in this theory is the consistency. For example, the academic person, especially the teacher, should be consistent in his speech and acting. For example, In the time of exam, teacher should specify the time of exam according of quality, quantity of question. In this example, the teacher should be consistent and doesn't permit of any increasing in time for any student. Also, in the class, teacher should deal with all students by the same way regardless of their mental levels and social situation. When the teacher puts a particular mark for every question, he should be consistent and eny thing such as his relationship with students should not effect grading.

On Mill's theory: She/ He [teacher], according to this theory, must think what he will teach and present the lesson in the best way and in simple way that must be suitable for all levels. He/ she must presents the lesson step by step to reach the mind of students and this will be

Second paragraph: everyone believes in a particular theory or opinion about the morality which can positive or negative. . . . One of them, Immanuel Kant cared for consistency in believing in a particular thing. A person should be consistent. Kant did not care for the consequence or the result of doing something. He did not care for other people who may get endangered of behaviour. The important thing in his theory is the consistent. For example, if you think lying is a bad thing, and someone comes to you to tell him the place of another person whom he intends to kill, to be consistent in your behaviour, you should tell him the truth. Her comment on Kant's from the fifth paragraph: concerning Kant, I think that his theory is nonsensical. Also, I think if he put himself in the place of the person who will be killed, he will change his opinion.

Third paragraph: Mill focused on the result of the action. He is concerned with utility or usefulness. For example, if you do actions that produce good results these actions are good. However, if they will produce bad results, they are bad; you must not do them again. Her comment on Mill's
On Aristotle's theory: The last philosopher... focused on the consequence. For example, if you treat other well, you will get good friendly relation. Teacher must advice his/her students to make their school cleaner, healthier, and more beautiful by growing up trees. Teacher can advise students by saying (health mind in health body). . . . This will give them healthy, fit growth.

Fourth paragraph: The last one, Aristotle believed the consequence. For example, if you deal with another people well, you will get good friendship relation. Her comment on Aristotle's from the fifth paragraph: They [Mill and Aristotle] do not believe in maxims/generalization. Rather, they have faith in consequences. Her comment on Mill's from the sixth paragraph: The morals may be bring for us the useful. But, the usefulness decide in to two kinds. The moral usefulness such as the feeling by the happiness, content, and satisfaction . . . etc. The non-morale usefulness such as friendship, clean air . . . etc. Mill and Aristotle theorized about material usefulness, while the morale usefulness do not care for it. Although the moral is the most important for me.

beneficial for both students and teacher.

from the fifth paragraph: They [Mill and Aristotle] do not believe in maxims/generalization. Rather, they have faith in consequences. Her comment on Mill's from the sixth paragraph: The morals may be bring for us the useful. But, the usefulness decide in to two kinds. The moral usefulness such as the feeling by the happiness, content, and satisfaction . . . etc. The non-morale usefulness such as friendship, clean air . . . etc. Mill and Aristotle theorized about material usefulness, while the morale usefulness do not care for it. Although the moral is the most important for me.
The non-morale usefulness such as friendship, clean air . . . etc. Mill and Aristotle theorized about material usefulness, while the morale usefulness do not care for it. Although the moral is the most important for me.

Table 2: Morality is a group of behaviours that grow up from a religious social principles and become in complete picture when all individuals of the society apply it. The summary of the topic, morals improve the relationship of the person with his God . . .

Table 1: . . . morals improve the relationship of the person with his God, family, and society to live in the society without causing harm others as well as he is not the cause in harm the other person.

Seventh paragraph: For me, I am mosilim, the good moral is all Islamic. Good morals result from strong Islam. Moslim should be moral and bolite with his God, prophet “Mohammed”, parents, and all people either moslims or non moslim. Either moral is a happit or convincing, it also may improved or acquired, just if there is an intension for that.

5.2.1.2.4.1 Interpreting the nature of the criteria

The researcher concludes from the description above that Ameera has not actively engaged herself in responsive way to formulate an opinion about morality that is related to the thinkers’ in a way that is interculturally developmental and dialogic. She writes about the different perspectives on morality (her culturally-rooted view and the theorists’ views) as two unrelated currents of thought. Each she has seen in isolation from the other.

Concerning her intersubjectivity, the researcher may say that she has excessively depended on her intuition to reject the theories without a meaningful engagement of the deeper meanings of each theory. This can be seen in her attempt to fuse the theories of Mill and Aristotle under the umbrella of care for consequence. She has totally ignored the fact that mainly each theory comes up with a new interpretation of a thing and that what
makes it a theory. Though she has talked about a minute difference in their care for consequences (with Mill’s care for emotional consequence and Aristotle’s care for friendliness and clean water) and has rejected their theories on the base of their care for material usefulness. She rejects Kant because he is unable to put himself in the place of the people who could be endangered with the consequences of one’s action. She rejects both the theories of Mill and Aristotle as they focus on material usefulness. Why material usefulness is not acceptable to her? On what bases she finds it inadequate? It is not made clear. Besides, her agreement and disagreement with the theorists in the first draft has turned into a complete rejection in the second draft. She has identified only parts of the theories to be rejected, the example in the case of Kant and the material usefulness in the case of Mill and Aristotle. She is unable to coordinate her agreement and disagreement dialogically with the theorists’ cultural position. Consequently, the researcher infers that her intersubjectivity has not become dialogic to the extent that makes a change in/to broaden her cultural convictions.

Her situatedness is also different. In contrast to the first draft in which she has reflected her opinion of the theories through applying them and reflected her Islamic perspective, in the second draft, she stops using examples from her field. Maybe because she has realised that she rejects the theories and this means that one cannot apply them. She might have found herself more comfortable with her culturally-based interpretation of morality. Maybe because of this reason she has deliberately omitted the part of Aristotle’s theory that explains the theory concern for human development and the part of Kant’s theory that talks about respect for human dignity. These parts might have been problematic for her as she could not find in her Islamic perspective things that enable her argue against these parts in the theories. One of the two (her Islamic and that of the theorists) perspectives have been completely denied the freedom to occupy a place in Ameera’s consciousness as a respected point of view (that is that of the theorists). It has been rejected with the awareness that some parts of it are valid and useful. The perspective of the thinkers has been denied a situation of dialogue with her perspective. In consequence, her Islamic view has become isolated from meaningfully interpreted and changed. It has been deprived of reaching the state of outsideness.
5.2.1.2.4.2 The scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue

One in the case of Ameera cannot talk about cultural development as the two cultural perspectives (the Islamic and that of the thinkers) have occupied different directions in her mind. She has talked about the Islamic perspective in isolation from the perspectives of the other theories. There have been no perceived changes in neither the way she has seen the Islamic perspective nor there has been a positive consequence for the little difference in seeing the theories, Mill’s and Aristotle’s, in the second draft. So, there is no cultural development.

As far as intercultural dialogue is perceived, one can say that the dialogue with theorists’ ideas has grown a little in the sense because she has become able to classify them differently. She has seen two of the theories under one umbrella in the last draft. Though they have something in common, she has given each a different category: “moral and non-moral”. Though this name, it seems, does not mean anything in general as she has not explained how consequence in Aristotle’s view is immoral and how it is moral in Mill’s; it has been a difference that she has perceived and expressed about using language. Concerning the main difference that she has been able to perceive between these two theories and her perspective, she has been able to judge the care for influences in the two theories as material while in her culturally-rooted perspective as moral. Maybe she wants to say that it is immaterial or spiritual but she has not used the correct word. Or, rather, maybe she wants to say that the theorists’ perspective does not conceive morality as it is conceived in her Islamic perspective. Therefore, their care for material consequences is not moral. Depending on this interpretation of this minute dialogic interaction between the two perspectives, the researcher can say that the dialogue has not gone deep in her discourse. The student has not been able to coin the correct terminology for describing her perception of the difference between the two theories. She could not make clear the difference between them and the Islamic perspective as between material and spiritual perspectives.
5.2.1.2.5 Student no. 5 (Mayasah)

Table (5-9) presents Mayasah's opinions in the first draft and her opinions in the second draft. Mayasah’s personal opinion about morality from table three in the first draft has been written against her opening paragraph as both more or less include the same idea. Her opinions from table one and some part of table four from the first draft, which include her opinion about morality deduced from Kant and her opinion about Kant’s theory, have been put opposite her second paragraph in which she writes explanation of and opinions about Kant’s theory. Her opinion about Mill’s theory, which is part of table four from the first draft, is situated against her explanation and opinion about Mill’s theory. Finally, the opinions, which are from table two (the culturally-rooted opinion about morality) and part of table four on Aristotle’s theory all from the first draft are put paralleled to the fourth paragraph in the second draft in which she has mentioned both the views.

In these following paragraphs the researcher attempts to describe the change and the thought shifts that have occurred in the second draft drawing upon the parallel relationship set between Mayasah’s opinions in the first and second drafts. Beginning with Mayasay’s personal opinion mentioned in the first draft, it is clear from the second draft that she thinks of morality at two levels: general and specific. The general is religious and cultural and the specific is personal. By personal, she has made clear in the second draft that she means the different attempts done by different people (thinkers in her case) to define morality. It is thus clear from her response that she considers her culturally-adopted opinion about morality a general understanding and the philosophers’ a specific one. That is why she, to the end of her essay, has stated that “morality is all the rules, maxims and principles which help us to respect and love each other and live in peace and freedom.” She has made it clear for the reader whether these maxims and principles are coming from her culture or her own specific definitions of morality. This, the researcher gets from comparing how she has used the same expressions “maxims” and “rules” (see the parallelism set between her opinion in table two from draft one and her opinion expressed at the end of the fourth paragraph in the second draft) to describe in the first and second drafts what morality means to her. Her opinion about morality as “honesty, straightfulness [sic] and respectful treatment for others” occurs to the end of the
second paragraph in which she explains and comments on Kant’s theory. This is consistent with her opinion about morality expressed above. For her, respectful treatment, it seems, is the base for morality which is the way for a peaceful life. These, she thinks, can be achieved through being straightforward and honest. Thus, one can say that her culturally-rooted opinion about morality is personalized.

In her interaction with the theorists she has explicitly expressed that she contradicts Kant’s absolutism the thing that she has not done in the first draft. However, she bases her rejection not on Islamic principles but on a personal conviction that life means change that is why we can’t be absolutists. Also her acceptance for not lying in the first draft based on Islamic belief has changed into rejection for absolutism in not lying. The justification for this is provided from again a culturally religious conviction of her: lying can be accepted for the general good. She has also rejected Kant’s non-care for consequences based on Mill’s theory. She argues “we as human beings with minds, who can think, can make the consequences predicted”. Thus, the researcher can say that three things have appeared in her way of explaining the theory and commenting on it. First, she uses Islam to accept not lying in the first draft. Second, she has not used Islam to reject the absolutism in not lying. Third, she uses Mill’s argument for the use of mind to predict consequences to reject Kant’s absolutism.

In Mill’s theory, she identifies three points: first, “to be morale, you have to think about consequences”; next, “your actions have to make majority of people happy”; and third, “the moral actions should have no utility”. She agrees only with Mill’s view on the necessity of using thinking to predict consequences and reject the other two points in his philosophy. The justifications she gives for the two other points needs further explanation on the part of the researcher. She begins by saying that “morality does not make all people happy because of [its] utility or usefulness”. Then she gives an explanation that fuses both the points in one justification for rejecting them. She writes: “We as human beings have many mistaken decisions because we are not [angels]. We have to make wrong [things] to learn from our faults. These wrong decisions have [their] utility. Therefore, we have to accept our life with [its] good and bad times”. The researcher can explain this long explanation on the part of Mayasah as follows. She believes that we all

---

3 In the Islamic studies textbooks taught in Yemeni schools, this is stated as an Islamic principle.
the time make decisions that are wrong. That may cause sadness to other people and to us. Mill may judge our actions as immoral based on the sadness caused by them. Utility can come from sad consequences. Thus, utility is not to be measured in terms of happy consequences. The whole justification given by Mayasah is an example of using personal reasoning to contradict Mill.

To Aristotle’s theory, she begins by stating that it is more general as it depends on physical and social elements. Two explanations are here possible. Probably, she wants to say that as it cares for social elements, then it is general. This explanation is consistent with her understanding of the morality that is based on society as general in her first draft. The other explanation is that she wants to say that Aristotle’s view is broader than Mill’s and Kant’s as it includes both physical and social elements. There is no further clue in Mayasah’s response that makes the researcher emphasize any of the interpretations. Then, Mayasah writes: “People who are morale have good health and good minds.” As Mayasah has stated that she does not believe in this in her first draft and has not commented upon it in the second draft, the researcher will take it as an account of the theory rather than her belief. What she agrees with in his theory, she states, is his idea that one’s knowledge of what he/she wants to be controls his/her actions. She bases her agreement on the admiration of the idea of knowing what one wants and a personal belief that controlling one’s action is better than controlling others’ actions which is selfish.

The following figure shows the researcher’s idea of what has happened in the second draft. Mayasah, though does state that morality means the principles that help people live peacefully with each other in the second draft, she does not state anywhere in the second draft (in contrast to her statement in the first draft) that the maxims that she adopts are Islamic). She has not used Islamic rules as a filter to receiving ideas from others. She bases her argument for accepting and rejecting on her personal understanding and preferences of what each theory means to her.
Kant's emphasis on respectful treatment; Mill's emphasis on thinking about consequences; and Aristotle's idea for making self-goals control one's actions.

Islamic view as Mayasah's identified belief system of morality + what she accepts or rejects form the theories is not sifted through her Islamic belief system.

(Table 5-9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayasah's responses (first draft)</th>
<th>Mayasah's responses (second draft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Table 3:** Morality is not an easy word to be defined. This term has a general and specific meaning. The general definition is related to our society but the specific one is related to ourselves. | **Opening paragraph:** Morality is the maxims and principles which people have to help them to live in a peacefully world. It helps people what are the right and wrong things to do. Morality is a general and specific concept. It can be defined generally according to our religion and culture, but as a specific concept each person can define it and act according to his own rules and way of thinking. We can take three theories of three different philosophers, who belong to different ages and cultures as an example of what is
Table 4: On Kant’s theory:
I agree with him because, our religion teaches us to say the truth always whatever happened.

Table 1: I think being morale means honesty, straightforwardness and respectful treatment for others.

On Mill’s theory: In my opinion, being morale doesn’t always make people happy. Sometimes, suffering has a great deal with morality?

Second paragraph: the first thinker is Immanuel Kant who focused on using maximes and personal rules to make a moral decision. He also wants to say that people should judge themselves before others. Kant was an absolutist and I disagree with him at this point, because we don’t live in fixed world. Our life has changed every second, so we have to change and we can’t be absolutist. Kant has two Maxims, we must never lie and we can’t predict consequences. For me, I don’t agree with him because lying can help others sometimes and we as human beings with minds, who can think, can make the consequences predicted. [She gives an example of a person who keeps a secret of a friend because of awareness of consequences of revealing other’s secrets.] Kant also speaks about respect people and their dignity. This is a very important point. We have to respect people. We have to be honesty, straightforwardness and treat others respectfully.

Third paragraph: Although Kant does not care about consequences, our second thinker Mill thinks that if you want to be
morality especially these days.\textbf{On Aristotle's theory}: For Aristotle, I don't think that if we have good health, we'll be morale people.

For Aristotle, I don't think that if we have good health, we'll be morale people.

mill’s philosophy of ethics is called utilitarianism. In his philosophy, he deals with three points. He says to be morale, you have to think about consequences, then your actions have to make majority of people happy and the moral actions should have no utility. I agree with Mill in only one point. It's right that we have to think about consequences. But morality does not make all people happy because of it's utility or usefulness. We as human beings have many mistaken decisions because, we are not angles. We have to make wrong thing to learn from our faults. These wrong decisions have it's utility. Therefore, we have to accept our life with it's good and bad times.

\textbf{Fourth paragraph}: according to Kant's and Mill's point of view, morality depends on maxims, consequences and respectful treatment of others. For Aristotle, morality is more general. It depends on physical and social elements. People who are morale, have good health and good mind. For Aristotle, the person who you want to be control all your actions. I agree with Aristotle to some extent. Person has not to be selfish to control others life. But the idea of knowing what we want to be is very
Table 2: Also to make a morale decision we should follow our Islamic rules and maxims. If we obey Allah we won’t cause bad consequences.

| Table 2: Also to make a morale decision we should follow our Islamic rules and maxims. If we obey Allah we won’t cause bad consequences. | good idea. Therefore, morality is all the rules, maxims and principles which help us to respect and love each other and live in peace and freedom. |

5.2.1.2.5.1 Interpreting the nature of the criteria

Beginning with responsivity, the researcher can say that Mayasah’s responsivity, rather than depending on the ideology of the two authoritative discourses (the Islamic and the theories of morality), emerges as she personally perceives and judges the utility of the theories depending on a discourse that seems personally meaningful to her, her own preferences and personal experiences. That can be clearly seen from the following: her discussion of the aspects of utility in Mill’s theory and the acceptance of the idea of knowing one’s goals to control one’s actions from Aristotle, and from her acceptance of the part of Kant’s theory (respecting other’s dignity through being honest and straightforward with them) that are based on her formulated definition of morality as maxims and principles that help people live peacefully with each other. She is choosy on what to accept and reject from others depending on personal preferences. In her discourse, the authoritative discourses are acknowledged and her reasoning self is the filter for all. She, in the second draft, does not state that the maxims and principles are only Islamic as she has done in the first draft. Thus, Islamic principles are not the filter for her interpretation of the theories. She stands authoritatively (though not ‘authorially’), side by side with the other two authoritative discourses.

With reference to intersubjectivity, her interaction with the theorists has been governed by her own personal preferences. She breaks up each theory into points and identifies with each point positively or negatively. Her being choosy about what to choose from each theory to accept or reject has driven her away from identifying with the theories as wholes. She does not see the dialogue between different perspectives (for example between views of the theories and Islamic view; and among the intersubjectivities of the theorists). However, the dialogue has occurred between her personal judgment and the parts of the theorist’s ideas she has identified with. The
justifications that she has provided are reasonable and seem personally true to her experience. But, that has not been done with all the theories. She has accepted Aristotle’s idea of using knowledge of self-goals to control one’s action because she likes the idea. She also does not provide a justification for adopting the idea of morality as principles and maxims. Therefore, her intersubjectivity has been dialogic and not dialogic. She has tried to coordinate her understanding with others in some places and has not done so in other places.

Regarding her situatedness, she has a personal situation on all the perspectives that she taken place in her discourse. She has identified herself both in her cultural perspective and in that of the theorists. But, she has not use any perspective to identify it with the other. She has been moving among the perspectives without growing with the perspectives or through the perspectives. She has not reached a state of situatedness.

5.2.1.2.5.2 The scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue

None of the perspectives in her discourse has undergone any qualitative change. The Islamic perspective is the provider of moral maxims and rules; the Kantian perspective, though she has identified more points in it, she does not understand it differently; Mill’s perspective is still unacceptable to her because the utility is defined in terms of happiness; and Aristotle’s perspective, after it has been totally rejected in the first draft, she accepts one idea from it in the second draft. No growth is identified in her personal perspective also. Thus, no cultural development is seen.

Intercultural dialogue has happened between her personal perspective and that of the theorists in terms of sometimes justified and sometimes unjustified agreement and disagreement. She has negotiated the views of the theories and some sort of the dialogue between her personal perspective and that of the others.

5.2.1.3 Conclusion of the findings from the first task

Tables 5.10 and 5.11 figuratively show using a tick and a cross how dialogic or non-dialogic the criteria exhibited in the five students’ writings in the last drafts of the task as well as the scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue.
(Table 5.10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Responsivity</th>
<th>Positive intersubjectivity</th>
<th>Dialogic situatedness/ Outsideness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asma’a</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdullah</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakiah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameera</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayasah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 5.11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Cultural development</th>
<th>Intercultural dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asma’a</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdullah</td>
<td>√ (narrow level)</td>
<td>√ (narrow level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakiah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameera</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayasah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from the tables above that whenever the criteria become dialogic, there is a scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue in the sense of broadening possibilities for new meaning making. In the case of Asma’a, all the criteria have realized as dialogic and, as explained by the researcher above, there is a potential for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. In the case of Abdullah, all the criteria except intersubjectivity have realized as dialogic and the potential in his case for cultural development and intercultural dialogue is a narrow one. This is because his broad cultural convictions (the Islamic convictions) have not undergone any dialogic exchange with those of the theorists. However, there has been a fruitful dialogue between his field (teaching) and the field of the thinkers (philosophy). These fields are small cultures within the larger speech communities of both the parties (the student and the philosophers). Therefore, the potential for cultural development and intercultural dialogue is described by the researcher as a narrow one. In the case of the other two
students, the criteria have not realized as dialogic and there has been no potential for cultural development and intercultural dialogue detected by the researcher.

With reference to the first draft results, it has been shown by the researcher that the criteria in the first draft have not shown any tendency towards dialogicality that may cause growth in meaning making. As a consequence, there has been no scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. Comparing this to the results from tables 5.10 and 5.11, two out of the five students have reflected dialogicality in the use of the criteria and there is potential for cultural development and intercultural dialogue in their present discourse. This does not mean that there is no improvement at all in the other three students. The remaining three students have exhibited some kind of growth in their way of opinions formulation. Though this is not dialogic, the quality of their opinion expression has improved. For example, Mayasah has been able to go deeper into the details of each theory and substantiate her agreement and disagreement in the last draft. This has been sparingly done in the first draft. This reflects the growth of her awareness of the other as well as her position towards it. Ameera has been able, though has not given it a proper name, to connect between her Islamic perspective and that of Mill and Aristotle in terms of Islam’s care for moral/spiritual consequences and theorists’ care for material consequences. Thakiah has also tried to connect between her Islamic position and that of the theorists. This is clear from her attempt to integrate them in one perspective. Mayasah’s, Ameera’s, and Thakiah’s attempts for interaction though has not reached dialogicality, they have exhibited the consciousness of the self and the other as basically different from each other. There have also been attempts to somehow connect with the other. Consequently, these attempts can be seen as rudiments of dialogicality. All in all, there is more dialogicality and rudiments of dialogicality in the second draft than the first draft. There is a positive correlation between the dialogicality of the criteria and the positive potential and scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. There is a positive correlation between the absence of the dialogicality of the criteria and the negative potential and scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

Seeing the improvement in the dialogicality of the criteria in the students’ written discourse and the positive effect on development in meaning making, the researcher
decided to proceed in her dialogue with the students focusing on the same criteria. The following section shows the analysis of the same five students' last drafts of the second and the third tasks.

5.2.2 Analysis of the five students' last drafts\(^4\) of tasks 2 and 3

The tasks two and three have been focused on academic discourse. Students have been asked to write papers on local issues from an ELE perspective taking into consideration the morality theories and their responses to them. The students have been given the freedom to either stick to the same issue or pick up different issues for both the tasks. The difference between the tasks has been that the paper for the first task is to be presented in a local ELE conference while the other is to be published in a non-local ELE journal.

The following is a comparative, descriptive, and interpretive analysis of the last drafts produced by the above five students (Abdullah, Ammera, Mayasah, Asma’a, and Thakiah) for the second and the third tasks. This analysis subsection is divided into six parts. Five parts correspond to the number of the students. Each of the five parts is divided into three sub-parts. The first sub-parts are descriptions of the shifts of thoughts between the second and the third tasks as they have appeared in the beginning, middle, and end of the students' essays. The second sub-parts are interpretation of the effect of the audience on dialogicality of the students' discourse. The third sub-parts are the researcher's interpretations of the dialogicality of the criteria. The third parts show the researcher’s interpretation of the scope of cultural development and intercultural dialogue. The sixth part is a conclusion of all the analyses of five students' responses to the second and the third tasks.

5.2.2.1 Student no. 1 (Asma’a)

In table 5.12-A the researcher presents two sketches of Asma’a’s introductory paragraphs to the second and the third tasks. The researcher has chosen some portions of both the responses that are representative of her flow of thought and situated them in the two columns in the table below. Only the parts that contain repeated thought have been

\(^4\) See appendix six for all the last drafts of the five students for the two tasks
deleted from the table and the examples have been summarized and reported by the researcher so that they will not be space-consuming. This has been done in all the following tables. The researcher presents a description of both the response in the following paragraphs.

In the introductory paragraphs of the response to task number two, left column, Asma’a talks about the relevance between education and development of nations. She considers the good teacher the base for building up civilized and well-educated nations. This is because they are the source models for children to acquire idealism and good behaviour. As language teacher helps learners know how to communicate, it is his/her responsibility to show them how to best communicate and deal with others morally. She defines morality as the codes of behaviour that stem from Islam. Asma’a, then, presents the main idea of her essay: The lack of motivation on the part of the teachers. She states that she will address the main reasons for this problem and the solutions for these problems.

In the third task, the introductory paragraphs have introduced the problem differently. Asma’a directly introduces the main idea of her essay to be the raising of teachers’ awareness of the problem of the lack of motivation on the part of the Yemeni learners. She states that there is a connection between morality and motivation and that morality can be used to generate motivation in the Yemeni learners. She states that morality in Yemen is based on God’s commands; and that teachers “may use the concept of morality as a beneficial tool to enhance and maintain an appropriate level of motivation in their pupils”.

(Table 5.12-A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response produced for task 2 (introductory paragraphs)</th>
<th>Response produced for task 3 (introductory paragraphs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Paragraph One): Education is the basic pillar on which nations develop and people improve. The first step of building a</td>
<td>(Section One): ... Language teachers are constantly faced with the problem of lack of motivation. Since motivation is a vital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 The main divisions in the students’ written responses for task three are called sections by the researcher because they consist of a larger number of paragraphs than the last draft to task two which consists of a less number of paragraphs. So, she used the word ‘section’ to refer to the main division in responses to task three and the word ‘paragraph’ to refer to the main divisions in the responses to task two.
Civilized educated society is to found good teachers and make sure that they are prepared enough for bringing up generations full of knowledge and idealism. Schools are social institutions from which our children learn and acquire not only knowledge and good behaviour, but also morality. Then, teachers, especially language teachers, should show good models of morale persons as they teach how to communicate with others and deal with them morally. What is morality but the standards, codes, manners, principles and rules that fountain from our religion, Islam, and we believe in as religious commitment and are socially accepted, to differentiate between right and wrong. . . .

**Paragraph Two:** In our field as English teachers, circumstances naturally arise and require us to make moral choices and judge the righteousness of actions. . . .

**Paragraph Three:** In this meeting, I would like to talk about the problem of lacking motivation on the part of the teacher. . . . One of the major goals of education is to develop life-long learners who are intrinsically motivated . . . But as we find, most Yemeni learners have no intrinsic motivation to learn English, perhaps because of their negative attitudes.

Component in successful language learning, this study will be an attempt to raise awareness of the motivations of Yemeni learners in those who are interested or concerned in teaching them. The concept of motivation is highly connected with the concept of morality, so they will be associated throughout this study.  

**Section Two:** In Yemen, a Middle-Eastern Arab country which is located in the south west of Asia, English is becoming more and more common. . . . It is observed that a large number of Yemeni learners have no motivation to learn English at all or have less motivation than that is required. In spite of this, many Yemeni learners are instrumentally motivated as they are well-aware of the utility of knowing English. It is rarely that we find a Yemeni learner whose motivation is integrative, perhaps because of the negative attitudes towards English and its speakers. Teachers are constantly enriched by daily contact with their learners which put them in touch with different perspectives and ways of looking at things. So it is their job to generate motivations extrinsically, so learning process is achieved successfully. For most Yemeni people, morality governs their lifes, behaviour, communication and even their way of thinking. Then, teachers may use the
towards this language and its speakers. Then it is the teacher task to generate motivations extrinsically, so teaching process is achieved successfully. The problem is that some teachers may find themselves not motivated enough to teach. This is one of the major causes of our students not learning English appropriately. . . . Teaching is a message about giving, but how can we give what we do not have or possess? It is indeed a moral dilemma.

Concept of morality as a beneficial tool to enhance and maintain an appropriate level of motivation in their pupils. The official religion in Yemen is Islam, so morality is based on God’s commands. A Yemeni child is brought up to be obliged to follow these commands and apply them while dealing with others, then, it will not be difficult to urge and motivate learners, speaking to them in terms of the language they understand, the language of the proper behaviour and the right thing to do.

In the table 5.13-B below, the paragraphs that constitute the body in each of Asma’a’s essays in the second and the third tasks are situated against each other. The following is a description of both the responses.

In the second task, the left column, Asma’a discusses the reasons behind the lack of motivation in the language teachers and attempts to find solutions for them. The researcher presents the problems for which Asma’a has offered solutions. The first of these reasons is the mismatch between the teacher’s cultural belief and the target culture’s belief system which causes some of the teachers to avoid teaching some of the lessons in the textbook. Asma’a uses Kant’s theory to attack such behaviour on the part of the teachers. As Kant’s theory does not accept the concept of “sometimes” in treating objects morally, the teacher has no excuse to refuse to teach some of the lessons in the syllabus. She adds that the teachers ought to show a sense of duty towards their students by teaching the course as a whole. The second reason she mentions is the inability of the teachers to organize the priorities in terms of the utility to self and others. The majority of the teachers in Yemen, she says, have more than one job. They tend to neglect teaching as their main duty towards their nations by giving priority to their other responsibilities or works. Asma’a uses Mill’s theory to tackle the immorality of such behaviour on the part
of English teachers by writing that if the teacher's actions will not result in happiness of the greatest number of people, then they are immoral actions. The moral action, then, will be "rearranging [their] priorities and responsibilities and reminding [themselves] frequently of [their] public commitment and [their] moral duty to [their] students". Asma'a, then, uses Aristotle's theory to offer a theoretical perspective on how an ethical type of a teacher can be created. She points out that "it all depends on one's ideology. Each one of us determines what kind of teacher he wants to become and he behaves according to that". She remarks that every teacher wants to lead an ethical life and be an inspiration for students. This will need "nothing more than making moral choices and avoiding moral crisis as far as [one] can". This type of teacher is probably capable of overcoming all the obstacles that make him/her unmotivated.

In the third task, right column, she enlists the reasons and the solutions that can be attempted by the teachers to deal with the lack of motivation on the part of the students. One reason she mentions is the absence of goals. She finds the teacher's raising students' awareness of the spiritual short-term and long-term goals of learning English a proper solution for such a problem. The second reason she finds as affecting the students' motivation is the mismatch "between the knowledge, beliefs, or interest which students have and the ideas with which they are coming in contact". The teachers' duty, she states, is to tell students that it is their duty to teach the whole syllabus and let students explore and discover the benefit of each point on their own. The third reason is "[the] degree of difficulty of subject materials and the methods used by the teachers". The solution she offers is that "English teachers" "should give [their] students valuable encouragement and reward them for reaching goals and deadlines".

(Table 5.13-B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Paragraph Four):</th>
<th>(Section three):</th>
<th>(Table 5.13-B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason produced for task 2 (main-body-constituting paragraphs)</td>
<td>Response produced for task 3 (main-body-constituting paragraphs)</td>
<td>Section three: What makes a Yemeni learner devoid of motivation to learn English? What is the result of lack of motivation? Is there any solution for such a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a number of reasons behind lacking motivation on the part of the teacher. This may include teachers’ English language competence and...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teaching skills, their qualification and
training in ELT, their salary and economic
level. Lack of encouragement and rewards
may demotivate teachers as well. Lacking
motivation may relate to a mismatch
between knowledge, beliefs or interests
which the teacher has and the ideas with
which he is coming in contact with through
teaching. [She gives an example of a
teacher who finds ideas in some lessons in
the English textbook in opposition with his
cultural belief system. As a reaction he
escapes teaching the lessons.] She
comments: If every teacher act this way,
learning process will be a complete failure.
... Immanuel Kant, a great absolutist
thinker, has a philosophy, in which there is
no concept of “sometimes”. According to
Kant, one should never go beyond rules.
Many of us will agree with Kant in this
situation, because moral decision should be
to teach that lesson despite whatever that
teacher faces. ... The notion of duty may
motivate that teacher to develop positive
attitudes to teaching and introduce such
topics in a way that satisfies all.

(Paragraph Five): Lack of motivation may
be caused by responsibilities, other than
teaching, taking priority. Many Yemeni
teachers, especially men, may have a job or
more other than teaching, so they may
problem?

... The most common reason for the lack
of motivation is the absence of goals ...
It is the teacher’s responsibility to enlight
their students, set the objectives and aims
for them and raise their awareness of the
merits that they can gain through learning
English—either material or spiritual.
Teachers may convince their students that
by learning English they obey Lord’s
commands in acquiring more knowledge,
since science and literature are mostly
written in English. This can be regarded as
a spiritual goal. Teachers may explain that
the students cannot get their qualification
or certification if they do not pass the
English subject successfully. This can be
taken as a short-term objective. Teachers
may also inform their pupils that knowing
English is a way to increase job
opportunities and salary potential in the
future with regard to material benefits. This
can be considered as a long-term objective.
When learners understand their goals, they
can focus on achieving them as well as
investing more efforts in order to reach
them.

Another reason may relate to a mismatch
between the knowledge, beliefs, or interest
which students have and the ideas with
which they are coming in contact. Teachers
neglect their academic duties in favour of material benefits. . . . For John Stuart Mill, a famous philosopher, a person is acting morally if his actions bring happiness to the greatest number of people. . . . A teacher like this should work on his own, improving his behaviour and personality, rearranging his priorities and responsibilities and reminding himself frequently of his public commitment and his moral duty to his students.

(Paragraph Six): Lack of motivation may have something to do with learning environment like the classroom atmosphere e.g. noisy building work, strikes, power cuts, redundancy, etc. . . . an English teacher may find himself paralyzed in the absence of tape recorders, computers, tables, charts and other materials that are needed during the course, so he may lose enthusiasm. Demotivating circumstances should never control our teaching. We should be creative and flexible whatever the situation in which we are put. . . . Personal issues may affect our motivation badly and consequently our performance in the class. Distracted teachers are very disadvantageous to their students. Teachers should be professionals at work by separating it from personal life.

(Paragraph Seven): I am certainly sure should make it clear that they are obliged to teach everything in the course and that they can take or drop any part to apply or not in real life but only after learning and exploring it. The students may consider it a way to increase understanding of the target community.

. . . . The degree of difficulty of subject materials and the methods used by the teachers may also demotivate learners, however, they must develop a sense of challenge and self-independence, if they want to survive in this world. The teachers’ treatment of the students may affect the students’ motivation and attitude where it either reinforces or undermines previous learning experience.

Demotivation is a serious problem that can affect a student very badly. . . . The solution lies in generating and finding motivation. Morale levels are generated, sustained and increased by expectancy of positive results, rewards, success and satisfaction. We, the English teachers, should give our students valuable encouragement and reward them for reaching goals and deadlines.
that there is no teacher among us who does not wish to live ethical life and to be a source of inspiration to his students. Truely, it is not impossible. What we need to do is nothing more than making moral choices and avoiding moral crisis as far as we can. We are free to choose our own personal moral code. As the great philosopher, Aristotle, finds, it all depends on one’s ideology. Each one of us determines what kind of teacher he wants to become and he behaves according to that.

Table 5.15-C presents the concluding paragraphs for both responses to task two, left column, and task three, right column. The following is a description for each response respectively.

In the response to the second task, left column, Asma’a points out that a motivated teacher fares better than a non-motivated or less-motivated teacher in terms of effect on the learners. This is conditioned by how moral he/she is. She recommends that non- or less motivated teachers ought to generate their own motivation or let others help them to do so. They can generate motivation, she proposes, building on one’s self-confidence, focusing on goals, making teaching priorities, and not waiting for rewards. This is because each teacher should play a role in the development of the country through obeying God’s commands, being in harmony with others inside and outside the schools’ doors, taking the right as his/her own measure for governing own actions and setting limits to one’s desires, and by making Prophet Mohammed the image for an ideal teacher.

In the concluding paragraphs of the response to the third task, right column, Asma’a sets off her argument for how a moral teacher can generate motivation in the students. Before she delves into the particularities of her proposal, she states that there are different theories of morality some of which are religious and some are not. She adds that
there are some common features between the religious theories and the non-religious theories. She presents the morality theories of the three thinkers one by one and when possible she shows how they are compatible with the Islamic view of morality. She begins with Kant’s theory which, she states, says “[act] always in such a way that you could will your action to be universal law”. This theory, she observes, is similar to an Islamic principle which states “[treat] others as you would like to be treated”. She relates this moral perspective to a situation in her teaching repertoire. A situation of a student who attends and work for all the classes except the English class, perhaps because of the “negative attitude the students has towards English and its speakers”. Asma’a proposes that the teacher needs to use Kant’s theory to direct the student to the importance of each subject in the school curriculum. There should be no difference in treatment among school subjects. The reason behind paying attention to all the subjects equally is that each student needs to serve society using all the knowledge acquired from all the subjects. This leads Asma’a to think of the consequence of learning for the societal good. Consequently, the theory of Mill which considers the moral consequence of doing an action comes to her mind. Thinking of the class as a community and of the possible influence that the behaviour of the student could have on other students in the class, she proposes, the student ought to be advised to consider the consequences of his/her actions on other students in the class. This takes her further to think about the larger society and how learning English could bring benefit to it. The learner gets a great benefit from learning English. It contributes to his/her thinking skills. Thus, choosing to develop and flourish is connected to learning English. In addition, a free decision that should be taken by the learner to learn is demanded. Depending on that, they will develop. This takes Asma’a to Aristotle’s theory which states that “our moral actions are freely chosen and are an extension of our [virtuous] habits”. She, insightfully states, that learners’ motivation and performance reflect the level of morality they have reached by choice. She further adds that the teacher may use these theories of morality to generate motivation in the students. They can be used in accordance to the situation that occurs to the teacher individually or in combination. She concludes her essay by saying that motivation cannot be imposed on students but needs to be generated through treatment and behaviour.
(Table 5.15-C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response produced for task 2</th>
<th>Response produced for task 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(concluding paragraphs)</td>
<td>(concluding paragraphs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Paragraph Eight): We, the English teachers, should have a better understanding of our motivations. A strongly motivated teacher is in far better position as a moral successful academic than a teacher who is less motivated. For less motivated teachers, in practice, there is much that you can do to generate your own motivation, or to get others to help you to do so. . . . Build on your own self-confidence, focus on goals, work with all of you and make teaching priority. . . . Never wait or ask for rewarding, even if you think that you have not gotten your rights.

(Paragraph Nine): You and I want to contribute in developing our country. It is our obligation to move on toward a more civil and moral society. Being good people before being good teachers will ensure keeping us in a good relationship with God and will also ensure fair harmony between us and others inside the school and outside its doors. The right should govern our behaviour and set limits to our desires and actions. . . . We should take our prophet

(Section Four): English teachers may attend their classes with great enthusiasm, but they may be chocked by the level of motivation that the learners have. . . . Positive changes can be accomplished if the teacher has a living conscience and a good level of morality.

(Section Five): Throughout history, many thinkers and philosophers provided humanity with different moral theories such as divine command theory, utilitarianism natural right theory and growth theory. There is no need to be a Muslim or even a member of Arab society to deal with Yemeni learners morally. Most religious and moral theories have shared many concepts and standards of morality. Natural virtues are constant and eternal and do not change from one place or time to another. Teachers may exploit and make use of the experiences of others to influence their students. For the purpose of mentioning, I will present three different theories of morality that may help teachers handle with their students appropriately.

Immanuel Kant, an eighteenth century
Mohammed as an example of the best teacher. By following his path, we will be guided to the best methods of teaching as well as of living. absolutist philosopher, advocated the use of maxims. Kant's supreme principle is "Act always in such a way that you could will your action to be universal law". This ideology is in somehow similar to the Islamic concept "Treat others as you would like to be treated". According to Kant, people must respect all other people, people should be treated equally. [She gives an example of a student who works hard for all subjects except English. She proposes that he/she should be told that what is hateful to be done to Arabic teacher should not also be done to the English teacher. . . .] Many students will not be eager to invest effort to learn English correctly and consequently less number of them can get the merits of knowing it which will also be reflected in developing the society. So there will be consequences to such behaviour. This takes us to another philosopher, John Stuart Mill, who believed that if people want to act morally, they should look at the consequences. [. . .] That student ought to make the moral choice that will bring benefits for him and his classmates and will be useful to the welfare of the class. No doubt that knowing English can contribute largely in developing and
flourishing a learner. It improves the students’ education and their critical and creative thinking skills. No matter how talented the teacher is, it is the learners’ decision whether they want to improve and whether their actions will help them become better people. Aristotle argued hundred years ago that our moral actions are freely chosen and are an extension of our virtues habits. Students should know that their motivation and performance reflect to a great extent the level of morality they have reached.

It may be difficult for some teachers to rely on any one theory in all situations. Flexibility may be needed in applying different theories at different times or in combination. Teachers may optimally implement a balance of what is universally regarded as having general moral value in given circumstances.

(Section six): As English language teachers, we do our best to fulfil our academic and moral duty towards our pupils. At the end of the day we cannot enforce students to be motivated, but we can influence them either directly or indirectly.
5.2.2.1.1 Interpreting the nature of the criteria

This part of the analysis is divided into three sub-parts each representing the interpretation of the dialogicality of one criterion. The analysis is based on a comparison between the students' responses to the second and the third tasks.

5.2.2.1.1 Responsivity

In spite of the obvious difference between the responses to the second and the third tasks, one can say that there is an attempt on the part of the student to develop a research idea and relate it to the morality theories. Relating the attempts done by the student in the second and the third tasks to her attempt made in task one, the researcher has observed that the student has started from where she has ended in task one. As has been explained in interpreting the nature of change of the response between the first and the second drafts in the first task, Asma'a has been able to come up with a well-formulated idea about the issue of morality and has been able to use it meaningfully to interpret the three morality theories. She has identified the issue of morality to be related with the idea of knowing the right and wrong and consciously taking a decision in relation to a particular situation. In this way, she has forged for herself a responsive understanding of morality that is restricted by her religious affiliation and at the same time making use of Mill’s theoretical position on morality. In the second task, the student is making an attempt to relate the whole idea of morality to education and its message for developing knowledgeable and civilized society. This, the researcher has understood from the following sentence in the student’s response to task two: “The first step of building a civilized educated society is to [find] good teachers and make sure that they are prepared enough for bringing up generations full of knowledge and idealism”. She defines morality as “the standards, codes, manners, principles and rules that fountain from our religion, Islam, and we believe in as religious commitment and are socially accepted, to differentiate between right and wrong”. Then, it is clear from this response that she still identifies with her previously taken position and is attempting to continue building on her previous understanding. She identifies the job of the teacher to be building up intrinsic motivation in his/her extrinsically motivated students. Yet, she finds that the unmotivated teacher is in a moral dilemma because if he/she has no motivation,
then, how to generate motivation in the students. This will be an obstacle on the way of the teaching-learning process. Thus, it is necessary to find out the reasons for the lack of motivation and look for solutions. Some of the reasons that she has found are the disqualification, law salary, absence of encouragement and reward, “mismatch between knowledge, beliefs or interests which the teacher has and the ideas with which he/she is coming in contact with through teaching,” “responsibilities, other than teaching, taking priority,” and the unsuitable classroom environment. The three moral theories have been used to derive solutions for these problems. She has used Kant’s theory to judge the immorality of a teacher who for example, due to the mismatch between his/her belief system and the cultural belief of the target language, avoids teaching some lessons in the syllabus. The teacher who “sometimes” gives self the right to do wrong things will continue doing them nonstop. So, there should be no “sometimes” in giving self freedom to avoid teaching some lessons. Kant’s theory, because of its refusal of the concept of “sometimes”, has been used as a touchstone to refuse doing things that result in the lack of motivation as immoral. Mill’s theory is also used to point out the immorality of a situation in which the teacher gives priority to responsibilities other than teaching and neglects doing his/her main duty, teaching. Above all, Aristotle’s theory, because of its focus on free choice, is used as the magical solution for the lack of motivation which has been judged as immoral using the previous theories. What a teacher has to do is to consider self as inspiration for the students who will be motivated if the teacher is morally motivated.

Tracing the shift in responsivity made by Asma’a in the third task, the conscious effort that she is making to transform the idea made in the response to the second task is clear. She begins her essay by identifying the lack of motivation on the part of learners to be the main moral problem for teachers. She addresses that the two concepts, motivation and morality, are strongly related to each other. The teacher’s duty towards these learners is to generate their motivation through morality. She justifies the use of morality as the solution for the lack of motivation on the part of the learners to their religious affiliation. “A Yemeni child”, she states, “is brought up to be obliged to follow these [God’s] commands”. This religious commitment which is for her basically moral can be used as a tool by the teacher for generating motivation in the students. But, what are the reasons
behind the lack of motivation among the learners? She presents some reasons such as the lack of learning goals, cultural mismatch between the mother tongue and the target language, the level of difficulty of the teaching methods and materials. These problems, according to Asma’a, occur due to the lack of motivation and the teacher may attempt to solve the problems using various ways such as raising students’ awareness of the different goals that they may adopt for learning English including the spiritual ones; and helping them consider mismatch between their culture and the target language culture as a chance to know more the target community; and treating them in a way that reinforces recall of positive learning experiences. A moral solution may also be a helpful solution for the lack of motivation according to Asma’a. She mentions different religious and theoretical stances on morality: the divine command theory, utilitarianism, natural right and growth theory. The researcher identifies the divine command theory to be the Islamic conception of morality because she, in the beginning of the essay has mentioned that morality for Muslims “is based on God’s commands”. In this way, she puts the Islamic conception side by side with the morality theories. These theoretical stances may altogether be suitable for enabling teachers handle unmotivated students. First, she begins with Immanuel Kant’s theory and how it may be relevant to Islamic conception. She picks up from the theory (people must respect all other people) what is relevant to her religious belief, (treat others as you would like to be treated); see the researcher’s interpretation to students’ first drafts for the first task table number 5.1. A situation is then proposed by her to show the immorality of the behaviour of a student who attends and studies all the classes except the English class. This behaviour of the students may have occurred because of the negative attitude the students generally have for the target language and its speakers (mentioned by Asma’a at the beginning of the essay) which in turn has resulted in the mismatch they feel between their culture and the target language culture (mentioned by her in the list of reasons for the lack of motivation). This behaviour of the students, Asma’a proposes, may be solved by directing him/her to the supposedly better behaviour that they ought to treat all the subjects and their teachers equally. Mill’s theory judges the immorality of this behaviour from another dimension, the dimension of the benefit or utility. The teacher, guided by this theory, may help the student predict the immorality of his/her action by making him/her imagine how unbeneﬁcial this action is.
The teacher needs to tell the student that if his/her classmates imitate this behaviour of neglecting the English language class and its teacher while caring for other subjects and their teachers, the greatest good of the class as the societal space in which the learner plays a major role will be in danger. This reminds us of Asma’a conditional acceptance of Mill’s theory in the first task by considering the benefit not only of the person but of his/her larger society or “the greatest good” as Asma’a calls it. As the welfare of the community is emphasized by Asma’a, this does not mean that she denies the individual the right for benefit. This takes her to Aristotle’s theory which gives importance to the individual freedom in choosing the moral acts that lead to individual’s development and flourishing. There will be no change whatever the effort on the part of the teacher to convince the learner of the immorality of not having motivation for learning English language and negligence of its teacher, she maintains, unless the learner himself/herself is aware that their level of motivation reflects how moral they are. The conclusion for section five on teaching morality she allot’s for instructing teachers that it will be difficult to depend on only one theory in all situations to generate motivation in students. A combination of more than one theory is needed depending on what is regarded as moral in a particular situation. This is Asma’a’s moral law which means taking a consciously moral decision by making a balance between what is universally accepted in a given situation. Section number six shows Asma’a’s emphasis that the morality of the teacher’s behaviour will be reflected on students’ behaviour and that their moral change should be based on awareness.

Comparing the responsivities to tasks two and three the researcher finds that Asma’a has been able to express her opinion more clearly in the third task than the second task. As she has continued with the opinion formulated by her in the first task (morality is a conscious decision taken in accordance to a situation while following the direction of Islam), her attempt to reflect this opinion in the second task has been half-achieved. Although she has stated at the beginning of her response to the second task that morality is following the commands of God, her belief of the moral decision as situational and beneficial to both the person and the society is not expressed in her way of using the morality theories as a touchstone for judging the immorality of the teacher’s unmotivated behaviour. In the third task, however, while she attempts to use the morality
theories to judge and at the same time solve the motivation problem, she does not forget to relate them to her religious belief and to her concept of achieving individual and societal benefits. The three elements (Morality as a conscious decision, as considering the consequences, and as following the Islamic rules of righteousness) that she has focused on in forging a personal response to the issue of morality in the first task have all been efficiently integrated in the third task. Thus, one can say that the response to the third task reflects a more deliberate attempt at reflecting a more internally responsive understanding than the response to the second task.

5.2.2.1.1.2 Intersubjectivity

In the response to the second task, Asma'a's interaction with the three theorists has been detected in her attempt to use their theories for the purpose of judging the moral level of the behaviour of unmotivated teachers. The way she has dealt with the theories for her purpose reveals consciousness of the purpose of each theory (absolutist use of moral maxims, utility of making a moral action, and moral behaviour as based on conscious decision). However, there has been no coordination between her personal opinion, morality as obeying the commands of God with relevance to making a conscious moral decision that is situational, and those predicted by her to be the theorists' opinions. Therefore, it can be said that her intersubjectivity is bending to the negative side because her position on morality is not coordinated with those of the theorists.

In the response to the third task Asma'a's personal opinion is to a large extent coordinated with those of the theorists. Kant's theory is seen to be similar to the commands of God in relation to its care for the moral treatment of others in the way we like to be treated. Mill's theory is conditioned by its care for the utility of an action as it relates one's personal benefit to the greatest good. Aristotle's theory in its support for the individual development as dependent on moral choice should be interpreted on the basis of the choice as springing from "virtuous habits". These virtues for Asma'a are natural and are supposed to be the same in every time and place; see section five in her response to the third task table 8-1C. They reflect the moral level they have reached. So, these are not to follow our wishes but to make our freewill have moral guidance. This guidance,
from Asma’a’s perspective, is a spiritual/religious one. Therefore, her intersubjectivity in the third task is dialogic.

5.2.2.1.1.3 Situatedness

There are two levels to be talked about in terms of situatedness: the interaction between the fields and the two cultural perspectives.

In the second task, Asma’a has successfully used the three theories of morality as a touchstone for interpreting the moral level of an educational behaviour characterised by the lack of motivation. On the second level, her Islamic perspective, though acknowledged to be her final authority for judging the rightfulness of behaviour, has not been integrated with the cultural position of the theorists. Thus, in the second task there has been outsideness on the narrow level while at the broad level her position has remained intact.

In the response to the third task, however, there has been a state of outsideness achieved at both the levels. She has used the morality theories to interpret the level of the morality of an educational behaviour characterised by the lack of motivation and to show the way to solve the problem of the lack of motivation. Besides, she has been able to integrate her Islamic perspective with that of the theorists in the sense that she has adopted a personal position that has enabled her interpret both the positions; Islamic rules, though her final authority, still subject to the mental awareness of the person; and the theorists’ position has been accepted only as they finally lead to the greatest good. Thus, a state of outsideness has been achieved on both the levels.

5.2.2.1.2 The role of the audience with reference to dialogicality

In the second task Asma’a has been aware that her audience, the local academic community, knows about the Islamic perspective and maybe this is the reason behind Asma’a’s silence about this perspective. She has just stated that the Islamic rules are the final authority concerning the morality of an action. There has been no attempt on her side to show the audience how the two perspectives, that of Islam and that of the theorists, could be integrated. In the third task as she addresses those who are interested in teaching Yemeni learners from outside the country, she has been clearer in the way she
has addressed the idea of how the two perspectives, the Islamic and that of the theorists, could be integrated.

Thus, it can be concluded that the effect of the other from the other culture(s) has to some extent made her discourse dialogic.

5.2.2.1.3 The scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue

In both the tasks the theories of morality have been used as tools in the context of education. Asma’a, in the second task, has used them to gauge the morality of an educational behaviour that is deprived of motivation while in the third task they have been used for this purpose as well as to find solution for the lack of motivation. Thus, a tool from the field of philosophy has been used in the field of ELE to solve one critical problem. This can be regarded as a sign for cultural development in the field of ELE as the student knows it. Furthermore, the tools themselves have undergone some changes through seeing them through the students’ personal convictions. This can be seen as a cultural development in the use of this tool as understood by the student.

The two perspectives, the educational and the philosophical on the one hand and the Islamic and the theorists’ perspectives on the other hand have been into dialogue. This can be considered an intercultural dialogue.

5.2.2.2 Student no. 2 (Abdullah)

Comparing the left column, in which the introductory paragraphs (sections) of the second task are written, with the right column, in which the introductory paragraphs of the third task are written, in table 5.16-A below, the researcher has found that there is almost no change in introducing the problem is detected. The following is a brief description of the content of the introductory paragraphs of the responses to both the tasks.

In the second task, the problem that “a great number of students in schools do not learn English or do not like to learn English language” is the main idea of the essay. Abdullah has explored the causes of this problem by using the statement above as a question directed to secondary school students and teachers. Besides, some information
has been collected from internet. Abdullah sees the essay to be an attempt to connect the problem to the morality theories. The main aims of the study are to explore the causes and the solutions for the problem, clarify the moral mission for teaching English, and draw “the educational institutes’ attention to the role to be played towards English language and its learners.”

In the third task’s introductory paragraphs, the same problem is discussed in the essay. Abdullah writes that this problem will be presented with reference to its manifestations, causes, and solutions. The same target groups are his source for data and the questions asked are “Why students in Yemeni schools do not like to learn English language?” and “What are the suitable solutions to such problems?”

(Table 5.16-A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s introductory paragraphs (task two)</th>
<th>Student’s introductory paragraphs (task three)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section One:</strong> . . . . Unfortunately, a great number of students in schools do not learn English or do not like to learn English language. This is one of the most important problems in Yemen.</td>
<td><strong>Paragraph One:</strong> . . . . Unfortunately, a great number of students in schools do not learn English or do not like to learn English language. This is one of the most important problems in Yemen. In this study, I have discussed this problem with reference to its manifestation, causes and tried to give appropriate solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section Two:</strong> to this study, I made many interviews with different teachers and school students. I ask them about the causes which make students do not like English language. I got some information from the internet. I made a connection between this problem and the concept of morality with reference to Mill’s and</td>
<td><strong>Paragraph Two:</strong> In order to get the necessary data I have interviewed two target groups that have a direct relationship with English language learning (learners and teachers). The first group consists of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abdullah, though he has mentioned that he will talk about the manifestations of the problem in the response to the third task, he does not mention anything related to the manifestations of the problem in the following paragraphs. The researcher attributes this to the student’s confusion between the response to the second task in which he has mentioned the manifestations of the problem and the response to the third task in which he has not mentioned any manifestations.*
Aristotle’s theories about morality. In addition, I used my experience being one of the school students in the past and now an English college graduate.

**Section Three**: This study aims at the following objectives: -To find out the main reasons which make students do not like to learn English language. – To offer appropriate solutions to this problem. – To clarify that teaching is a moral process. – To draw the educational institutes’ attention to give a big concern to English language and its learners.

50 students of the secondary stage all of them are boys. The second group consists of 9 members of males English teacher at the secondary stage. I asked them “why students in Yemeni schools do not like to learn English language?” “What are the suitable solutions to such problems? I asked everyone lonely.

In Table 5.17-B, the main-body paragraphs are presented. The main-body sections in the response to the second task have been put against the main-body paragraphs in the response to the third task.

In the main-body paragraphs in the response to the second task, some manifestations of the problem are mentioned. These are the students’ absence from the English classes; the students’ non-care in the class and in doing homework and preparing for examinations; failure in English in colleges; and hiring foreign workers to occupy positions which require fluency in English. Though a belief that the reasons for the problem are moral in origin is expressed, it is presented only in the concluding paragraphs. Two long paragraphs in section five are allotted to expound two perspectives for seeing the origin of the problem; the students’ and the teachers’. The students have negative outlook about English language. They feel that English is not beneficial, a “Western comer”, difficult; and its teachers are “harsh”, “stern”, and do not explain the lessons as demanded by students. He adds that their teachers shamelessly tell them that they will pass the exam effortlessly. He continues that teachers’ perspective completes the remaining part of the tail. First, they blame the social and official institutes for the students’ lack of awareness of the importance of learning English. They, for example,
refer to the non-provision of aids for teaching English and absence of the required life activities from the teaching materials. Second, they blame the school principles and controllers of examinations for students’ effortless success in English exams. The two perspectives pour into two points; the lack of motivation and the negative attitude towards English.

The main-body paragraphs of the response to the third task begin with the following: “the lack of motivations [of] students to learn English language and the negative attitudes of students towards English language” are the main reasons of the problem. Abdullah, then, defines them. First, he begins with motivation. Following Gardner (2000), Abdullah mentions two types of motivation: the instrumental and the integrative. The instrumental motivation Abdullah equates with Mill’s idea of morality as usefulness or utility because they both focus on doing something because of its utility whatever it may be. The integrative motivation he finds similar to Aristotle’s theory of morality as growth and flourishing as both emphasize the importance of social relationships and education. Aristotle’s theory is still to be related to another kind of motivation, the developmental one. They are similar in the sense that both assert the importance of personal satisfaction and development. The second reason is the negative attitude toward English. The second problem is to be considered as a part of the first problem; attitude is a component of motivation and therefore it affects it positively or negatively. Following Wanden (1991), Abdullah lists three components of attitudes: the cognitive, the affective, and the behavioural. However, in spite of defining each component, he does not mention whether he will focus on all or two components and how they are related to the morality theories.

(Table 5.17-B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s main-body paragraphs (second task)</th>
<th>Student main-body paragraphs (third task)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section Four:</strong> This problem has many manifestations. The first is that many students do not attend the English classes in schools. Students do not react with</td>
<td><strong>Paragraph Three:</strong> At the end of the interviews, it has been cleared that the main causes of this problem are the lack of motivations on students to learn English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers and they do not care about the English homework and examinations. Bringing many workers from other countries whom speak English to work in the places in which English language is the base. Most of the college students who study English as a secondary subject fail in it, and so on.

**Section Five: First paragraph:** If we want to study or discuss any problem, it is inevitable to stop on the main reasons that cause that problem. For this problem, I believe, the reasons are moral in origin. I interviews nine English teachers and more than fifty students from different schools and areas. I find that some students look at English language negatively. They think there is no benefit from learning it. It is a western comer. Other students say that they do not like English language because it is difficult. Its teachers mostly are very stern or harsh and use bad words. They say: if they ask the teacher to explain anything they have not understood, he does not explain it. He says do not fair all of you will pass. This bad behavior makes them not care about English language subject.

**Paragraph Two:** Teachers give two reasons to this problem. The first is the ignorance of the value of learning English language and the negative attitudes of students towards English language. Gardner (2000) asserts that studies of motivation of second/foreign language learners often refer to a distinction between two types of motivation namely, instrumental versus integrative motivation. Gardner (1983, p. 203) defines instrumental motivation as “learning a language because of someone or less clearly perceived utility it might have for the learner”. More specifically, a learner is instrumentally motivated when he/she wants to learn a language “to pass an examination, to use it in one’s job, to use it in holiday in the country, as a change from watching television, because the educational system requires it” (Wilkins, 1972, p. 184). This is what John Stuart Mill, a Western philosopher, has asserted in his theory about morality “… you should weigh the morality of an action in terms of its utility or usefulness”.

**Paragraph Four:** On the other hand. Integrative motivation was defined as “learning a language because the learner wishes to identify himself with or become integrated into the society” of the target language (Gardner, 1983, p. 203). Therefore, a learner is integratively...
language through societies, and official and social institutes. They do not give English language teachers and learners special value. Aids and devices which used to teach Arabic language are the same for English language. Most of the context of the existing English language courses does not benefit students in their life. Mostly, it is structural. They do not give students some lessons on any skill or thing to apply it in their life. The second reasons which teachers give is refer to the principles and controls of school. They say: we know that students only think on examinations. Students find that they pass in English subject without answering any question. This behavior from the principle or the control of the school makes students feel that English is not necessary subject. Therefore, they do not study English and not attend its classes.

motivated when he/she learns a language because he/she wants to “know more of the culture and values of the foreign language group . . . to make contact with the speakers of the languages . . . to live in the country concerned” (Wilkins, 1972, p. 184). The Europian theorist Aristotle indicated this concept in his theory about morality “those things that help us grow and flourish are good. . . . Aristotle concept of growth includes those physical and social thing that are necessary for human development. . . . The social things include friendship, supportive social relationships and education”. Besides Gardner’s integrative and instrumental constructs, there is a third type of motivation which Cooper and Fishman (1977) termed “developmental”. Developmental or personal motivation, according to them, refers to motivation relating to “personal development or personal satisfaction” (Cooper & Fishman, 1977, p. 243). This includes such activities as watching movies and reading books in English. This is what Aristotle indicated in his theory about morality “. . . If you are attempting to live an ethical life, Aristotle said you should ask yourself what kind of person you want to become. Then you can make moral choices based on whether an action will help you become that person.”
Paragraph Five: The second reason is the negative attitude of students toward English language. Gardner (1985) considers attitudes as components of motivation in language learning. According to him, “motivation . . . refers to the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language” (p. 10). However, Wenden (1991) proposed a broader definition of the concept “attitudes”. He states that the term attitudes includes three components namely, cognitive, affective and behavioural. A cognitive component is made up of the beliefs and ideas or opinions about the object of the attitude. The affective one refers to the feeling and emotions that one has towards an object, ‘like’ or ‘dislike’, ‘with’ or ‘against’. Finally, the behavioural component refers to one’s consisting actions for behavioural intentions towards the object. Learning a language is closely related to the attitudes towards the languages (Starks & Paltridge, 1996). Karahan (2007, p. 84) avers that “positive language attitudes let learner have positive orientation towards learning English”. As such, attitudes may play a very crucial role in language learning as the would appear to
In the concluding paragraphs of the response to the second task, Abdullah makes an attempt to come up with solutions for the above mentioned problem. He observes that all the causes for the problem are somehow related to the ignorance of the value of English language. He makes a claim that learning English language is a moral problem because it is beneficial for all (Mill's theory). It makes possible interaction among countries without the need for translators or spending money on hiring them and reading medical leaflets as they are written in English. The benefit of English is also religiously acknowledged. Prophet Mohammed encourages the learning of foreign languages for the sake of protecting self from the evil deeds of those who speak these languages. After relating the benefit of English to morality, he uses two morality theories: Mill's and Aristotle's as "a complete solution" for the problem and as a "measure for doing things". Using Mill's, Abdullah shows the morality of learning English for its happy consequences for the greatest number of people including self. Its speakers can easily find a job and serve the society replacing the foreign workers. Aristotle's theory judges an action to be moral if it leads to the flourishing and development of individual. There are many things that an individual can do using English language for self interest such as reading English newspapers, listening to English channels, and cultural exchange. Abdullah's raises awareness of the teachers and official institutes of how to deal with this problem morally. Beginning with teachers, he preaches that teaching English is a moral responsibility as well as enlightening students on the value of this language. Mill's theory in its focus on the utility of consequences should guide teachers' treatment with the students and their behaviour in the class. The principles of the schools and the controllers of examinations guided by Aristotle's theory of morality should know that passing students in the English exams (with them not deserving to pass) is an immoral thing. It is detrimental to the students' growth in learning the subject. The ministry of education has
a moral responsibility on its side. Guided by Mill’s morality theory of utility, the ministry should provide suitable aids for teaching English. The concluding sentences emphasize that a moral position should be adopted. This can happen by making the usefulness and the growth that come from learning English the responsibility of the whole society as well as the result of positive attitude and motivation towards it.

In the concluding paragraphs of the third task Abdullah draws the readers’ attention to the effect of the attitude towards English on the motivation for learning it. The key, thus, for solving the problem is to work on the students’ negative attitudes. Three things are to be done: first, modifying the courses to include lessons that enlighten students on the importance of English language; second, training teachers to change the negative attitudes of the students through helping teachers understand that teaching is a moral process; and third, providing schools with the proper facilities for learning English that make language learning fun.

For the change of the motivation, Abdullah, following Gardner and Lambert, recommends teaching programs ought to be designed in a way that taps on students’ motivation. Only the activities that generate it should be selected and taught. The concluding sentences emphasize the morality of learning English and the duty of making this clear as a religious one.

(Table 5.18-C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s concluding paragraphs (second task)</th>
<th>Student’s concluding paragraphs (third task)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section Six: Paragraph One:</strong> To give a suitable solutions to this problem, it is necessary to make a connection between the value of English language and the solutions. Because all the reasons spring from ignorance of the English language value. In our Islamic religion, learning English language is a moral job. Everyone of us should do his</td>
<td><strong>Paragraph Six:</strong> Throughout the study, it is found that an English foreign language learner’s motivation in language learning is affected by his/her attitudes towards learning the language. Therefore, the most important or the most essential solution to this problem is the change of the negative attitudes of the students towards English language. This change can be done through English courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
best to learn English language. Because there are many benefits you can get from it. If you live with English language people, you can understand them easily. When you travel to an English country, you need to a translator to translate what other say for you or what you say for them. However, if you understand to speak English, you will not need a translator. Therefore, you can safe the money which you will give the translator for yourself. Most of the medicine leaflets are in English language and you can read.

**Paragraph Two:** Our Prophet Mohammed (Peace upon him) indicated this concept of utility by saying “The person who learns other’s language will be safe and not to be deceived by them”. In addition, there are two theories for two European theorists “John Stuart Mill and Aristotle” about morality. These two theories can be a complete solution for this problem. They play as a measure for doing things. Mill says in his theory “... you are acting morally if the consequences of your action bring happiness to the greatest number of people, including yourself...” Aristotle says “Those teachers and the school situation (http://www.sciencedirect.com/article/English language position in Yemen). The English language courses should contain some lesson about the usefulness of the English language and real context by which students can use in their life. It should fulfill the Yemeni learners’ English language needs. It should be interesting. Its aids and devices should be suitable to the educational environment. Teacher training programs need to be modified and modernized to equip teachers with the new teaching methodology. They should be patient to reach the knowledge to students and very kind with them. They should treat students according to their minds and abilities. Because teaching is a moral process and not imperative play. The school situation should be facilities for teaching English language such as English language clubs, language labs, cassette recorder. Such things make student interested to learn English language.

**Paragraph Seven:** After the change of students’ attitudes, eyes should move to the motivation. Gardner and Lambert (1972, p.3) state that “his [the learner] motivation to learn is thought to be determined by his attitudes towards the language. All in all, a better understanding of students’ motivation and attitudes may assist English as a foreign language curriculum and instruction designers
things that help us grow and flourish are to device language teaching programs that
good . . ." Learning English language
brings many benefits. It helps the
person finds a good job as a tourist
instructor or a worker in any company.
Students who learn English language
will graduate and play a big role in
improving the country income. They
will cover the needs for tourist
translators and instructors. They will
replace the foreign workers in many
institutes and companies which require
English language.

Paragraph Three: being able to use
English language, we can read the
English countries newspapers, books
and listen to their channels. We can
speak and live with English people.
These things help in making cultural
exchange.

Paragraph Four: Therefore, firstly, it
is a moral responsibility on us to
explain the value of English language
for parents, students and all society, and
change their attitudes towards learning
English language. As an English
teacher, we should know that teaching
English language is a moral process and
not imperative play. We must make a
respectable relationships with students.
We should the morality measure of Mill
to generate the attitudes and motivation most
conducive to the production of more
successful EFL learners (Gardner & Lambert,
1972; Midraj, 1998, 2003). Additionally, it can
help material writers create and teachers select
activities and tasks that tap students'
motivation and attitudes (Midraj et al . . .
2008). Finally, we should do our best to do
everything will bring happiness and usefulness
for our society. It is a moral responsibility on
us which God will ask us about.
"If you want to act morally, you have to look at consequences . . . you are acting morally if the consequences of your action bring happiness to the greatest number of people, including yourself . . ." as a standard for our behaviour with students. Principles and controls should know that tolerance in passing students in English subject without answering the exam is an immoral behaviour. Aristotle says “Those things that stifle our growth are bad.”

Paragraph Five: Ministry of education should know its moral responsibility. It should do its best to renew the English language courses according to the concept of usefulness. “You should weigh the morality of an action in terms of its utility, or usefulness.” Mill, morality Theory. It should provide suitable aids for teaching English language. Finally, we must all assume our moral and behavioural responsibility towards our society. We should do everything helps in the growth and development of the society. Morality should be our way in everything we do for our society.
5.2.2.2.1 Interpreting the nature of the criteria

The dialogicality of the three criteria is interpreted in the following. The headlines are named responsivity, intersubjectivity, and situatedness in alignment with the criteria names.

5.2.2.2.1.1 Responsivity

Interpreting the responsivity, the researcher comes to the conclusion that it is getting an academic shape in the third task. The two reasons for the problem announced in the second task are the same in the third task; the negative attitude and the lack of motivation. These, in the third task are defined and classified from the EFL literature. Motivation is classified into instrumental, integrative, and developmental; and attitude is identified to be a component of motivation. From the long explanation provided by the students and the teachers in the second task Abdullah has elicited the above reasons to be the cause of the problem. In the third task, he has avoided the long explanation to directly state the reasons and adds academic touch to it. Besides, the two reasons have directly been related to the morality theories. In the second task, the utility of English has been explained at different levels; the social and the religious. It has been argued that the absence of awareness of the utility of learning English, at both individual and social levels, is immoral according to Mill’s and Aristotle’s theories of morality. Proper solutions are thus provided with the guidance of these theories in terms of advices to the teachers and the official educational institutions. In the third task, the attempt has been different. First, the morality theories have been related to the types of motivations and to attitude as a component of motivation. This connection between the literature of the ELE field and the field of philosophy has been absent in the second task. The work on the solution in the third task is more systematic in the sense that the negative attitude and the lack of motivation are worked upon separately in two different paragraphs. The problem of the negative attitude is to be solved through raising awareness of students, training teachers to change the negative attitude, and providing facilities to make learning fun. The solution for the motivation problem comes from the ELE literature with Gardner and Lambert’s proposal of designing English programs that generate students’ motivation.
Taking care of these problems, Abdullah says by the end of the third task, is a moral responsibility that has religious implications.

From the explanation above of the responsivity to both the tasks, the researcher depicts the responsivity to the third task to be more dialogic than that to the second task. The student attempts to present an active understanding of the morality theories through the literature of his field. The presence of the morality theories as the only literature to draw upon for measuring the morality of the causes of the problem and providing the solution (in the second task) has been replaced by drawing on both the literatures of ELE and Philosophy to do the same thing in a more systematic. Abdullah has been dealing with two fields to use them for his purpose and making them internally convincing.

5.2.2.1.2 Intersubjectivity

The interaction, in the second task, has been between Abdullah’s understanding of the students’ and teachers’ accounts of the reasons for the problem on one hand and the morality theories on the other hand. The informal discourse of the teachers and the students has been put by Abdullah into interaction with the formal discourse of the morality theorists. The informal discourse provides the causes for the problem and the formal discourse provides the judgmental aspect of the immorality of the causes. However, towards the end, when he has attempted to provide solutions in which the two discourses are meeting, he fails to make the interaction dialogic. The moral responsibility is stated to guide the solution of the problem but some explanation is needed to relate the morality theories to the solution. For example, it is not clear how the Ministry of Education will be guided by Aristotle’s theory and how the teachers will be guided by Mill’s theory. Thus, one can say that Abdullah has been able to make the intersubjectivity dialogic in the middle of the essay but has not been able to maintain it till the end of the essay.

In the third task, on the other hand, the interaction has been between the ELE literature and the Philosophy literature in his mind. The scholars from both the fields are put into interaction with each other. The ELE scholars have been used to provide definitions and classifications for the causes of the problem and the morality theories have been used to provide a measure for the immorality of the problem. Moreover,
though the reasons are not convincing enough, the morality theories have been classified in accordance to the types of motivation. Thus, Abdullah provides the moral base for solving the problem from the ELE perspective. Therefore, the researcher judges the intersubjectivity to be dialogic as Abdullah has been successful in coordinating the two formal discourses of ELE and Philosophy.

5.2.2.2.1.3 Situatedness

In the second task, Abdullah has situated himself as a student of English in the past and as an English graduate in the present. He has also stated the target groups of teachers and students to inform his discussion of the problem and the problem to be connected with the morality theories. However, in his discussion of the reasons and the solution, the morality theories have been subordinated to the ELE perspective in Abdullah’s mind. For example, they have been used to judge the immorality of the reasons and the morality of the solutions. The morality theories have not undergone the effect of the ELE perspective.

In the third task, the morality theories have been classified in accordance with the three types of motivation and have been the basis of a morally-oriented solution to the lack of motivation and the negative attitude of the students. Thus, both the positions have undergone the state of outsideness and therefore are dialogic.

5.2.2.2.2 The role of the audience with reference to dialogicality

On Abdullah, the audience has a different effect from that it has had on Asma’a. For example, in the response to the second task, Abdullah has attempted twice to argue for the morality of learning English and acknowledgement of the utility of using it from a religious perspective. However, in the third task, he has not mentioned anything related to religion except towards the end of the essay. Thus, the broad cultural perspective of Abdullah has not come into dialogue with that of the theorists. This means that the audience has not made the interaction of the broad cultural perspectives dialogic.

However, the narrow cultural perspectives, the two fields, have not come into dialogue in the second task but have come into dialogue (see the section on
intersubjectivity and situatedness). This entails that the non-native/foreign audience (or the other in Bakhtin’s terminology) might have caused Abdullah’s discourse to be dialogic.

5.2.2.2.3 The scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue

There has been a development in both the perspectives in Abdullah’s mind in both the tasks. This entails that there is a scope for future cultural development at the narrow level (see the section on intersubjectivity and situatedness).

The two fields (ELE and Philosophy) have come into dialogue in the third task and have not maintained being in dialogue till the end of the second task.

So, there is a scope for both future culture development and intercultural dialogue in Abdullah’s discourse when he attempts to address issues in his ELE field using ideas from another field.

5.2.2.3 Student no. 3 (Mayasah)

Table 5.19-A below presents Mayasah’s introductory paragraphs in tasks two and three.

In the introductory paragraphs in the response to the second task, Mayasah has provided a brief account of the importance of English language and studying it, a historical account of its introduction in Yemen, and a brief introduction into a small study about the idea of Arab students finding difficulty in studying English.

In the introductory paragraph in the response to the third task, Mayasah talks about the role of English language as a World language in the curriculum and its role in developing students. The education plays a role in developing a country in all levels, and English, through its place in the curriculum, is seen as a tool that can lead to development as it is the third language spoken in the World as well as the language of knowledge and research. Saying this, Mayasah states that the issue to be discussed in the essay is the characteristics of effective teachers for better education. This issue, she believes, is not relevant only to the Yemeni teachers’ context but can be of value for other teachers in other countries.
### Student's introductory paragraphs

**Paragraph One:** Education is the best way to develop ourselves and our countries, economically, politically and socially. Since English is one of the international languages of the World, teaching English is a very important way to make people able to communicate with other nations. Most people speak English and most of knowledge and the latest researches are written in English. Because of the importance of English language Yemen is one of the countries where English is taught as a foreign language beside different subjects which students have to study in Yemeny curriculum. [Mayasah, in the remaining part of this paragraph, presents a brief historical account of when and how English first taught in Yemen.]

**Paragraph Two:** Although studying English is very important, many students in many Arab countries have many problems with it. When I wanted to write this paper, I tried to enter many internet clubs to know more about the students opinions about English and the problem which they face. Then, I tried to make a questionair for 10 of my neighbors, relevants and others who

### Student's introductory paragraphs

**Paragraph One:** English is one of the most important languages in the world. Using English language in the curriculum of any country is very important, because it helps in the improvement of the students’ level of that country. Education develops the countries economically, politically and socially. English language is the official language of Five of the World’s countries, America, Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. It is the language with the third most native speakers in the World after Mandarin Chinese and Spanish. Most knowledge and the latest researches are written in English. I would to discuss the issue of “How to be an effective teacher?” to gain better education. This issue is not related to Yemeny teachers but also to other teachers in other countries of the World. I would like to publish this paper to share this issue and its solutions with ELT Journal readers to exchange of views.
The table 5.20-B below presents the main-body paragraphs from Mayasah’s responses to the second and the third tasks respectively.

In the main-body paragraphs in the second task, Mayasah focuses on the character of the teacher. She justifies her focus saying that morality is as important as education for development. She uses four students’ problems with their teachers from the responses to the questionnaire to present her idea. The first problem is of a male student who has studied English at an early age in a private school and liked English. However, later he has been taught by unfair teacher who treats students unequally. Mayasha exploits the chance to recommend learning English at an early age and that teacher ought to be a moral person. The morality of a teacher realizes in having the “right maxims” such as fairness, wisdom, patience, mercy to guide thinking. Enlightened by Kant’s theory of morality, beside the use of maxims, a teacher should never lie or use students as tools to gain money. The second problem is reported by a female student who has a repeatedly-absent and unqualified teacher who treats students badly. Mayasah proposes an in-service training for this kind of teachers. The personality could be worked upon using Aristotle’s emphasis on good growth and good social relationships. If the teacher’s growth is well, she will not be absent from school or late to classes; and if she treats students well, they will understand lessons and will be interactive. The third problem is of two students taught by a bad teacher. One of them has failed and the other has got low marks. Consequently, they are bored of studying English, find it difficult, and don’t know why in the first place they need to study it. Guided by Mill’s theory of morality, the personality of this teacher could be worked upon morally by the teacher’s prediction of the
consequences of his/her work. If it makes the majority of people happy and benefitted, then the work should be done and vice versa. Some suggestions from Mayasah follow for improving the performance of this kind of teachers such as making plans and objectives for fulfilling that. Mayasah concludes that it is the teacher's duty to make students happy and pass the exam, thus connecting between happiness and good consequences.

In the main-body paragraphs in the third task, Mayasah introduces the idea of effective teacher. She does not mention the same subjects to be the source of her ideas in this essay. Rather, she uses the legacy of her field, ELE, to introduce her ideas of an effective teacher. "The ELT teachers deal with learners who learn a new language." She uses her reasoning to connect morality to effectiveness in teaching: "[being] an effective English teacher needs patience" and "to be patient and kind, teachers have to be morale." She uses her understanding of morality in Kant's theory for introducing effectiveness in teaching. "Morality," she says, "is inherent and internal within us," so, "teacher has to use principles and maxims" to make moral decisions. Besides, Kant also opposes lie and use of people as tools. Building on his legacy, she says that a teacher should be honest and not use students as tools to gain money.

Beside patience, she chooses additional characteristics of an effective teacher, confidence. She claims that "[confidence] is a very effective tool in teaching." Using Aristotle's view, she argues for how a teacher can gain confidence and help students be confident. Morality, for Aristotle, comes from good growth, good social relationships as well as from knowing what one wants to be. These moral characteristics help teachers allot more time for students, get them engaged in knowledge exchange and help shy students interact.

The third step for a teacher to be effective is to possess "a mixture of characteristics and adjectives" to enable students learn language by "talking in it." This may be fulfilled by befriending with them and making them happy. Besides, teacher, to be effective, needs to choose best actions based on awareness of its usefulness using imagination to get consequences that make him/her as well as students happy. To support this understanding of morality as bringing happiness to self and others, she uses two quotations by Chomsky (2002) and Schivone (2007) about the principle of universality. It
means that if things are right/wrong for me, then they are right/wrong for the other and vice versa.

(Table 5.20-B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s main-body paragraphs (second task)</th>
<th>Student’s main-body paragraphs (third task)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paragraph Three:</strong> According to this questionair, my experience as an English student for more than 9 years and as a prespective teacher, it is clear that many students like English and want to develop their language but they face some problems with studying, teachers or the curriculum itself. One of the most important issues, which I want to discuse in this paper, is the character of the English teacher. According to the questionair, it is found that, for one of the students, who finished high school this year, studying English is very interesting, because, he studied in private school in childhood. He faced problems with his teachers in the last year. His teacher did not treat all students equally and sometimes he was not fair. Her I want to discuse two important points. First, in our curriculum we have to study English from earlier age to be more effective and useful. The other point is that teacher has to be morale. Education is not the only way to develop our society, morality also</td>
<td><strong>Paragraph Two:</strong> being an effective teacher needs a lot of patience. The ELT teachers deal with students who learn a new language. To be patient and kind, teachers have to be morale. Morality with all the different views about it, has an essential part of our life. Morality is inherent and internal within us. Teacher has to act according to his principles and roles, also the society maxims have to be there. For Kant, a great thinker, to be morale, you have to use maxims and personal role to make decisions. He also says that people must never lie and never use people as tools. So teacher has to be honest and do not use his students only to gain money. Kant was not right when he said that we can not predict consequences and when he was absolutist. Morality is a subject to change and most is not absolute. What was once moral, is no longer moral today and thus we move on toward more civil and more human society. For consequences, teacher can know and realize that planning lessons and using teaching aids can make a different atmosphere in the class and help in teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is a perfect tool to live and develop ourselves. Being morale is to have right maxims and principles which help in produce better people in better environment. Classroom is a small community and the teacher should be an example for his student. Teacher should be fair, kind, wise, merciful and forbearing. A teacher has to think deeply according to his maxims and his personal rules as what Kant, a great thinker, said. It is right that Kant may be wrong when he was an absolutist and when he said that we can not predict consequences, but he was absolutely right when he said that a person can never lie and use people as tools. Teacher as an example for students should never lie and should never use students as tools only to gain money but he/she should also think about the consequences when he/she does anything to not affect students. For example, if you have two students one is your relevant and the other is not. As a teacher you have to treat them equally and think about their feelings, circumstances and judge their work at the same way.

**Paragraph Three:** Confidence is a very effective tool in teaching. Teacher has to be confident and has to make an eye contact with his/her students. Students have to trust the teacher, because he/she has all the answers and the knowledge which they need. The way of the teacher behaves is very important. Aristotle’s view of morality can help the teacher to be more effective. For Aristotle, good growth and good social relationships can create a moral person. Also knowing who the person is and what he/she wants to be is very important in Aristotale opinion. For the teacher good health, helps in giving more time and care for students. Good social relationships helps the teacher to inject his/her personality whenever he/she can. Being active, making the class more comfortable and fun helps students to interact with their teacher. A good teacher is not who only has knowledge of subject but has the personality to convey that knowledge in engaging and motivational terms. An effective language teacher is that who care more about his/her students’ learning than about his/her own teaching. Teachers can use their personality to encourage students to share in the classroom activities. They can create with classroom materials such as using props and role plays and encourg students to make posters and their own

---

**Paragraph Four:** Nada is another student. She does not want to study at the college because she has to study English as an addition subject. She hates English
and she blames her teacher because she was always absent all the time, not good enough and she does not treat them in a good way. It is clear that in our schools we have some of non well-educated teachers. Teachers need in-service as well as out-service training courses. In developed countries, they make different tests for students before entering any college. In China and Japan the best students are those who will be teachers. Teaching is the most important job in these countries, because it helps to develop and build all the society.

Teachers has to have good social relations with his students. For Aristotle, morality is not only maxims and principles but also good growth and good social relationships. Good health and growth help the teacher to never be absent or late for school. Good social relationships with students inside the classroom helps students to have better understanding, agreement and interaction with the teacher.

Paragraph Five: Two of the students is taught by teachers who were not good. They face many problems in studying English. One of them failed and the other had a very low mark. They think that English is a very difficult, bored and they teaching aids. Teacher can use different approaches to creative activities inside the classroom to help shy students to interact with their classmates. For example, teacher can use day to day situations, that will help shy student and to use their words which they know. Als teachers have to prepare a lesson plan which include as much as possible time for a lesson plan which include as much as possible time for students to speak. This is the best way to improve their pronunciation, interactivity, and practicality.

Paragraph Four: Good and effective teacher is not a teacher with knowledge only or a teacher with good personality, but a good teacher should have a mixture of characteristics and adjectives which help in affective teaching.

"There are two common misconception about English teaching. First, a professor whit a doctorate is not necessarily a good English teacher. Second, a native speaker of English is not automatically an effective teacher. If fluency were the most important variable in language instructions, a native speaker – especially one with a doctorate would undoubtedly be superior to those who are not native speakers" (Kao Shin – 2007).

We can say that we do not learn language by talking about it, we learn a language by talking in it. An effective teacher is who use his knowledge and experience to help
feel badly about English. They do not know why do they have to study English. These two students need a morale teacher to help them. Morale, according to Mill, is to use the imagination to predict consequences and to make majority of people happy and to be a way from any unusefull thing. A good teacher with good method and aids will help the students. A teacher has to make a plan and put objectives to be a good teacher. First, students have to know what is the importance of English. The teachers have to know some points such as: a) How to organize the class time. b) How to prepare the lesson and what is the lesson’s aims. c) How to use the right method for the right lesson. d) Focussing on how and what students learn more than how much. e) Using the educational aids and instructional materials such as the visual aids like pictures, word cards, charts. Teacher is the only person who can help his students to success and to like the subject. Being good students will make them happy and they will pass the exams. Therefore, thinking about what the teacher needs and how he/she teaches can make good consequences.

students, he/she also use all the possible ways, methods, maxims, principles and techniques of teaching and life to make and create an educated jeneration. Some teachers try to be close to their students, they are as friends. They know them very well and know the differences between them. They know how to treat them and how to solve their problems. Teachers who make their students happy are morale teachers. For Mill, another thinker, morality apply in looking and thinking about consequences and using imagination to decide if your action is morale or not and that is by making people happy. Mill’s utilitarianism, urge that morality means acting in such a way result consequences which make people happy including yourself. You must not make people suffer and by aware of all the actions which has utility or usefulness. As a teacher we have to major the utility of actions according to our religion, culture and society. But, we as human being do not like to be treated badly, so we have to react in such a way not to affect others or make and harmful results for them.

“If we adopt the principle of universality; if an action is right or wrong for others, it is right or wrong for us”.

[Chomsky – 2002]

“In fact, one of the, may be
the most, elementary of
moral principles is that of
universality, that is, if
something is right for me, it
is right for you, if it's wrong
for you it is wrong for me".
[Schivone – 2007]

Table 5.21-C below presents the concluding paragraphs in Mayasah’s responses to the second and the third tasks respectively.

In the concluding paragraph in the second task, Mayasah winds up with the realization that students like English but they have problems learning it. There should be cooperation between teachers and students for development of selves and communities. On their part, students have to study hard and use extra-curricular resources like internet to get knowledge. Teachers, beside knowledge and skills, ought to know latest research and be moral to be able to develop selves and societies.

In the concluding paragraph in the third task, Mayasah states that personal principles that help us act morally need not be only those that we get from our culture and religion. To be effective teacher, we have to be moral as this makes our education perfect. Also, learning English can help us interact with other people and develop selves and communities.

(Table 5. 21-C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s concluding paragraphs (second task)</th>
<th>Student’s concluding paragraphs (third task)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paragraph Six:</strong> Most of students like English but face problems in their study. Students and teachers have to help each</td>
<td><strong>Paragraph Seven:</strong> Personal principles which belong to person’s university, not only his/her culture, region, country, can be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Though the student has not indented this part of the essay as a paragraph, the researcher considers it a concluding paragraph because the student attempts in this paragraph to wind up the essay.*
other to make better education to develop themselves and communities. Students have to study hard, read, write and interact to internet to learn more. Teachers have to be aware of all the latest researches which help them to develop their skills as teachers. They also have to be morale because, a well-educated person can not develop himself or his society without morality.

roles to act morally. Education, teaching, learning and morality, all of them are concepts play essential roles in our life. To be good and an effective teachers, we have to be morale. Morality helps us to know more our education perfect. Studying English and teaching English help us to know more about others and communicate with the wide world around us, to be better people within better communities.

5.2.2.3.1 Interpreting the nature of the criteria

Under this part, three sub-parts are enlisted: responsivity, intersubjectivity, and situatedness.

5.2.2.3.1.1 Responsivity

In both the tasks Mayasah argues that students face problems in learning English because of the teachers. However, the way she has gone about it differs in each task.

In the second task, she has conducted a study using a questionnaire to elicit responses from ten school students. Out of the responses of the ten students, she has selected four students’ problems with their bad teachers to talk about the bad characteristics of an English teacher and how these are to be fixed. Based on the three theories of morality by Kant, Mill, and Aristotle, she selects some good characteristics to replace the bad characteristics of the referred to English teachers. An English teacher has to have the “right maxims;” think of good consequences that make self and the students happy; and should have good health and good relationship with the students. Beside these characteristics from the theories of morality, she recommends an in-service training and the use of some techniques to be used by teachers for better planning and management of classroom. On the students’ side, she recommends making them study English at an early age. By the end of the essay, she mentions that the solution for the problem lie in both the
hands of the students and the teachers and both the parties should do some effort for improvement of educational experience.

In the third task, she addresses the problem without mediation of students’ problems. Rather, reasonably she argues that teaching English as a foreign language demands patience from teachers. She adds to patience another characteristic, kindness, and connects them to morality. About morality, she writes that it is “inherent and internal within us”. This description of morality understandably leads her to Kant’s understanding of morality as personal rules or maxims. Beside the above two characteristics, she adds drawing on Kant, honesty and non-use of people as tools. Then, like in the second task, she chooses from every theory characteristics for a moral teacher who is also a good teacher. Unlike in the second task, she attempts to come up with key adjectives (like honesty from Kant, confidence from Aristotle, and the use of imagination to bring both happiness and good consequences from Mill) rooted in the ideology of the theories and conducive to the change in students. For example, honesty and kindness are parallel to opposition of lie and use of people as tools in Kant’s. Confidence can spring from knowing what one wants to be in Aristotle’s, etc. Furthermore, the solutions for the students’ problems depend on the change in the teachers’ character into a moral one. The main aim in this task, solving the problem of the students by the change of the personality of the teacher, is focused upon rather than the multiple solutions that are not in harmony with each other in the second task. For example, in the second task, she, beside the change in the teacher’s character, has recommended in-service training, techniques to be performed by the teacher, learning English at an early age by students, and many other things to be done by teachers and students to solve the problem. This implies that, in the second task, she has not focused on her main aim which is the change of the character of the teacher as the solution of the problem. In the third task, however, all the solutions have been related to the change in the character of the teacher including the change in the student’s learning behaviour.

To conclude, there is a change of responsivity in the third task towards dialecticality rather than dialogicality in the sense that an understanding on the part of Mayasah is seen of her main aim and how she meaningfully derives justifications of this understanding from the other(s); i.e. morality theorists. However, this has not developed
into an internally convincing discourse as the morality theories have been the unquestionably only source for the development of the teacher's character. The broad cultural (Islamic) perspective expressed by her in the second task and the discourse of the field (ELE) that is supposed to be used as demanded in the task have not played an effective role in her argument for the choice of these particular characteristics from the morality theories. The second others in the task, i.e. the (ELE) theorists with the morality thinkers as the first others, to whom she belongs as a professional are not included in her dialectic endeavour.

5.2.2.3.1.2 Intersubjectivity

In the second task, there has been a total lack of intersubjectivity in the sense that that the adjectives, collected from each theory, have not been related to the ideological orientation of each theory. However, in the third task, there has been some awareness of how to coordinate her opinion with that of theorists. Though, there have been places which show that this coordination has not occurred in the way she has dealt with others in her own field. For example, she has used three quotations from the ELE literature about universality by Chomsky and Schivone and about the characteristics of a good teacher by Kao Shin and imposed her interpretation on these quotations. It has not been made clear how the teachers help students to talk in the language with what Kao Shin has stated in the quotation nor there has been an explanation of how the principle of universality would be of relevance to Mill's care for consequences; see paragraph three in the right column.

Thus, one can say that the intersubjectivity has been achieved in the student's attempt to coordinate her opinion with that of the theorists but there has been no shift of this dialogic intersubjectivity in the treatment of the other writers.

5.2.2.3.1.3 Situatedness

In the second task, the student has attempted to mix solutions from her field with those coming from the morality theories. But, her attempt has not been successful as there has been no connection between the solutions coming from her field with those coming from the morality theories. For example, there has been no suggested connection between
how an in-service training could add to the characteristics of the teacher’s moral personality.

In the third task, there has been awareness at a broad and narrow level of the importance of interaction between cultures and fields. For example, in the last paragraph in the third task she acknowledges that moral principles coming from other cultures and religions can inform our moral understanding. In addition, there is a statement in the same paragraph that states that education can be perfect if associated with morality. However, in the whole essay there have been no attempts to prove or justify so. Thus, one can say that the situatedness is not dialogic in both the responses to the tasks.

5.2.2.3.2 The role of the audience with reference to dialogicality

Mayasah’s awareness of the audience in the second and the third tasks has resulted in some changes. The use of the Yemeni students’ problem to introduce the bad characteristics of English teachers in Yemen in the second task has been replaced by an argument for the role of morality to improve educational effect of the teacher on the students’ performance. There has been a fuller argument of the role of English language as a subject in the school curriculum for development at the beginning of the third task. This role realizes in activating interactions between communities for better humanity and communality expressed by Mayasah at the end of the essay in the third task. Such argument of the relation between English language and development has been left in its rudiment in the second task. There has been tendency which has occurred in the third task but not in the second task, the use of quotations. The researcher argues that Mayasah’s awareness of the need to relate to the others (the readers of the ELT Journal, see the introductory paragraphs to task three, the right column) and to make them consider what she writes has triggered her attempt to argue more for the role of English language in development. This, she argues can be in terms of improving communication between communities and development of understanding that may ensue as a result of such communication. The same reason might be behind her tendency to avoid the use of the students’ problems (it is no more an appeal to the Yemeni audience) and instead has used quotations from writers in the field who are not Yemeni or Arabic.
To conclude, the awareness of the audience as the other has resulted in tendency towards letting the other affect the self more (here Yemeni teachers’ adoption of characteristics coming from non-native morality theories and the role of a foreign language in the development of the student’s community). However, the essay’s main argument has been for the change of the teacher without utilizing the ELE field theoretical position and there have been no examples of how the communication between communities can lead to development. Thus, there has been dialecticality rather than dialogicality in her discourse. An awareness of the other in improving self is there rather than dialogicality between two parties (the self and the other as fully engaged in changing each other).

5.2.2.3.3 The scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue

The argument of the student in the second and the third tasks has been to develop the character of the teacher to improve the learnability of English language. For this purpose, the morality theories have been used to come up with “right maxims” for a morally good teacher who could bring up progress in students’ performance in English language. Though she has talked about communities’ interaction and development that may take place because of interaction, the student’s broad cultural perspective has remained untouched. The other (morality theories) has affected her conception of the preferred character of the teacher but her narrow cultural perspective (the field as a small community) has not undergone growth as a field that has a literature on the matter that might develop because of the discourse of the morality theories. Thus, one may conclude that there is no culture development.

The intercultural dialogue has got affected because of the student’s dialectical tendency. The two cultural positions, the ELE field and the larger Islamic position, have been submerged to Mayasah’s tendency to use the other for improvement of the above mentioned cultural perspectives. Thus, there is also no cultural dialogue.

5.2.2.4 Student no. 4 (Thakiah)

In table 5.22-A below, the introductory paragraphs of the responses to the second and the third tasks are presented.
In the introductory paragraphs in the second task (table 8-4A), Thakiah gives a brief introduction on the status of English language in the World and in Yemen. This is followed by the main aim of the essay which is discussing the problem of “the lack of interest in English classes” and a definition of the word “interest” from a dictionary as well as from the student’s perspective. Two concepts “interest” and “motivation” are related to each other using a definition of motivation which reads that interest is aroused by motivation. An interpretation by the student follows stating that the absence of motivation will entail the absence of interest. In consequence, the absence of interest will lead to the loss of two benefits: the cultural and the functional.

In the introductory paragraphs in the third task, Thakiah produces similar introduction about the status of English in the World and in Yemen. She, in consideration of a wider audience, states that the problem of “the lack of interest in English class” is not encountered only in Yemen but may be encountered in other countries where English is taught as a second or foreign language. She gives the readers a brief introduction into the steps of her “research”: definition of the word “interest”, relating it to motivation, reasons of the problem, connecting the problem with morality, and finding solutions for it. After presenting the sections of her essay, she provides definitions of two main concepts: “motivation” and “interest” along with her own conception of the meaning of the word “interest”. Unlike in the second task, she attempts to introduce motivation as a moral concept because of its utility in arousing interest, and therefore for its role in facilitating learning, based on Mill’s view which sees morality in terms of utility. Maybe based on the same theory, the student does not explicitly write it, she finds, like in the second task, that if there is no interest; students will not get two types of benefit (the cultural and the functional).

(Table 5.22-A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s introductory paragraph (second task)</th>
<th>Student’s introductory paragraphs (third task)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paragraph One</strong>: English is the most studied second or foreign language today, and it is difficult to think of any country in</td>
<td><strong>Section One</strong>: English is the most studied second or foreign language today, and it is difficult to think of any country in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the world where English is not being taught. While Yemen is one of the countries where English language is taught as a foreign language, there are many problems in learning or teaching this language. One of these problems that will be discussed in this research is "the lack of interest in English classes". The meaning of concept of interest according to dictionary is "the desire to learn or hear more about something to be involved with something". In my view interest is an abstract something that exists in person's side that push him to get something or to success in doing something. This abstract word which is "interest" its existence is caused by the existence of motivation because according to the definition of motivation which is taken from one of book "Motivation arouses the interest of the person and once he is interested he becomes attentive, he is willing to concentrate and to work, learning is facilitated even if the task a head be difficult." Therefore the absence of motivation, which is a vital component in successful language learning, leads to the absence of interest which lead altogether to exist a big problem which is "students fail in learning this language" which becomes the dominant global language and it is the world where English is not being taught. While Yemen is one of the countries where English language is taught as a foreign language, there are many problems in learning or teaching this language. One of these problems will be discussed in this research is "the lack of interest in English classes" which may encounter many of countries in which English is taught as a second or foreign language. This research is for the sake of students who learn English language, teacher who teaches English language and for Ministry of education. In this research we will briefly introduce a definition for this problem and discuss it with motivation which is one reason of the exist this problem, then we will examine the other reasons that lead to exist this problem which occur on three wider circle: Teacher, students themselves, and curriculum. Then through the discussion we will connect this problem with morality which produced by three thinkers who gave their views about it. After that we will make some solutions for this problem. Finally we will conclude the whole research.

Section Two: "The lack of interest in English classes" is a big problem which we must not ignore and we must deal with it with more important. To be clear, we must
magic entry visa to internation business, education, Science, technology, literature, tourism, diplomacy, the mass media and much more. Therefore, students will lose the benefits that they will get if they succeed in learning this language. The kind of benefits that students will get are divided into two types “the cultural benefit, and “functional benefit.”

define the word interest which may have a confusion in meaning. The meaning of concept interest according to dictionary is “the desire to learn or hear more about something to be involved with something.

In my view “interest is an abstract something that exists inside of person that pushes him to get something or to success in doing something. This abstract word which is “interest” its existence is caused by the existence of motivation because motivation arouses the interest according to its definition which is “motivation arouses the interest of the person and once he is interested, he becomes attentive, he is willing to concentrate and to work; learning is facilitated even if task is a head be difficult.” Morally, motivation is moral, this can be proved through Mill’s view of morality, he said “you should wieght the morality of an action in terms of utility or usefulness and because motivation arouses the interest which consider a good benefit and leads to presence a big benefit which is “students fail in learning because once student is interested, he becomes attentive, he is willing to concentrate and to work, so learning is facilitated even if the task is difficult. Therefore, the absence of interest which leads to exist a big problem which is “students fail in learning this language”
which becomes the dominant global language and it is the magic entry visa to internation business, education, Science, and much more. Therefore, students lose the benifits that they will get from learning this language. To be more specific, we will discuss two types of benifits which are cultural benifit and functional benifit which altogether have a base on two types of motivation.

In (table 5.23-B), the main-body paragraphs from Thakiah’s responses to the second and the third tasks are presented.

In the main-body paragraphs, second task, Thakiah begins by defining the cultural benefit, following Douglas Brown, as the customs, values, and ways of thinking, feeling, and acting. Using a quotation from him in which he argues that a more successful acquisition of language occurs from adopting the cultural perspective of the target language. This, she calls the integrative motivation. For her, the integrative motivation is the condition for getting the cultural benefit because it entails learning the language of the target community to integrate self with its culture. This, she argues based on the definition of motivation, will arouse the interest of students to get the cultural benefit. Another type of benefit is introduced by her, the functional benefit. It means the practical benefit which is learning English to get a job. This benefit is related to the instrumental motivation which is defined as the “desire to gain social recognition or economic advantages” from learning English. The lack of motivation entails the lack of interest (see the definition of motivation above). The lack of both will cause students’ failure in learning the language. Failure in learning the language entails not getting its functional benefit. Mill’s theory, unlike the second task, has been introduced in the main-body paragraphs and is used by Thakiah to argue for the morality of learning language because of its utility or benefit. The benefit obtained, Thakiah argues, can be measured in comparison with previous consequences. Another morality theory, Aristotle’s, is used to
judge the morality of learning English because of its benefit. Based on this theory, she deciphers that the presence of the problem as immoral as it obstructs cultural and educational development. The presence of the problem, she states, is due to three parties: the students, the teachers, and the curriculum. Teachers can be a cause for the lack of students' interest in learning English and the solution for this, she recommends based on Qadah's paper, lies in the adoption of a student-centred methodology. The students' absence and non-attentive attitude to English classes as well as the ignorance of the benefit of learning the language lead to the lack of interest. The solution, then, is to make them aware of the benefit using a saying by Prophet Mohammed (peace and prayer be upon him) that learning others' language save one from their evil. The curriculum also may cause the problem and the solution is to make it easy and interesting for students.

In the main-body paragraph, third task, Thakiah presents a similar argument. The difference between the two versions of the essay is that only Aristotle's view of morality is presented because Mill's has been used in the introductory paragraphs. The second difference is that she makes the solution of the problem the major responsibility of the teacher. Teacher can arouse interest in students and enlighten them on the value of learning the language. More references have been included to recommend activities to be used by the teacher to arouse students' interest. The curriculum should be designed effectively but in the end it is the teacher's responsibility to make it work for arousing students' interest. One last difference is to be mentioned here. The Hadith by Prophet Mohammed that enlightens students on the benefit of learning a foreign language has disappeared in this version of the essay.

(Table 5.23-B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student's main-body paragraphs (second task)</th>
<th>Student's main-body paragraphs (third task)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paragraph Two:</strong> With reference to cultural benefit, through my reading to the book “Teaching by Principles” which is written by “Douglass Brown,” he discussed</td>
<td><strong>Section Three:</strong> The previous two types of benefit are fulfilled by the presence of two kinds of motivation which are integrative and instrumental motivation respectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in his book the principle "the language-cultural connection," he said "whenever you teach a language, you also teach a complex system of cultural customs, values and ways of thinking, feeling and acting". He also said

"Especially in "second lg learning contexts the success with which learners adapt to a new cultural milieu will affect their language acquisition success and vice versa in some possibly significant way. From this perspective, however, lies in the interaction between cultural learning and language learning."

From my point of view if students get the cultural benefit they will be able to communicate with others and according to "Vashna Narang" in her book "Communicative language teaching" she said "linguistic is nothing but sociolinguistics." The success to get cultural benefit from learning English language will be succeeded by the presence of integrative motivation, which refers to learning the language of the target community in order to integrated into culture of that community, which arouses the interest of students to learn and get the

With reference to integrative motivation which refers to learning the language of the target community is the proper base for getting a cultural benefit as "Douglass Brown, 2001, 64" said in discussing the language-culture connection "whenever you teach a language, you also teach a complex system of cultural customs, values and ways of thinking, feeling and acting". Also he said in his book

"Especially in "second lg learning contexts the success with which learners adapt to a new cultural milieu will affect their language acquisition success and vice versa in some possibly significant way. From this perspective, however, lies in the interaction between cultural learning and language learning."

From my point of view if students get the cultural benefit they will be able to communicate with the others and this it will be fulfilled through communicative language teaching (CLT) which aims at promoting the learner's communicative competence, helping them fulfill their communicational needs and as "Vashna Warvarg, 68-1996) said "linguistic is nothing but sociolinguistics". The other
culture benefit. With reference to the functional benefit, which means the practical benefit, students can get this benefit if the success in learning this language because English is the language of many documents in the business and industrial sectors, especially those involve with international relation and it ensures a better job and position. This benefit comes from the instrumental motivation which refers to the desire to gain social recognition or economic advantages through the knowledge of this language. Therefore the lack of interest English classes is caused by the lack of motivation and these lead to make students fail in learning this language. Then they will lose the benefit that they will get from learning this language. Morally, according to Aristotle’s view of morality which focuses on growthing, for him “those things that help us to grow and flourish are good and those things that stifle or stunt our growth are bad,” so, because the presence of this problem obstructs the person’s social

| Kind of motivation is instrumental motivation which refers to the desire to gain social recognition or economic advantages through the knowledge of this language. This kind of motivation is a proper base for getting the functional benefit which means a practical benefit, through learning this lg, because English is the language of many documents in the business industrial sectors, especially those involve with international relation and it ensures a better job and position. Generally speaking, the lack of interest is caused by the lack of motivation which altogether lead to make students lose the benefit that they will get from learning this language. Morally, according to Aristotle’s view of morality which focuses on growthing for him “those things that help us to grow and flourish are good and those things that stifle or stunt our growth are bad,” so, because of the presence of this problem obstructs the person’s social and educational development and because the consequences of this problem make students fail to get the benefits that they will get from learning this lg, it is immoral. But before any attempts to generate motivation to be effective, we must follow some conditions (Dimitrios Thanasoulas, 3, at hotmail) which are as follows |
development and his education
developments, this problem is immoral
because this problem make students fail to
get the benefits that they will get of
learning this language.

**Paragraph Three:** the other reasons that
cause this problem, which is “the lack of
interest in English classes,” associated with
the reason of lack of motivation are
centered on three widening circles:
Teacher, students themselves, and
curriculum. I will begin with the teacher
who plays a main role to make his students
interest in the class. Through my reading of
a paper by Dr. Hamood Qadha about “what
makes a good English language teacher”,
he discussed in his paper the point that
might make students not interested in the
class or that might bring them to the point
of hating the class and the reason of this
occurs on the shoulder of teacher. He said
“In teacher-oriented classes students are
trained to depend on other people’s view.
They are not trained to use their own mind
and bring their point of view and
perception into operation. This might lead
students to hate the matter being taught
because they are always told how to look at
it”. Moraly because “teacher-oriented
class” make students hate class it is not
moral according Mill’s view of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a- appropriate teacher behavior and good teacher’s report. b- a pleasant and supportive classroom atmosphere. c- a cohesive learner group characterized by appropriate group norms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the previous conditions can be fulfilled by the teacher. Therefore the teacher is another reason and he is one of three wider circle, teacher, students themselves and curriculum that cause the above problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section Four:** The teacher who plays a
main role to make his students interested in
the class and who creates the motivation on
his students is the pivot of the discussion in
this part. Whatever is done by a teacher has
a motivational, formative, influence on
students. Through my reading of a paper by
Qadha about “what makes students not
interested in the class or that might bring
them to the point of hating the class and the
reason of this occurs on the shoulder of
teacher” He said

“In teacher-oriented classes students are trained
to depend on other people’s view. They are
not trained to use their own mind and bring their point
of view and perception
consequences he said “if people will suffer because of your action, that you shouldn’t do it”, and this example proves that the caring of consequences has a necessity and proves of falsing Kant’s view of uncaring of consequences. It is found according to Dr. Hamood the result of this study he said

“The finding of this study, however, suggest that through finding out conceived learner’s instructional preferences, and interests, students become self-confident and active contributors [. . . ]

And then he said from this perspective, teacher-education can become more student-centered [. . . ].”

Therefore, a directive role on teacher’s part can create effective learning opportunities even within a predominantly learner-centered classroom. Dr. Hammood also stated “what qualities does the English teacher need?” and if these qualities are available in a teacher in my view he exactly will teach his students in an interesting way makes his students like his class, some of these qualities are as follows: [. . . ]

After he stated all the qualities, he presented them to a group of teachers and students of three different colleges:

into operation. This might lead students to hate the matter being taught because they are always told how to look at it”.

Morally, because “teacher-oriented classes make students hate the class of English, so it is immoral according to Mill’s view of morality which cares of consequences. He said “If people will suffer because of your action, that you shouldn’t do it”, and this example proves that the caring of consequences has a necessity and proves on falsing of Kant’s view of uncaring with consequences. In the case the role of teacher is to establish a relationship of mutual trust and respect with the learners, by means of talking with them on a personal level. This mutual trust could lead to enthusiasm in learning (Dimitrios Thanasoulas, at hotmail.com). The result of the above study according to Dr. hammood, he said

“The finding of this study, however, suggest that through finding out conceived learner’s instructional preferences, and interests, students become self-confident and active contributors [. . . ]

And then he said from this perspective, teacher-
"Faculity of Education Zabid," "Faculity of Education Hodeidha," and "Faculity of Art" in order to express their opinions about these qualities. The results of this questionnaire reveal that high percentages of students and teachers alike regard the preparation and presentation of materials, planning a lesson, making it interesting and analyzing their needs to be most important in a good EFL teachers. It is clear that if these qualities that they get the high percentage are available in a teacher he can presented his class in an interesting and effective way. From this perspective, the teacher plays a main role in making his students interested and he needs to creat the right atmosphere in the classroom to overcome the students' reticence.

Paragraph Four: The second circle or pivot is the students themselves. The problem also occurs because of students themselves for the following reasons: 1) Many students do not pay attention to the class when the teacher teaches them. 2) Many students do not come regularly to English classes. They will miss the class and then they think that this language is education can become more student-centered [. . .].” Therefore a directive role on teacher’s part can Create effective learning opportunities even within a predominantly learner-centered classroom. Dr. Hammood also stated “what qualities does the teacher need? (Qadha, 2009, 6) and if these qualities are available in a teacher in my view he will teach his students in an interesting way. Morally, from this perspective, the teacher plays a main role in making his students interested, he needs to create the right atmosphere in the classroom to overcome the students’ reticence (Varshan Narang, 1996) and he takes the charge of this point. Once I read a maxim, it was said by Chani’s doctor, he said for his students “My job is not to teach you the subject, my job is to make you like the subject”. Through this maxim we can appeal the necessity role of teacher in making his students interested rather than becoming just a source of information. Teacher can be helped in making his students interested in the presence of a pleasant and supportive classroom atmosphere which can undermine learning and demotivate learners (see MacIntyre, 1999 and young 1999). On the other hand,
difficult to learn which make them loose interest to attend English classes. 3) Many students do not believe with the benefits that they get from learning this language. One of these benefits associated with cultural benefit and functional benefit. The Prophet Mohammed "peace and prayer be upon him" told us this benefit he said "learn the others' language to be safe from their evil". and this will be fulfilled because within the learning the others' language we learn their culture and how they think, then we will save their evil.

**Paragraph Five:** The third circle is curriculum which has an effect on making students interested in the class. The curriculum must be easy and interesting for students to like it. And the curriculum is a big issue and to discuss this issue with this problem we have to make specific research to talk about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>learner motivation will reach its peak in a safe classroom climate in which students can express their opinion and feel that they do not run the risk of being ridiculed (Dimitrios Thanasoulas, at hotmail.com)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section Five:</strong> Because the learners are the pivot in which we discuss this problem for the sake of them, they are the reason that cause this problem. Therefore the exist of this problem occurs on the shoulder of students themselves who are the second pivot of wider circle for the following reasons: 1) Many students do not pay attention in the class when teacher teaches them. 2) Many students do not come in English classes regularly, many lessons miss them and then they think this language is difficult to be learnt and makes them not interested in English classes. The solution for the two previous problems occur on the hand of teacher through the following points: 1) by making learning fun and any motivation problems that may appear should be ascribed to his attempt to convert on enjoyable activity to drudgery. 2- Maintaining and protecting motivation. 3- Encouraging positive self-evaluation because students need both ample opportunities to learn and steady encouragement and support of their learning efforts. Morally, in my view</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
because teacher has a big deal in affecting on his students, so he will take the charge of making his students interested. Students have little responsibility in making themselves interested.

**Section Six:** Curriculum has an effect on making students interested in the class. Curriculum is a public statement which explains and justifies what a school does (ML. Tickoo, 2003, 233). There are seven steps put by (ML. Tickoo) we should make them in our mind in designe curriculum, they are as follows:


Through these seven steps we can design an effective curriculum which make students interested in but the blame does not occur only on the curriculum which may be effective but the teacher couldn’t introduce it in an effecting way. Therefore the teacher is responsible for making students interested in curriculum.
In the concluding paragraph to the second task (table 5.24-C), Thakiah states that the solution of the problem is in the hands of students, teachers, and the curriculum.

In the concluding paragraph to the third task, Thakiah concludes that the solution of the problem is dealing with its reasons: the students, the teachers, and the curriculum.

(Table 5.24-C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student's concluding paragraph(s) (second task)</th>
<th>Student's concluding paragraph(s) (third task)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph Six: Finally, for any problem there is a solution if we deal with it more important and the solution as I have already said occurs on the shoulder of teacher, students, and curriculum.</td>
<td>Section seven: Finally, for any problem, there is a solution if we deal with this problem with more important and the solutions of this problem exist on its reasons which are motivation, teacher, students and curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2.4.1 Interpreting the nature of the criteria

As is the case in the above three cases, this sub-part consists of three main parts each involves the researcher's examination of the dialogicality of the three criteria.

5.2.2.4.1.1 Responsivity

As there have been no major differences between the two essays, the researcher is going to deal with them in her interpretation of responsivity as one response. Thakiah has attempted in both the essays to use the morality theories (Mill's and Aristotle's) as tools to evaluate the moral dimension of the problem of the lack of interest in learning English language. As she deals with the lack of motivation as detrimental to the types of benefit introduced by her, this has led her to think of the two theories from a new angle, the benefit. She has re-contextualized the two theories as both advocating two types of benefit: the instrumental and the educational and the social ones. This classification of the
theories by her is not without a cause. Development and utility are both benefits. Unlike Abdullah above, she does not associate Mill’s view with instrumental motivation and Aristotle’s with integrative motivation. Rather, she has associated Mill’s with usefulness in general working on Mill’s own dictum: “you should [weigh] the morality of an action in terms of utility or usefulness”. Aristotle’s view: “those things that help us grow and flourish are good and those things that stifle or stunt our growth are bad” has been associated with a special type of benefit: the social and the educational. This, the researcher argues, comes from Aristotle’s emphasis on social relationships and education as aspects of growth. Thakiah has decentralized herself from her first understanding of the two views, one advocating it as happy consequences and the other advocating it as growth, into a new understanding which classifies both under the umbrella of benefit. The new context in which she puts the theories as tools for use (the context of benefit as moral and loosing it as immoral), helps her decentralize from her first interpretation into a new one. Thus, her responsivity can be judged of being dialogic as she has reflected active understanding of her own purpose. She uses others’ tools (the two theories of morality) in a new context considering their main purpose as morality theories.

5.2.2.4.1.2 Intersubjectivity

Her interaction with morality thinkers and those of her field reflects an attempt on her side to democratically coordinate the opinions of the moral theorists with those of the ELE theorists. The two parties are seen as independent discourses whose original purposes are respected. That is, the morality theories are used for the purpose of measuring morality and the ELE theorists discourse is used to provide thoughts, definitions, and techniques which are used to solve the problem of the lack of interest. They both contribute into each other’s new interpretation; the ELE problem of the lack of interest is seen as immoral, and the two morality theories previously seen as isolated from each other now are grouped under a new idea, benefit as moral. These two parties (the ELE theorists and the morality theorists, having two distinct discourses, are coordinated with the student’s own discourse whose purpose is to argue for advocating the lack of interest in learning English as immoral and advocating the learning of English as being
moral by solving the problems obstructing it using the ELE field recommendations. Thus, it can be said that Thakiah’s intersubjectivity is dialogic.

5.2.2.4.1.3 Situatedness

At a broad level in the second task her position as a Muslim has manifested in her use of a saying by Prophet Mohammed (Peace and Prayer by upon him) which advocates a cultural benefit of learning a foreign language/language of the others to save self from evil. Her position supports the position of the theorists for advocating the benefit as moral. These two positions, thus, are seen as supportive for each other. This position is an extension of her opinion in the second draft of the first task in which she advocates the integration of Islamic view of morality with the theorists’. The difference, however, is that instead of suppressing the morality theorists’ view to the dominance of the Islamic perspective (her suggestion in the second draft of the first task), now both are seen as advocating the same thing with no claim for predominance. Consequently, her broad perspective situatedness can be judged as dialogic.

At the narrow level (field), her field understanding has been expanded by the use of tools from another field (Philosophy); see the interpretation of intersubjectivity and responsivity above. Therefore, situatedness has reached dialogicality.

5.2.2.4.2 The role of the audience with reference to dialogicality

The difference captured in both the essays may be attributed to Thakiah’s awareness of her audience. In her second task essay which is supposed to target Yemeni audience whose main religion is Islam, she includes a Hadith by Prophet Mohammed (Peace and Prayer be upon him) that explains the benefit of learning a foreign language. This Hadith is no more used in the third task essay which targets audience in “countries in which English is taught as a second or foreign language”; and for whom Islam might not be the main religion. As the Islamic position of the student is seen in dialogic situatedness with the theorists’ position, one might also predict that the effect of the local audience has positively affected dialogicality.
The other differences captured in the third task essay, the inclusion of more quotations from the ELE theorists'; and making the solution of the problem of the lack of interest the main responsibility of the teacher which has not been clearly stated in the second task essay but is made clear in the third task essay, may be due to the student's awareness that she will address a wider, varied, and probably more informed audience. The inclusion of more quotations from ELE theorists has enhanced dialogicality. For example, the quotations from Macintyre and Young about the importance of classroom atmosphere and activities in invoking students' interest have added rigour to Thakiah's dialogic attempt to use the two discourses (those of the ELE theorists and those of the morality theorists). Thus, situated dialogicality captured in both the essays has been enhanced in the third task essay due to the role of the audience as the other.

5.2.2.4.3 The scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue

The discourse has been dialogic. The cultural/Islamic position of the student has been in dialogue with the morality theorists as it has been seen in the second task essay. Though this dialogic attempt has not occurred in the third task essay (maybe due to the effect of the audience), it can be argued that there is a cultural development in the student's position expressed in the second draft of the first task. Her Islamic position, expressed in the second draft of the first task, has dialogically evolved in the second task essay. This has resulted in her Islamic position stand side by side with the theorists'; see interpretation of intersubjectivity and responsivity). This can be considered as development in her cultural position. Now it is seen as having a position equal to the other rather than subverting it.

With regard to the intercultural dialogue, it can be said that it has occurred at both the levels (the broad and the narrow); see the interpretation of situatedness.

To conclude, one may state that there is a possibility of the occurrence of cultural development and intercultural dialogue in Thakiah's future discourse.

5.2.2.5 Student no. 5 (Ameera)

In the introductory paragraphs in the second task (see the left column in table 5.25-A below), Ameera, in the first paragraph, provides a brief introduction about why
English is an international language. Some reasons are given such as its being the official language in many countries like India and Singapore; and giving it priority in the teaching programs in over 100 countries in which it is taught as a foreign or second language. In the second paragraph, she, following Harmer (n.d.), presents a list of reasons for learning English among which is learning for advancement. This may be to get better jobs or to know another culture to compare it with one's culture.

In the first section in the third task (see the right column in table 8-5A below), she provides a similar introduction about English as a global language. Beside the reasons for the globalization of English mentioned above, she adds one extra reason. It is that it has a majority of native speakers; and immigrants to its countries need to use it in many ways. In the second paragraph, she gives two reasons for learning English; learning it as a school subject and for advancement. She specifies advancement as a cultural one because learning cultural elements is now given importance in English learning and because language is inseparable from its cultural content. In the third paragraph, she states the main ideas of her essay: to introduce Yemeni learners' reasons for learning English; relate them with Aristotle's morality theory; and to find solutions for this problem (Ameera has not specified what the problem is in her introductory paragraphs).

(Table 5.25-A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student's introductory paragraph(s) (second task)</th>
<th>Student's introductory paragraph(s) (third task)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paragraph One:</strong> A language may become a global language when it becomes an international language. There are two ways in which English has become a global language. First, there are many countries in which English has been the official language and it dominates the domains of government, the law court, the media, and the education system. In which countries English may be described as the second</td>
<td><strong>Section One. Paragraph One:</strong> A language may become a global language when it becomes an international language. There are three ways in which English has become a global language. First, it has the majority of native speakers and the immigrants to the majority to these countries have to use English in many formal domains e.g: English for an English-man. Second, there are many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
language as English compliments a person’s MT. They are countries like India, Singapore and Nigeria. Second, English has been made a priority in many countries in their foreign language teaching programs, though it may have no official states. This is the language that children are taught in school. English as a foreign language (FL) is now being taught in over 100 countries such as China, Russia, Germany, Spain, Egypt, Brazil, and Yemen. (Bakshi, R. N. (2003) p. 85)

**Paragraph Two:** People who wish to learn a foreign language may have anyone of a great number of reasons for doing so. If we take English as an example, we can make an endless list of these reasons. It will not, of course, be complete, but at least show the great variety of both the needs and desires of students to learn English. Here is my personal list. I gathered from different sources: (a) Knowing and working the target language community [...]. (b) Learning ESP (English for Specific Purpose) [...]. (c) Learning it as a subject in school curriculum [...]. (d) Setting to the target culture [...]. (e) Learning it for Advancement: Some people want to study English because they think it offers, in some general way, a chance for advancement in their daily lives. It is countries in which English has been the official language and it dominates the domains of government, the law court, the media, and the education system. In which countries English may be described as the second language as English compliments a person’s MT. They are countries like India, Singapore and Nigeria. Third, English teaching programs, though it may have no official states. This is the language that children are taught in school. English as a foreign language (FL) is now being taught in over 100 countries such as China, Russia, Germany, Spain, Egypt, Brazil, and Yemen . . . etc. (Bakshi, R. N. (2003) p. 85)

**Paragraph Two:** So, there are many reasons to learn English language by the students as a foreign or second language such as learning English language as a subject in school curriculum, as well as learning English language for advancement . . . etc. in this research, I will discuss the one of the reasons for learning English for advancement especially culture advancement as a development. Cultural elements began to be considered as an important aspect of learning English language. Language does not exist in a vacuum, so language learners should be aware of the content in which the target
possible that a good knowledge of a foreign language will help you to get a better job than, if you only know your native language. Also, some people who learn English language to have another language and culture and make a comparison with a native language. He/ She tries to, through it, to develop or improve our culture in our society. (Harmer. J. (?) – p 1 & 2)

Paragraph Three: In this research, I will discuss my interview with some secondary students school, about their reasons for learning English language, and what the relationship between the results of this interview with Aristotle’s theory of Morality. In shaa Allah, I will try to bring some solution for my problem.

In the main-body paragraphs (see left column in table 5.26-B below), Ameera defines the key word “advancement” in the main aim “learning English for advancement” as “forward movement, progress in something, and developing or being developed”. She adds that there are many aspects for advancement; the physical or material, the cultural, and the educational or intellectual. She argues that the reasons mentioned for learning English are in fact goals either long-term or short-term ones. The preference is for the long-term ones as they make students’ education an easy job. However, she mentions that some factors inside and outside the classroom affect students’ motivation and may obstruct the achievement of students’ goals. The goals for advancement can be getting a job, interacting with speakers of the language, and understanding the target language’s people and their ways of thinking. A claim by Ameera follows that learning for advancement or development is better than other reasons as it enhances intrinsic motivation as well as individual’s contribution to his/her country. Ameera interviews a number of secondary school students (males and females) to explore their reasons for learning English. She discovers that learning English for advancement is not among students’ reasons for learning English. She explains further the meaning of advancement as comparing cultures and developing national thought. In an attempt to use Aristotle’s view of morality, she divides the theory into two parts: the factors/aspects of development and the idea of achieving what one wants to be. The first part is used to address the idea that physical and social factors for development are absent from the
educational milieu of the students. This implies that there is no advancement. Using the second part of Aristotle's theory, she argues that the above factors may be regarded as instrumental motivation. The real factor for advancement is one's willingness to grow and develop. Based on this argument, she claims that the solution for the problem of the absence of the goals for advancement is to have intentionality derived from long-term goals. These will bring about intrinsic motivation. Intentional learning for self and society development is the key for learning English for advancement. Beside intentionality, some other practical solutions are provided by her for improving the quality of educational experience.

In the main-body paragraphs in the third task (see the right column in table 5. 26-B below), the reasons for learning English mentioned in the introductory paragraphs in the second task are reproduced: knowing and working in the target community, learning English for specific purposes, learning it as a school subject, and learning it for advancement. She, then, as in the second task essay defines the word advancement. She, in addition defines the term ELD (English Language Development) which is mistakenly seen by her as relevant to the context or her argument. Three aspects of advancement she mentions again: the physical or the material, the cultural, and the intellectual or educational. She allots a whole section for explaining cultural advancement which she considers as very important. This is conditioned by individual advancement which in turn will lead to cultural advancement. Two examples of these individual-cultural advancements are given: working abroad and achieving better understanding of the target culture and its ways of thinking. One whole section is allotted to argue for the interrelation between language and culture. Moreover, the benefits from studying culture through language are listed. These reasons support her argument that knowing the target culture makes language learning meaningful. It arouses interest and motivation for knowing the target community. The following sections give an account of her study of the schools students' reasons for studying English, the absence of the goal for advancement from the students' agenda, and her argument that students' agenda for learning English is meaningless with the absence of the goals for knowing the target culture's ways of thinking. Another section follows in which she, as is the case above, uses Aristotle's view of morality to talk about growth and development as something to
be sought after in learning English. The two types of growth mentioned by Aristotle, she argues, are absent from students’ educational environment and are negatively affecting students’ extrinsic motivation for growth. The theory, she writes, makes one’s intentionality a major factor for growth. This leaves students with no excuse as they need to develop a sense of responsibility to choose what to focus on for their growth. Similar to her attempt to solve the problem of the lack of the reason of advancement through intentionality above, she, in this essay, connects intentionality to self-society goals of development. This connection, she argues, beside practical changes in classroom methodology and school provision of the right atmosphere for study will solve the problem.

(Table 5.26-B)

| Paragraph Three: Here, I will focus on one of the reasons learning English language which is “learning English language for Advancement” The word “Advancement” means forward movement, progress in something, and developing or being developed. For example, towards the border, advances in computer technology. There are many aspects of advancement such as physical/material, cultural, and education/intellectual . . . etc. These aspects of advancement can be at the individual level and at the social level. | Section 2-1. Paragraph One: People who wish to learn a foreign language may have anyone of a great number of reasons for doing so. Here is my person list, I gathered from different resources: (a) Knowing and working the target language community [. . .]. (b) Learning ESP (English for Specific Purpose) [. . .]. (c) Learning it as a subject in school curriculum [. . .]. (d) Setting to the target culture [. . .]. (e) Learning it for Advancement: Some people want to study English because they think it offers, in some general way, a chance for advancement in their daily lives. It is possible that a good knowledge of a foreign language will help you to get a better job than, if you only know your native |
motivated to some goals they wish to reach. There are two types of goals: short-term goals might have such things as the urge to pass an end-of-term or end-of-semester exam or complete a unit successfully. Long-term goals might have something to do with a student’s wish to get a better job or become a member of the target language community. Teacher will find a strongly motivated student with a long-term goal easier to teach than a student who has to study the language because it is on the curriculum and who does not have such goals.

**Paragraph Five:** There are some factors that may help students achieve their goals. These factors may affect the student’s motivations (extrinsic/intrinsic motivation) that consider the important thing to achieve the goal. Some factors may be there inside the class: 1. Physical condition: [...]. 2. Method: [...]. 3. Teacher: [...]. 4. Success: [...].

**Paragraph Six:** Some factors may be there outside of the class: A student’s attitude will be strongly influenced by those around him. Indeed any member of the community in which the student lives may effect his/her attitude to the target language. For example, a young student’s parents are very much against the culture of language. As well as, some people who learn English language to have another language and culture and make a comparison with a native language. He/She tries to, through it, to develop or improve our culture in our society. (Harmer. J. (? – p 1 & 2)

**Section 2-1.1. Paragraph One:** From the above, I will focus on one of the reasons learning English language which is “learning English language for Advancement” The word “Advancement” means forward movement, progress in something, and developing or being developed. For example, towards the border, advances in computer technology. ELD “English Language Development” is the systematic use of instrumental strategies to promote the acquisition of English by students whose primary language is not English. ELD strategies support this learning method, enabling students to acquire English language in a manner similar to the way they learned their native language, naturally and through regular interaction with others who already know the language. (Spillett . A, (?), p.6)

There are many aspects of advancement such as physical/material, cultural, and education/intellectual...etc. These aspects of advancement can be at the individual
the target community. It is possible that this will negatively affect on the student’s attitude. Conversely, a positive attitude on the part of the parent might have a very positive effect. Also, if the students’ friends are all studying the language and if this seems a prestigious thing to do, the student may be favourably disposed towards that language. The other major factor that will influence the student’s attitude will be (especially adult learners) his/her previous experiences as a student. If the student members being humiliated by a lack of success as a learner he will find his extrinsic motivation negatively effected. 

Previous success, of course, will have the opposite effect. The teacher’s a treatment of the student will also effect the student’s motivation and attitude where it either reinforces or undermines previous learning experience. For example, the teacher experience was unhappy will be doing a grave disservice to that student, but a teacher who is able to encourage a previously unsuccessful student will be helping that students motivation and attitude.

Paragraph Seven: In this paragraph, I will deal with the concept of advancement, previously discussed on page.2, as development. In this section, I will tackle

level and at the social level.

Section 2.1.2. Paragraph One: In this section, I will mention the important aspect of advancement for learning English which is cultural advancement. I will give some individual advancements which lead to cultural advancement from learning English language: (1) Learning English language gives you the ability to do business abroad and in other countries and in areas that previously were not able to access them. [. . .]. This, I believe, can lead to personal, individual advancements contribute in to the development of societies and growth of cultures. (2) Learning English will help you learn this language to communicate with another who speak English language, and to get better understanding of their culture and the way of their thinking.

Section 2.1.3. Paragraph One: there are many linguists who deal with the relation between English language and culture, such as, Sapir, Whorf . . etc. Sapir (1921) argued that ‘language, race, and culture are necessarily correlated’, adding the remark ‘language and our -thought- grooves are inextricably interrelated, are, in a sense, one and the same. So, Kitao (2000) giving references to several authors lists some of the benefits of teaching culture as follows:
this concept as a develop, life-language process that continues as far as one grows. There are some students who use English language as a tool to achieve their purposes: (1) English language is the language of business [...]. (2) Learning English language will help you learn this language to communicate with another who speak English language. Also, it will give you a better understanding of their culture and way of thinking. [...].

**Paragraph Eight:** From the above, I conclude that advancement as development is for better reason for studying English as a foreign language by students in my country. This is, I believe, can enhance intrinsic motivation in students and therefore its cultural value on the effectiveness of individuals contributions for their countries must be better. To investigate my ideas, I went to schools of (males & females) and melt secondary school students who are about 80 students, and I interviewed them about what the reasons for learning English language? A few of them focused on profession. Some of them thought to have another language and culture to communition. A considerable number of students said, they learn English as only a subject in the school curriculum, to grow their skills, it is entering to a lot of fields.

- Studying culture gives students a reason to study the target language as well as rendering the study of L2 meaningful (Stainer, 1971)
- It will help learners relate the abstract sounds and forms of a language to real people and places (Chastain, 1971).
- The study of culture increases learners’ not only curiosity about and interest in target countries but also their motivation. [...].
- Studying culture gives learner a liking for the native speakers of the target language. [...]

**Section 2.1.4. Paragraph One:** To investigate my ideas that cultural advancement or development is a better reason for studying English language as a foreign or second language. I went to schools of (males & females) and melt secondary school students who are about 80 students, and I interviewed them about what the reasons for learning English language? A few of them focused on profession. Some of them taught to have another language and culture to communition. A considerable number of students said, they learn English as only a subject in the school curriculum, to grow their skills, it is
entering to a lot of fields, and to get a better future, from this interview, I feel that there is a problem in thinking of students. Some of them think to have other language and culture, but they do not think about advancement as personal/cultural development that may be in this language. For example, learning language for sake might lead students to discover new things in that language. He/She will be able to develop our social or thoughts through it. He/She makes comparison between our culture with target culture through this language. They will sense that English language may help them to have a better future and plan for their future.

**Paragraph Nine:** According to Aristotle’s theory of morality which focused on the consequences and growth. Aristotle’s concept of growth includes two factors which are physical and social factors. They are necessary for human development. If these factors help us to grow are good, if these factors stifle our growth or development are bad. This problem from which some students are suffering because, the factors that help them grow or develop or even think in development do not exist. Physical factors which do not find in daily life, for the student. For example, the student goes to school in the same time, he and to get a better future. From this interview, I feel that there is a problem in thinking of students. Some of them think to have other language and culture, but they do not think about advancement as personal/cultural development that may be in this language. Through, learning English language which may lead the student to discover new things in that language, He/she will be able to develop his/her social or thoughts through it. Or, he/she makes comparison between his/her culture with target culture through this language. They will sense that English language may help them to have a better future and plan for their future. People involved in language teaching have again begun to understand the intertwined relation between culture and language (Puvernness, 2003). So, for L2 students, language study seems senseless if they know nothing about the people who speak the target language or the country in which the target language is spoken.

**Section 3. Paragraph One:** According to Aristotle’s theory of morality which focused on the consequences and growth. Aristotle’s concept of growth includes two factors which are physical and social factors. They are necessary for human development. If these factors help us to
thinks in his family and how he will do to get money to find a good food for his family. Or, he thinks in study the language only to get a better job to get from it money to live a better life. In the other side, social factors which are also do not available in some students’ lives. These students belong to families which have some problems. These cause collapse of social relationships. In addition, there is not extremely good education environment for students of school or educational aids which make the studying of English more attractive so the growth of students will occur. Therefore, how he will develop thinking on the development or advancement without these factors. This, I call an instrumental motivation. This is different from intrinsic motivation (refer back to p.3). Instrumental motivation leads to achieving short-term goals (cf. p.2) while intrinsic motivations help achieving long-term goals. Aristotle proposes ‘see what kind of person you want to be. He adds that one can choose from his life-time goals and use English language to achieve these goals in the most effective way.

Paragraphs Ten and Eleven: [. . .]. Paragraph Twelve: I will try to give some solutions for this problem that may be useful for some students. I feel that the grow are good, if these factors stifle our growth or development are bad. This problem from which some students are suffering because, the factors that help them grow or develop or even think in development do not exist. Physical factors which do not find in daily life of some students in the world. Some students, which study English language, go to school in the same time they thinks in their family and how they will do or work to get money to find a good food for their family. Also, They think in study the language only to get a better job to get from it money to live a better life in their society. This is because, the economy situation that many families are suffering from it in the world. On the other side, social factors which are also do not available in some students’ lives. These students belong to families which have some problems which cause collapse of social relationships. For example, [Arabic word for revenge] which happen between two families or two [Arabic word for tribes], and [Arabic word for war] that may happen especially which happen in this age. In addition for previous, there is not extremely good education environment for some students of school or educational aids which make the studying English language more attractive, so the
solution is in the intention. Students' intention rests in his/her goals. Students' goals for learning English language must belong to the long-term class of goals. As I previously illustrated these can exist through intrinsic motivation which I, here, call intention. Student's intentional learning should related to both their profession, society and their own self-development goal. Teachers play an important role in learning condition in students. Teachers should be, firstly, educated well and should do hardly as he/she can to contact the information to the student. School and teachers try to available good visual aids that may help students to get desirement to learn English language also, to be develop and using it in their real life. Every class should not be more than 20 students. These solutions may help students to think to develop on English language.

growth of students will occur. Therefore, how he will develop in his moral or growth and how he will think in a cultural development without these factors. Aristotle adds in his theory of Morality that one can choose and see what of kind person you want to be. And one can choose from his life actions and conditions that can lead to growth. This put a lot of responsibility on learners who should know their life-time goals and use English language to achieve these goals in the most effective way. They must not care by these factors and they mustn't make it effect in their special motivation and not make these factors as justifications for theirselves.

Section 4. Paragraph One: I will try to give some solutions for this problem that may be useful for some students. I feel, first, that the solution is in the intention. Students' intention rests in his/her goals. Students' goals for learning English must belong to the long-term class of goals. Students' intentional learning should related to both their profession, society and their own self-development goal. Second, the solution is in the teacher. Teachers play an important role in learning condition in students. Teacher should have a particular morals because he/she is an image for her/his students. They must be respectful,
honest, faithful, clean, and organized in their acting and speech. Also, they must be educated well and hardly as they can to contact the information to their students by using a good visual aids and more challenging activities and using it in their real life. These ways may help students in anywhere to get desirement to learn English language and to know the culture of the people and the countries which EL is spoken it. According to the school, every class should not be more than 20 students. These solution may help some students to develop or grow in their morals and thinkings.

In the concluding paragraphs in the second task (see the left column in table 5.27-C below), she states that because English language is an international language, reasons for studying it varies. Learning it for advancement is a valuable one. In the remaining part of her concluding paragraphs she provides a full-fledged summary of the whole essay.

In the concluding paragraphs in the third task (see the right column in table 5.27-C below), she confirms learning English for advancement is a better reason than the students' reasons. She recommends that every student should have long-term goals for learning English. She winds up the essay by saying that the solutions provided by her help the growth of students' morality and this in turn will achieve their specific goals.

(Table 5.27-C)

| Student's concluding paragraphs (second task) | Student's concluding paragraphs (third task) |
Paragraph Thirteen: In the end of my research, I conclude that English language is an international language. It is very useful in many fields and makes students more open. Therefore, students have different reasons for learning language. Yemeni students study English language to get jobs, as a subject of school curriculum, or for communication. These can also get advancement in their lives, because of it. Every person should have goals to achieve them. I discovered that there are two kinds of goals: the short-term goals and the long-term goals. From these goals, some students who have a long-term goals will teach English easier that the students who have to study the language because it's on the curriculum and who do not have such goals. [. . .].

Paragraph Fifteen: I have made interview with some students from secondary classes (males, females) and conclude that they have some reasons for their learning English language. But most of them do not think in development or advancement that may lead to improvement in a moral sense. [. . .]

Section Five: The summary of this research, I conclude that there are many reasons for learning English, but this research focused on one reason which, I think, is a better reason for learning EL. The reason is learning English for cultural advancement. [. . .]. As I mentioned pervious, that any student has a good goals, which must belong to the long-term class of goals, and a good intention for learning English language he must care or effect by the factors. In the end, I tried to present some solutions which may help some students to grow or develop on their morality and to achieve their special goals.

5.2.2.5.1 Interpreting the nature of the criteria

As Ameera’s main argument in both the essays for both the tasks is almost the same, the researcher sees them as one response. This entails giving references and quotations from both the essays. This part will also be divided in three sub-parts as is the case in the four cases above.
5.2.2.5.1.1 Responsivity

Ameera's responsivity that she develops in both the essays is rooted in her moral conviction that ensues from Aristotle's view of morality as development as well as her cultural/Islamic conviction. Tracing her moral conviction back to the second draft of the first task, the researcher quotes the seventh paragraph from the right column in table (5-4) above. It says:

For me, I am mosilim [sic], the good moral is all Islamic. Good morals result from strong Islam. Moslim [sic] should be moral and bolite [sic] with his God, prophet “Mohammed”, parents, and all people either moslims [sic] or non moslim [sic]. Either moral is a happit [sic] or convincing [sic], it also may [sic] improved or acquired, just if there is an intension [sic] for that.

From the above quotation, it is clear that her Islamic moral convictions condition the development of morality with intentionality. The researcher traces this Islamic conviction of the student to one Islamic rule presented in one of the seminal books of Islamic Shariah: Saheehul Bukhari, Volume number one. The book opens with a Hadith by Prophet Mohammed which says: “Acceptance of deeds by God is based on one’s intentionality”. Therefore, good intentionality must be the drive for all deeds in Islamic tradition. This is prescribed in the school curriculum and is taught to students as part of their Islamic studies syllabus. This Islamic rule must have been assimilated by Ameera in her understanding of Aristotle's freedom of choice to drive one's moral development. The choice of the moral action, she believes, is restricted by good intentionality. The question is how she has connected intentionality with development. For her, development or advancement is a moral one. This can be seen from the last sentence in section seven (see the right column in table 5.27-C above) in which she restates her main purpose of the essay for the second task. It reads:

In the end, I tried to present some solutions which may help some students to grow or develop on their morality and to achieve their special goals.
The above quotation shows that the development meant by her in the two essays is a moral one and is related to students’ “special goals”. In the two essays as she attempts to come up with a solution for the absence of the reason of learning English for advancement from Yemeni students’ agenda, she writes:

I feel, first, that the solution is in the intention. Students’ intention rests in his/her [sic] goals. Students’ goals for learning English must belong to the long-term class of goals. Students’ intentional learning should [sic] related to both their profession, society and their own self-development goal.

From the quotation above it is clear how she connects intentionality to development. Another question is due here; how does she connect intentionality to Aristotle’s view of morality? The answer may be the following. Among the three theories of morality, only Aristotle’s looks at morality as development. Development for Aristotle is conditioned by what one wants to become, thus one’s goals. Connecting all the above quotations, it is clear that her response is based on both Islamic convictions and interpretation of Aristotle’s theory.

One may also ask why she has not found Aristotle’s theory sufficient to connect between moral development and goals. The answer comes from Ameera’s judgment on Aristotle’s theory as focusing on material usefulness (see Ameera’s comment on Aristotle’s theory from the sixth paragraph in the second draft for the first task, the right column table 5.8 above). She may want to inject this theory with morality in her religious belief which is necessarily intentional as seen from the quotation above.

Another question is “Why does individual development should necessarily lead to cultural development?” This can be related to her view of morality. If one gets back to her own conceptualization of morality (see the right column’s opening paragraph table 5.8 above), one will find the sentences in which she attempts to define morality:

The behaviour is a group of movements and external and [sic] feeling [sic] expressions through which the person tries to achieve agreement between himself [sic] and the society in which he lives.
The above sentence shows clearly that morality for her is something that relate individual to society. From here comes the arbitrary relation she conceives between individual and society for moral development.

Therefore, in relation to the responsivity in the essays, the researcher finds that there is a serious attempt on Ameera’s side to come up with a new idea of moral advancement as the reason for learning English. Moral advancement is an individual development that is related to one’s intentionality to develop self and society through learning the target culture and comparing it to one’s culture for the purpose of improving one’s cultural ways of thinking. In the literature of the reasons for learning English by Harmer in her essay, advancement is an acknowledged reason for learning English. It is called cultural advancement. Building on the legacy of Aristotle, she calls it moral advancement. She develops the idea of moral/individual advancement leading to cultural advancement in her essay. To conclude, her responsivity is dialogic because of the presence of active understanding of the topic of learning English for advancement in the context of moral advancement. There is an internally persuasive discourse emerging in the essays as the student attempts to use discourses of others (discourse of her field, discourse of Aristotle, and her own Islamic discourse) to argue for her idea of moral advancement as “a better reason” for learning English.

5.2.2.5.1.2 Intersubjectivity

In the interaction between Ameera’s discourse and the other discourses, it is clear that she attempts to coordinate her opinion and those of the others. Aristotle, to begin with, she divides his view of morality into two parts: one part talks about the factors of growth and the other talks about morality as growth to what one wants to be. Ameera has not divided the theory in this way in her previous accounts of it. It seems that because now she has a different purpose, i.e. using the theory to argue for a case for a moral development as a reason for learning English language that is beyond material factors. Following Aristotle, she states that physical and social factors are important for development. Considering the absence of these factors from many Yemeni students’ educational atmosphere, she asks a rhetorical question: how will they develop with the all
the factors not available? She answers her question using the second part of the theory. One should choose actions and conditions that make him/her achieve life-time goals. She comments that such action puts a lot of responsibility on the students in terms of identifying life-goals and creating the conditions for their achievement. So, the original theory’s purpose is kept intact while using it for a new purpose through interpreting it differently.

In addition, in Ameera’s attempt to use the literature for her purpose, she, in the third task essay, develops her idea of advancement to mean an individual-cultural one. Through this modification of her idea, she has been able to make use of the literature on learning English for cultural development as well as that on language-culture interaction. The literature itself will be widened through her idea of relating individual advancement to cultural advancement.

Thus, the intersubjectivity is to be judged as dialogic as there is a coordination of all parties’ point of views in a new context of the student’s idea.

5.2.2.5.1.3 Situatedness

Comparing Ameera’s position in the second draft of the first task with her position in the second and the third tasks essays, it may be predicted that the development of morality is conditioned by her own cultural/Islamic position in all the essays. However, the researcher observes a growth in this view due to the interaction between Ameera’s Islamic position and that of Aristotle. Intentionality is the base for development in her and in Aristotle’s perspective. However, in the last two tasks, she varnishes her Islamic position with that of Aristotle. Intentionality is a matter of choice. Besides, there has been a growth of this adopted position from the ELE literature. Intention, being a choice-based one, must be directed by one’s life-time goals. In this way, all the three positions, Ameera’s Islamic perspective, Aristotle’s perspective, and the ELE perspective have grown into a state of outsideness or dialogic situatedness.

5.2.2.5.2 The role of the audience with reference to dialogicality

Though the researcher has not detected major changes between the two tasks essays (i.e. the second and the third), she has found, like other students, that Ameera has
included more ELE references in the third task essay. This has enhanced her argument for the necessity of the other (the audience of other cultures) to develop and support one’s views. She has also emphasized the communication between cultures to be the drive for advancement in the same task. Thus, the idea of cultural interaction as the base for moral development in learning English is also created. In conclusion, it can be said that the role of the other has enhanced dialogic interactivity between self and the other and provided a source for new idea creation.

5.2.2.5.3 The scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue

The two cultural positions, that of the student and that of Aristotle, have undergone growth in perspective in Ameera’a mind. The two fields (Philosophy and ELE) also have undergone expansion: the intentionality in Aristotle’s is to be based on long-term goals from the ELE literature. The above growth follows intercultural dialogue between Ameera’s Islamic perspective and that of Aristotle as well as between the field of philosophy and that of ELE. Thus, it may be said that there is a scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue in Ameera’s future discourse.

5.2.2.6 Conclusion of the findings of the second and the third tasks

In both the tables below the signs tick and cross are used to present dialogicality and non-dialogicality respectively. The plus put to the left of the tick sign means enhanced dialogicality and the word “non-transcendental” means that the dialogicality of/at one discourse/level does not transcend to another discourse/level; from narrow culture to the broad culture or/and vice versa.

In table 5.28 below, the nature of the criteria via dialogicality is presented task-wise. All the students’ discourses except one (Mayasah’s) are dialogic in the third task and in the case of Abdullah it is characterised by enhanced dialogicality (see the section on Abdullah’s intersubjectivity in the analysis of tasks two and three). Even Mayasah’s intersubjective discourse, though has not transcended from the discourse between her and the Philosophy theorists to the discourse with the ELE theorists (see the analysis of Mayasah’s intersubjectivity in the second and third tasks), has reached a stage of a non-transcendental dialogic intersubjectivity. In the second task, three out of the five students have achieved dialogicality in their discourses as far as the criteria of responsivity and intersubjectivity are concerned. With reference to the criterion of outsideness/dialogic situatedness, it has been achieved in the case of
two students (Thakiah and Ameera) but not in the case of two other students (Abdullah and Mayasah). In the case of Asma’a, it has been achieved at the narrow level but not at the broad level. On the other hand in the third task the same criterion (i.e. outsideness) has been achieved at both the levels in all the students’ discourses except two, Abdullah and Mayasah. In the case of Abdullah, it has been achieved at the narrow level while in the case of Mayasah there is no progress at all. From the description it can be concluded that the more students use the criteria, the more able they become to use them dialogically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of the students</th>
<th>Second task</th>
<th>Third task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsivity</td>
<td>Dialogic intersubjectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asma’a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdullah</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayasah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakiah</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameera</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 5.29 the dialogicality and non-dialogicality with reference to the audience (whether local or non-local) are presented. Besides, the emergence of and scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue are presented task-wise. Examining the effect of the audience in the table below, it is seen that the effect of the non-local audience has a positive effect on dialogicality. In two of the cases, discourse dialogicality has been positively affected by the non-local audience at both the levels (the broad cultural level and the field level) with one of the cases reflecting enhanced dialogicality. In the remaining three cases it has been achieved at
the narrow level in two cases with one of the cases revealing enhanced dialogicality; and in the last one it is realized as dialectical (that is when one of the parties receives changes with the other remaining intact). However, the effect of the local audience has less positive effect on the dialogicality. Two cases have reflected absence of dialogicality at both levels (the broad and the narrow) and one case has reflected its absence at the broad level. The two remaining cases have shown dialogicality.

With relevance to cultural development and intercultural dialogue, it still can be said that there is a correlation between them and the positive/negative dialogicality of the criteria. For example, we can observe the increase of the emergence of and possibility for cultural development and intercultural dialogue as catalyzed by the dialogicality of the criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of the students</th>
<th>The role of the audience with reference to dialogicality</th>
<th>Cultural development</th>
<th>Intercultural dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>Second task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asma'a</td>
<td>X at broad level</td>
<td>√ at both levels</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdullah</td>
<td>X at both levels</td>
<td>√ at the narrow level</td>
<td>√ at the narrow level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayasah</td>
<td>X at both levels</td>
<td>Dialectical</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakiah</td>
<td>√ at both levels</td>
<td>+√ at the narrow level</td>
<td>√ at the broad level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameera</td>
<td>√ at both levels</td>
<td>+√ at both levels</td>
<td>√ at both levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Conclusion

This chapter has presented a two-dimensional analysis of the students' *perception* and *performance*. The students' *perception* of how situatedness, responsivity, and intersubjectivity of writing discourse was taught in the previous writing courses showed that these aspects were approached and taught monologically. The absence of the dialogic aspect of these criteria was also perceived as detrimental to development and change. Therefore, the researcher
intervened by selecting some texts, designing three tasks, and talking to students focusing on how the three criteria could be used dialogically. The students wrote drafts and the researcher analysed their written *performance* focusing on the dialogicality of the criteria, their effect along with that of (non-) and local audience on cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

The first drafts of the first task were written before the researcher’s talk to the students. The analysis of the first drafts reflected absence of dialogicality of the criteria in the students’ written discourse. This, it has been seen, has negative effect on the growth in meaning making that is culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic.

Consequently, the researcher talked to the students focusing on the dialogic use of the three criteria. Then, she selected five students’ last drafts for analysis. The drafts reflected the growth of the dialogicality of the criteria used in the discourse of two students. This was associated in the growth in terms of meaning making that reflects changes in the broad and narrow cultural level and intercultural dialogue. The written discourse of the remaining three students reflected rudiments of dialogicality.

The last two tasks were focused on the students’ *academic* discourse. The students were instructed to write papers to be presented in a local ELE conference for the second task and a paper to be published in a non-local ELE journal for the third task. The researcher continued talking with the students focusing on the dialogicality of the criteria while writing their drafts for the second task. However, she did not talk with the students while they were writing the response to the third task.

The comparison between the responses to the two tasks reflected increased dialogicality in the use of the criteria in students’ written discourse. Their responses to the last task reflected even an enhanced dialogicality. The students’ written discourse showed tendency to create meaning/knowledge that transcended the common discourse in their field (ELE) and culture (Yemeni). Hence, evidence was seen from their written academic discourse as reflecting cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

On the basis of the evidence from this study, thus, the researcher recommends teaching these dialogic criteria for enabling academic meaning/knowledge making that is culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic.