CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion

6.0 Introduction

The following chapter concludes the whole thesis. It makes connection between the critiques, conceptual framework, and the empirical study occurring in various chapters. The researcher finds it helpful to inform the reader that the researcher’s approach throughout the thesis is phenomenographic. It aims at describing, analyzing, and examining the researcher experiential9 conception of a new role of academic writing from an ESP perspective in an EFL context for which three dialogical sociocultural criteria play as the catalyst. The divisions of the chapters as well as the issues raised in these chapters should be considered as categories10 of the researcher’s conceptual experience. The whole thesis needs to be considered as a conceptual and an empirical attempt to come up with a new orientation for the ESP field towards cultural development and intercultural dialogue in an EFL academic writing context.

The chapter consists of nine sections named as follows: the proposal’s conceptual background, contextualizing the proposal, results of critiques and discussions of writing, ESP, and academic writing, justifying the choice for the sociocultural framework, the criteria, the empirical study, towards a dialogic sociocultural approach for academic writing, questions for further research, and conclusion.

6.1 The Proposal’s Conceptual Background

The main idea of the thesis is to make an attempt to come up with a new idea of a dialogic sociocultural perspective for teaching academic writing for the specific purpose

10 Marton (ibid) and Svensson (1997) agree that the description of concepts in phenomenography results in categories (or description of conceptions) to, paraphrasing Marton’s words, denote forms of thought to be brought together in order to characterize the researcher’s perceived world inseparably from the thinking person and from the thought about object, 196-7.
of cultural development and intercultural dialogue in Yemeni EFL context using dialogic sociocultural criteria (i.e., intersubjectivity, situatedness, and responsivity). The study consists of two main parts one is conceptual and the other is empirical. The purpose of the theoretical part is to provide a critique of the absence of this particular aspect in the theory and practice of ESP in general and academic writing in particular. The purpose of the empirical part is to provide a concrete description and analysis for this could be achieved in the researcher’s EFL context in the field of teacher education. The researcher began by addressing the question of why a foreign language is needed in the first place. The researcher reflected upon this question from the perspective of dialogue as ecology of cultural knowledge. How cultural knowledge is to be made into dialogue with each other? Considering the role of the foreign languages as a bridge between cultures the idea of using them to initiate the dialogue between cultures came to the researcher’s mind. If cultural dialogue is to be for the specific purpose of teaching foreign languages, what will be the consequences? To enable the reader visualize possible consequences of the use of foreign languages for the dialogue between cultures in terms of ideas and knowledge generation she used anecdotal tools. The first was an account of the role of translation and the scholars who knew foreign languages and used them to create knowledge in the flourishing of two civilizations namely the Islamic-Arabic and the British. The researcher attempted to sift from the account provided in the first anecdote to draw the readers’ attention to the idea of the possibility of using foreign languages for the specific purpose of cultural development and intercultural dialogue. Cultural development, the researcher defines here in a broad sense to mean an individual’s development in terms of meaning and knowledge construction that has a larger influence on the broad culture beginning with the field to which the scholar belongs and (when possible) ending with his/her national culture. Intercultural dialogue, the researcher defines in terms of cross-cultural interaction between scholars (or to-be-scholars) within the particular cultures of two fields and/or two different social cultures. Two strata of development are seen here: the development in the field level (an enclosed culture) and the broad cultural level; i.e., the social culture. These are to be seen as both integrated in the sociocultural evolvement of the individual. An individual who is a scholar in a particular field (a narrow culture) also belongs to a particular social culture. So, both these sociocultural strata (the broad
and the narrow) affect each other. The trigger for such dialogue, the writer proposed, was three criteria; situatedness, responsiveness, and intersubjectivity. The definitions for these criteria are arrived at through a conceptual analysis of the writings of Mikhail Bakhtin and the sociocultural scholars. The individual is considered the dynamic factor with which the two strata of culture (the particular culture of the field and the broad culture) are dynamically interacting. Individual development of meaning/knowledge making, then, was the target for the fulfillment of cultural development and intercultural dialogue. The criteria above were seen to be catalysts for cultural development and intercultural dialogue in meaning/knowledge making of the Arabic scholars in the Islamic golden age. So, it was hypothesized by the researcher that if the above criteria are fulfilled in the individuals' meaning/knowledge construction, cultural development and intercultural dialogue might occur in their discourse. Building on a 'what if' reasoning (i.e., what if foreign languages used for the specific purpose of cultural development and intercultural dialogue), the researcher set off an investigation on the nature of the connection between cultural development and intercultural dialogue as triggered by the criteria. Her second anecdotal tool was from Wells’ (1999) dialogic sociocultural account of Golding’s novel, The Inheritors, followed by two accounts of development by Bakhtin (1986) and Eliot (1919). Through the second anecdote and the two accounts she attempted to clarify the nature of the connection between cultural development and intercultural dialogue. The value of dialogue between cultures according to Bakhtin is to enable cultures to enrich each other; hence the idea of cultural development as the fruit for dialogue between two cultures is conceptually argued for. Cultural development was seen loosely in the Bakhtinian sense as enrichment of cultural understanding/change in meaning/knowledge making. From Eliot’s account of the interaction between tradition and individual talent the researcher reflected on the idea of the individual as the engine for cultural development and the role of tradition (cultural resources) for such development to occur. Eliot saw the situated interaction between the individual and his/her culture in terms of aesthetic seeing of the pastness of the past as well as its presence. He saw it as enclosed within the realm of one culture; the situated cognition was seen as distributed between the past writers in a field and the writer of the present time in a particular field; i.e., literature. In the account of Golding presented in Wells’ book the researcher brought into focus the
idea of development as construction of a ‘new’ cultural tools (the sailing ‘log’) through dialogue between two tribes.

To summarize, the two anecdotes (the use of foreign languages in the renaissance eras and Golding’s novel) and the two accounts (Bakhtin’s and Eliot’s) functioned as the backdrop for proposing a dialogic sociocultural account (criteria-based) for the idea of using foreign languages for the specific purpose of cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

6.2 Contextualising the Proposal

In the above section it has been argued from a dialogic sociocultural perspective that the cultural development and intercultural dialogue were to emerge through an individual’s dialogic use of three criteria; situatedness, intersubjectivity, and responsivity. The nature and tentative definitions of these criteria are addressed in a later section on the criteria. The researcher addressed the question why cultural development and intercultural dialogue in the first place is important in the country of the researcher. The country of the researcher undergoes an after-revolution era in which the country needs to rebuild upon its own resources for development and connect with other cultures in an intercultural dialogue. In the last plan for higher education curriculum, it is has been proposed that the curriculum planners may make use of the experiences of other countries to initiate our educational experiences. This imitation-oriented view of creating the educational experience, the researcher believes from her experience as a teacher in higher education, is reflected in the educational experience in the writing courses offered to student-teachers in English department in her university. The nature of teaching-learning activities does not help students see English language as a tool for constructing meanings that reflect cultural development and intercultural dialogue. For example, the researcher finds from the list of the aims of the five prescribed writing courses that the nature of the writing experience provided for the students is in favor of the mechanical and monologic view of writing. The previous writing courses did not prepare students for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. The researcher, after scrutinizing the list of the courses’ aims, came to the conclusion that the student-teachers’ expertise in writing lacks proper preparation for the role a scholar is expected to play in the creation of self-
generated cultural knowledge mediated by the foreign language. The foreign language gives access to foreign scholars' created self-generated cultural knowledge with which student-teachers can compare their own cultural conceptions and may be produce modified or new cultural conceptions. Cultural conceptions here may be seen to indicate deep conceptual orientations to seeing things that is culturally rooted and is transferred to the specific culture of the field. So, the researcher thus proposes that the cultural development and intercultural dialogue may realize in terms of what Abousenna (2007) would call creative assimilation. The foreign meaning and the cultural meaning may get explored and used fruitfully so that both the broad and the narrow cultural meanings of the student-teachers may develop and be dialogic. This, the researcher believes, may be triggered through the following: first, orienting student-teachers to write to both local and international audiences on problems that are locally significant and triggered by foreign writings, and second, through enabling them use the three criteria dialogically.

6.3 Results of Critiques and Discussions of Writing, ESP, and Academic Writing

To establish her conceptual framework, the researcher began from the larger framework/umbrella for academic writing, ESP. The researcher addressed some issues related to the theoretical and practical framework of ESP such as its growth into a life-oriented field, its concern for students' needs analysis, the dispute among its practitioners over the issue of common core and specific skills hypothesis. The main argument that the researcher advanced concerning these issues were that in spite of the field's life orientations it did not consider the cultural development and intercultural dialogue as one of its specific purposes for English education. It was concerned with the narrowly conceived students' needs to 'master' the specific language structures and language skills (narrowly seen) of the field as its sole life orientations. The common core and the discipline-specific dilemma, in which the field was trapped, occurred due to the artificial awareness of the life-related activities. In real life specificity and generality feed into each other and language is not a product of the communicative process. It is also constituted of it. These issues, though not very evident in the academic writing theories.
were assimilated into the nature of theory and practice that were prevalent in the field. For example, rhetoric theories were concerned with the form not the content of writing demanded from the students. The process theories were concerned with the experiential aspect of writing with less emphasis on the product. The social current in academic writing focused on students’ mastery of important genres that gave them access to form and content of the essential writing skills for efficient functioning in society. However, the whole field of teaching writing teaching academic purposes in the EFL context did not address the idea of teaching it for cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

Another umbrella field the researcher pursued her argument from was the field of dialogic writing class. The reason behind the choice of the researcher was to trace the purposes for the use of dialogue in writing classes as well as the methodologies for achieving these purposes. While tracing the various ‘dialogic’ pedagogical designs for the writing classroom, the researcher realized that the main idea from dialogue in the writing pedagogies was to enable student writers express themselves, develop a point of view, consider another points of views, use writing for social purpose of freedom and equality achievement. The use of group discussions and teacher feedback was mainly for achieving the above purposes. As a result, the researcher reached a conviction that the use and purposes of dialogue attempted in the writing theory and practice did not include the above aim for which writing may be a tool of cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

After exploring the larger umbrella fields (writing theory and practice and ESP theory and practice), the researcher provided a critique of the main theories and pedagogies in academic writing. The conclusion of her critique was that the present theory and practice of the mainstream academic writing especially in an EFL context does not address the idea of academic writing for the specific purpose of cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

6.4 Justifying the Choice for the Dialogic Sociocultural framework

From the above investigation which aimed at searching for whether the above idea of cultural development and intercultural dialogue was present in the general framework of ESP and writing pedagogy (the umbrella fields for academic writing) in
general and in academic writing pedagogy in particular, the researcher found it not addressed. Consequently, she proposed the dialogic sociocultural approach to academic writing for the specific purpose of cultural development and intercultural dialogue with three holistic, dialogic criteria (intersubjectivity, responsivity, and situatedness).

To establish her theoretical framework the researcher began by introducing the idea of development in Bakhtin’s dialogical theory as well as the sociocultural theory. Both the sociocultural theorists argued for individual development that is basically cultural. Both saw the interaction between the self and the other as a trigger for development. The researcher, in the EFL context, identifies the other to be a foreign thinker whose ideas are tools that trigger cultural thinking in the student-teachers. The Bakhtinian dialogic perspective can be seen as extending and empowering the sociocultural framework. Taking into account Vygotsky’s focus on children’s learning through interaction and Bakhtin’s analysis of the dialogue between mature adults, for examples, in the novels of Dostoevsky, the researcher believes that Bakhtin’s framework of dialogue enriches the sociocultural framework and provides a justification for the choice of adult learners by the researcher i.e., undergraduate students. Moreover, Bakhtin saw the interaction between fields of inquiry as functioning within the broader network of other fields and social life. That provided the researcher with the theoretical context against which she set off her investigation.

The two main concepts in the sociocultural theory (mediation and internalization) are seen within a dialogic lens. Vygotsky saw the cultural artifacts as mediating human cognitive functioning. Human beings also mediate each other’s functioning. The less capable person is seen to internalize the purposes and the way of functioning through interaction with the more capable person. Reading this interpretation of the mediation and internalization processes of Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory from a Bakhtinian dialogic perspective the researcher saw the dialogic aspects of these two concepts in the following way. The artifacts that mediate human cognition and activity carry with them the purposes and the cultural cognition of their first makers. When a new user is to start using them, they get imbued with a new intentionality and re-contextualized for new uses in a different cultural setting. The new users’ cultural understanding may also get broadened. This is because in dialogue both the perspectives get changed not only one party. So,
internalization should be thought of as dual; happening to both parties: the original users’ purposes and the new users’ understanding. Extending this insight into the field of teaching academic writing for the specific purposes of cultural development and intercultural dialogue, the researcher proposes that the academic texts written by scholars from other cultures are to be considered as cultural artifacts. The ideas presented in them have been created for cultural purposes originated in the cultures of their writers. These cultural artifacts mediate intercultural dialogue between the student-teachers and the authors of these texts. The student-teachers might question or critically analyze both their cultural knowledge and that of the writers of the texts. If they come up with new ideas or attempt to use the writers’ ideas in the context of their cultural understanding, a sort of cultural development may occur in both sides. The student-teachers might dialogically internalize the original use and purposes of the texts as they re-contextualize/externalize them for new use in their culture.

6.5 The Criteria

Using some theoretical and practical models of teaching academic writing, the researcher focused on the criteria that she proposed might be a catalyst of cultural development and intercultural dialogue. These criteria (dialogic intersubjectivity, situatedness, and responsivity) were integral parts in the models of academic writing though all the three did not appear together in these models. For example, the criteria of situatedness occurred in Berkenkotter and Huckin’s model though with different connotation from the one proposed by the researcher. It appeared in other models like Australian model in another form “contextualizing” teaching within disciplinary areas. Intersubjectivity, though with different connotations from that proposed by the researcher, appeared as an instructional technique named “scaffolding” used to describe interaction between teachers and students.

These criteria having appeared in the academic writing models, the researcher observed, were not intended to serve cultural development and intercultural dialogue in the sense described by the researcher.

In an attempt to introduce the criteria to the literature of academic writing in an EFL context, the researcher traced them in the Bakhtinian dialogic literature as well as in
the literature of sociocultural theory. She came up from the criteria discussion with tentative meanings of the three criteria with dialogic sociocultural characteristics. Situatedness means *situating self in and outside something*. Intersubjectivity means *a democratic way of interacting with the other and respecting the difference*. Responsivity means *forming an idea or opinion of one's own in relation to others' opinions*. These criteria, defined so broadly, were intended by the researcher to serve as tentative criteria for teaching academic writing that the researcher believed may enable the emergence of culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic academic writing behavior. The researcher operationalized these criteria for academic writing classroom in terms of the nature of texts selected for reading, the nature of the tasks, and the nature of the teacher-student talk.

**6.6 The Empirical Study**

The empirical study constituted the second part of the thesis. It aimed at concretizing the proposal, using the criteria for teaching, and analyzing students' written works.

The following are the research questions that guided the empirical study:

1. What makes students' responsivity, intersubjectivity, and situatedness dialogic?
2. Is there a positive/negative relation between the dialogicality of the criteria (responsivity, intersubjectivity, and situatedness) on the one hand and cultural development and intercultural dialogue on the other?
3. Does the audience local and non-local have some effect on dialogicality?

The researcher chose a group of fourth and third year student-teachers from English department in the college of education where she taught for four years. The researcher provided initial description of the nature of the divide between the courses taught in Arabic and those taught in English. This description was followed by a critique of the writing courses assigned for this group of students. The rationale behind the
description and the critique was to refer to the fact that there was no clear attempt made to bridge the gap between the students’ cultural background (both academic and social) and the courses taught in English. The courses taught in English were linguistically-oriented, content-based, or skill-based while courses taught in Arabic targeted initiating the students to the Arabic-Islamic educational philosophy and provide content-based as well as skill-based courses on education in Arabic. The critique of the writing courses using the list of the objectives in the college guide showed that the writing courses were form-oriented and monologic.

The researcher aimed at exploring the possibility of using writing at an advanced level as a tool to bridge the cultural gap (thus, initiating cultural dialogue) caused by the nature of course design in her college of education. Furthermore, she wanted to explore the possibility of using it as a tool for cultural development. Before initiating her intervention, she distributed a questionnaire to examine students’ conception of the criteria responsivity, situatedness, and intersubjectivity; and their (i.e., the criteria’s) possible role in cultural development and intercultural dialogue in the previously taught writing courses.

The students’ responses to the questionnaire reflected that these criteria were approached and taught monologically in the previous writing courses. There was also a lack of intervention as towards cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

The researcher intervened by selecting some texts, designing three tasks, and talking to students. The rationale of the tasks was to mediate the interaction between the researcher interventionist teacher position and the students’ potential zones of cultural development and intercultural dialogue through the use of the criteria. The aims of the first task were as follows:

- To gauge students’ ability to formulate an opinion about the topic and the themes (i.e. meaningfully respond) mediated through the texts. Meaningful response means that students are able to substantiate and explain a personal, adopted, or adapted point of view.

- To evaluate how students have culturally situated themselves in relation to the writers and the field of the texts (i.e. what cultural position will they reveal in
their answers? Will they be able to situate themselves as teachers or they will choose another social role to reflect?).

• To examine whether they are able to meaningfully negotiate different interpretations of a point in a way that reveals tolerance of difference and exhibition of a democratic and well-defined position on the matter in relation to another (i.e. to be able to reflect dialogic intersubjectivity).

The aims of the second and the third tasks were as follows:

• To gauge the dialogicality of the criteria in the students’ writing that is specifically related to their field.

• To see whether still there is a connection between the dialogicality of the criteria on the one hand and cultural development and intercultural dialogue on the other hand.

• To evaluate the effect of the audience and the setting of the problem on the dialogicality of the criteria.

• To see whether there is any improvement in terms of the potentiality for cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

The nature of the tasks was complex as the intention of the researcher was to use them for both exploring the realization/non-realization of the dialogicality of the criteria, whether they have a potential role in cultural development and intercultural dialogue, and enabling students to initially use them. The task demanded a personal response that is substantiated, culturally situated, and dialogically intersubjective with opinions on morality of three theorists. The second and the third tasks explored the use of this opinion to approach a local problem facing an ELE professional; and writing it for different audience, local and non-local audiences. The researcher played many roles as per the demands of each task. She played the role of a friend, an informant, an instructor, and an investigator/explorer. During the dialogue with the students she attempted to raise students’ awareness of the use of the criteria using questions and examples from their writings. Students wrote several drafts for each task and the researcher used mainly students’ written responses across drafts and across tasks to examine the dialogicality of the criteria and the potential for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. She also
recorded students' reflection on what they conceived to be the differences between drafts of the same task and across tasks and used them along with the students' responses to the questionnaire to provide triangulation where possible.

6.6.1 A summary of the findings of the empirical study

- The initial responses of the students given before the researcher's intervention in terms of dialogue reflected poor dialogicality in the use of the three criteria. For example, in terms of responsivity, they did not tend to substantiate their ideas in relation to the other(s)'s idea(s). In addition, there was no evident scope for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. For example, there was no tendency to substantiate a cultural belief from another culture's perspective (thus, using ideas from other cultures to broaden one's frame of cultural understanding); neither was there a sign of adopting a culturally different perspective to extend a cultural framework; nor was there a new understanding of one/both the cultural perspectives as a result of both coming into contact with one another. See the findings from the analysis of the first draft of the first task.

- The students' responses began reflecting gradual dialogicality in the use of the criteria from the second draft through the third task after the researcher's intervention. The meaning of dialogic criteria identified in chapter 3 served as the frame of reference for evaluating the dialogicality of the use of the criteria. For example, if a student exhibited an ability to use a theorist's idea from a different field (philosophy in the case of the present study) to support an argument in his/her own field (ELE), he/she then used the dialogic criterion situatedness effectively. This is because the student has reflected an awareness existing within and outside the field simultaneously. This awareness resulted in the development of the culture of the field in terms of mind action; i.e., the student was able to negotiate a new idea into the field dialogically. Abdullah's case in the second draft is a clear example of this.

- There was substantial evidence that whenever there was a growth in the use of the criteria dialogically, there was promising evidence in terms of the potential for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. For example, when a student
shows a democratic interaction as he/she attempts presenting her/his ideas in relation to the theorists' (thus, exhibiting dialogic intersubjectivity), there was an evidence of a broadening of this student's cultural perspective. Asma'a's case in the second draft of the first task is an example of this.

- The repeated use of the criteria dialogically resulted in continuous occurrence of cultural development and intercultural dialogic meaning/knowledge making in their written academic discourse. It has also been seen that the students reflected both dialogicality and enhanced dialogicality when they address their writing to non-local audience.
- Dialogicality may be achieved at both/across the broad and the narrow cultural level and thus the cultural development and intercultural dialogue can be achieved at both levels.

6.7 Towards a Dialogic Sociocultural Approach for Academic Writing

The whole thesis is an attempt to argue for a fresh specific purpose for teaching academic writing, that of cultural development and intercultural dialogue. The researcher proposes some criteria within a dialogic sociocultural approach as a catalyst for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. These criteria are dialogic intersubjectivity, responsivity, and situatedness.

Cultural development, the writer defines here in a broad sense to mean an individual development in terms of meaning and knowledge construction that has a larger influence on the broad culture beginning with the field to which the scholar belongs and (when possible) ending with his/her national culture. Intercultural dialogue, the writer defines in terms of cross-cultural interaction between scholars (or to-be-scholars) within the particular cultures of two fields and/or two different social cultures. The criteria are identified from the dialogic sociocultural perspective to have dialogic meanings. Situatedness means situating self in and outside something. Intersubjectivity means a democratic way of interacting with the other and respecting the difference. Responsivity means forming an idea or opinion of one's own in relation to others' opinions.

For the purpose of emphasis the researcher here reproduces the main aim and the broad divisions of the thesis. The thesis consists of two main parts; conceptual and
empirical. The idea from the discussions and critiques made in the theoretical part was to provide the rationale and justification for the inclusion of such a new specific purpose (cultural development and intercultural dialogue) within the framework of ESP academic writing. The existing ESP academic writing is skill-based in a very narrow sense. In addition, it is culturally restricting in terms of idea development and creativity in knowledge-building. Cultural here is seen in two senses; the broad and the narrow. The narrow one means a culture of the field and the broad one means the social or national culture of the students. The theoretical and practical framework of ESP in general and ESP academic writing in particular lacks the proper technical and conceptual tools that enable it provide for enabling cultural development and intercultural dialogue. The researcher argues that the dialogic criteria she sifted form the dialogic sociocultural perspective could be a useful tool for enabling such aim. She attempted to operationalize the criteria in terms of their use for material selection, classroom interaction, and the nature of the tasks. Here is how the researcher operationalized each criterion for the above purposes.

Operationalizing situatedness for classroom use as follows:

- The choice of texts: the texts used for reading to write may be chosen from other fields of study other than that of the students. The criterion for choice, then, is the supposed relevance or the probability of finding new ideas. Also texts written by theorists from other cultures may be selected so that intercultural dialogue may occur.

- The types of tasks: the tasks should help students see connections among academic fields. They may represent challenges for finding connections or suggest for students some connections to work upon.

- Teacher-student talk: the teachers need to encourage students not to confine themselves within the boundaries of their fields. They may direct them to find answers from other disciplines if the students could not find solutions in their own disciplines.

Operationalizing responsibility for classroom use as follows:
• The choice of texts: the texts that present ideas to be responded to should be given priority for selection as reading texts.

• The types of tasks: tasks that require students to respond to other texts must be given. They should demand students’ formulation of their own relational responses to an existing problem/idea. These tasks demand problematizing an existing situation, questioning existing solutions for problems through critiquing, and finding solutions which will be regarded as responses to the existing problems/ideas.

• Teacher-student talk: teachers should help students come up with their own responses whatever be the forms in which these are written. They should assist students step by step to enable them come up with mature responses through dialogue. Teachers need to adopt a dialogic stance in their interaction with the students. This because some of the students may lack self confidence and may resist forming responses of their own. Here the role of the teacher as a dialogue partner will play a major role in encouraging students to do so.

Operationalizing intersubjectivity for classroom use as follows:

• The choice of texts: Texts should be thought of by students as tools that present points of views, proposals, suggestions, and ideas of theorists. They need to be thought of as virtual channels for interaction with other theorists of yesterday or the present day or even supposedly existing future theorists/audience.

• The types of tasks: The tasks that are to be used have to require positive intersubjectivity rather than passive or zero intersubjectivity. That is, they need to initiate dialogue between students, between students and the teachers, between students and the writers of the texts, between students and related writers who wrote about similar ideas from their local community or outside, and between the students and persons outside the classroom.

• Teacher-student talk: the kind of interaction between the teacher and the student(s) needs to enhance students’ awareness of others who have talked about the same topics locally or abroad. The talk needs to broaden students’ sense of the other as a trigger for idea creation rather than imitation. The teacher mediation
needs not only lead to the non-transformative internalization of others’ ideas but also to using them as a platform for making ideas.

- Students’ produced texts: the texts produced by students need to exhibit dialogic intersubjectivity reflected in their intertextuality. Students should be encouraged to produce texts that show how they their opinions with others’ and put it in a democratic way while being conscious of their purpose of writing.

The empirical study provided a specimen of how the criteria were used by the researcher to select texts, design tasks, and approach classroom talk to promote the emergence of culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic potential in students’ academic writing. The criteria were also used to evaluate how dialogic students’ writings are. It has been found by the researcher that the use of the criteria was effective for the purpose argued for by the researcher. Therefore, the researcher proposes as a dialogic sociocultural approach based on the criteria for teaching academic writing for the specific purpose of cultural development and intercultural dialogue in her EFL context.

6.8 Questions for Further Research

The researcher chose the sample for her empirical study from students who got an average grades between good and excellent. Below this grade the researcher does not claim the success of her proposal. Further research is needed to address how effective the criteria use would be with a group of students who may be addressed as ‘poor’ writers.

The researcher’s analysis and critique were restricted to idea generation and interaction through texts and between teacher and students. Further research may address online interaction, oral/face to face interaction, etc. The textual aspects of writing were not touched upon in the analysis or in the critique of academic writing for specific purposes. These can be addressed in further research.

More varieties of tasks addressing different skills like listening and speaking may throw light on the application of the concepts. Further research may attempt using similar tasks with different combination of skills like listening and speaking, listening and writing, or reading and speaking.
Using the criteria in different fields and with more variation of participants may also widen the scope of the study and clarify the concepts further.

Further research may also address the nature of the integration of the three criteria and how each specifically triggers the development in the meaning making. Because of the time limit the researcher could not identify this aspect of criteria use in meaning making.

Because of the time limit the researcher could not do any follow up to check whether the students have internalized the use for the criteria dialogically after a period of time. Further research is needed in this concern.

6.9 Conclusion

The whole study is an attempt and therefore a full-fledged comprehensive approach is not claimed by the researcher. She has provided a conceptual argument as well as an empirical study to support her proposal. However, she is aware that further research is still needed to substantiate her conceptual framework and more empirical studies using different research methods are needed to confirm the findings of her empirical study.

However, she is confident that she has done the best in her hand to intersubjectively, responsively, and situatedly make her academic discourse dialogic. Now, it is in the hand of the reader to decide whether her academic discourse in the present thesis is culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic. She wishes, by the end of this, that this work would be worthy of joining the dialogue of the EFL academic writing discourse.