CHAPTER ONE

Laying the Foundation for a Dialogic Sociocultural Perspective for Teaching Academic Writing

1.0 Introduction

The aim of the chapter is to provide the rationale, the background, the scope, and the significance of the thesis. The chapter consists of six main sections. In the first section, there is a discussion of how foreign languages have mediated the ancient Arabs' meaning/knowledge construction and taking over from other ancient civilizations. The result of this mediation has been cultural development and intercultural dialogue. Some criteria (intersubjectivity, responsivity, and situatedness) are perceived to be the catalysts for such dialogue and development. The working definitions of the two concepts (cultural development and intercultural dialogue) are introduced in the section and proposed to be the aims for teaching academic writing for pre-service teacher development programme in the researcher's EFL Yemeni context. The need for these aims (cultural development and intercultural dialogue) in this context is clarified and argued for. Moreover, the criteria are initially introduced. The second section gives a summary based on Swales' book, Episodes in ESP, about the major theoretical and practical issues in ESP (English for Specific Purposes) as the umbrella field for EAP (English for Academic Purposes). A discussion and critique follow the summary in which the researcher argues for the field's need for a dialogic sociocultural stance which may provide for the aims and criteria proposed for teaching academic writing in the above context. The third section, introduces the dialogic sociocultural perspective's main assumptions and conditions that qualify it for the achievement of the above aims and the provision of the above criteria in the teaching-learning context of academic writing. The fourth section introduces the aims and ways of dialogue provided for by different theoretical and pedagogical stances on writing as presented in Irene Ward's book, Literacy, Ideology, and Dialogue: Towards a dialogic Pedagogy. This discussion is a precursor for a more focused discussion on the pedagogies and theories of academic writing that will be presented in Chapter Two. The theoretical and pedagogical stances
have been put in parallel comparison with the dialogic sociocultural stance adopted by
the researcher. While presenting the summary, the researcher argues how her approach
fares well the presented theoretical and pedagogical stances in its provision for dialogue
and development. A discussion section follows the summary about how the approach
adopted by the researcher may provide for the aims and the criteria theoretically better
than the theories and pedagogies summarized above. The fifth section points out the
significance of the study. The sixth section provides a brief conclusion of the chapter.

1.1 Language within a Community and Intercultural Contact - Role of
Foreign Language

This section consists of two main subsections. The first subsection is meant to
give a brief introduction of the pre-history of foreign language learning with a specific
purpose orientation; that of fostering development that is enriched by intercultural
dialogue. It includes a discussion that highlights the role of bilingual speakers and
scholars using the ‘foreign knowledge’ introduced through a foreign language in cultural
development and intercultural dialogue. The researcher attempts through her account to
draw the reader’s attention to the idea of the dialogic sociocultural aspects of learning
foreign languages. The second subsection introduces tentative definitions of the main
concepts in the thesis; the dialogic criteria (intersubjectivity, situatedness, and
responsivity), cultural development, and intercultural dialogue. She explores the idea of
the symbolic role of the foreign languages in facilitating cultures’ and languages’
dialogue. She advances a proposal for pre-service teacher development in her country’s
EFL context to use the dialogic criteria in productive language learning
(meaning/knowledge making) for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. She
uses a conceptual dialogic sociocultural discussion to substantiate her proposal and
makes it clear it’s kinship to and differences from the critical, competitive-functional, and
global perspectives for teaching and learning foreign language in various EFL contexts.
1.1.1 Language for the Specific Purpose of Development and Dialogue

Among all living organisms, human being exhibits the ability to think creatively. All species use their heredity memory to keep type, find food, and protect self from natural enemies. Only human race has developed a higher order cultural memory which Vygotsky (1978) calls higher order mental functions using psychological sign systems to record experience, reflect on it, and reconstruct it differently to produce a new one. The explanation to this according to sociocultural theory (SCT henceforth) is that humans evolved a complex language system through which they can mediate all higher thinking functions. Because of this fact, language has been and will remain the main sociocultural tool for individual and sociocultural development.

Each community adopts a specific language through which its specific conception of the world evolves. ‘Language’, according to Vygotsky (1987) ‘is the tool of tools’ (as cited in Wells, 1994, 1999). Language enables communities to interact with each other and exchange knowledge and wisdom. Through this interaction, individuals’ sociocultural development occurs. In each community, a group of people have been concerned with learning other communities’ languages so that dialogue and development may take place. Unfortunately, few members had the aim to learn and use foreign languages for the development of knowledge. These ‘elites’ were more interested in the sociocultural means that learning a foreign language makes available. They were concerned with the intellectual maneuver that learning a foreign language could cause both at the individual and cultural levels. For example, Al-Biruni intended to facilitate dialogue between Hindus and Muslims. He thought that the two groups had a great deal they could learn from one another. He collected books and studied with Hindu scholars to become fluent in Sanskrit. He translated books both from Sanskrit to Arabic and vice versa. He was both a scholar and a translator who contributed into the two philosophies (Islamic and Hindu) understanding of each other. The texts he collected were artefacts produced by the two civilizations and the two languages he efficiently knew were used as tools. The two languages (Sanskrit and Arabic) were used as cultural tools to bring about cultural development (new cultural understanding of other culture) and intercultural
dialogue. As learning and use of foreign languages was restricted to the elites’ groups in Britain (Ager, 1985) and may be in other European countries in the past, it was also limited to interested persons in Arabic and Islamic reigns. Learning foreign languages, however, became available to all in the present time. It will be discussed in the second part of this section where the writer presents the essential role foreign language played in the flourish as well as interaction of civilizations.

With the spread of Islam beyond the Arab World to include other non-Arabic nations, the need to learn other languages became a necessity for communication purposes specially to help people know about Islam; and to help Arabs who had settled in those countries to make a living. Then, more Arabs knew foreign languages for trade and commercial purposes thanks to the active trade movement between the Middle East, other Asian regions, South Africa, and Europe. When Islamic civilization reached its golden age, caliphs had been aware of the role of science and knowledge in the development and growth of nations (Falagas, Zarkadoulia, & Samonis, 2006). They gave grants to those who knew foreign languages to translate seminal books on Philosophy, Literature, hard Science, social Science, and Astrology from languages such as Greek, Latin, Persian, Sanskrit, etc. They also gave grants for scholars to study the translated books. The Arabic scholars, at an individual level, started dialogically composing their own Arabic versions of other’s experiences, rejecting or accepting previous conclusions, and bringing new sciences into existence, for example, Algebra and Sociology were two among many. The work of Arab and Muslim scholars such as Johannitius (Hunain Ibn ’Ishaq), Avicenna (Ibn Sina) and Averroes (Ibn Rushd) were translated into Latin and became the core curriculum in the ancient universities of Europe. In this way, a constant interchange of ideas took place between East and West. The knowledge of previous civilisations was thus not just transmitted to another culture, but constituted the basis for innovation and change (Abbasi & Omrani, 2013). For example, new theories were brought to ancient sciences such as Medicine. For example, Ibn Al-Hythem experimentally proved that vision was not a result of the eye sending light to the object therefore seeing it as Aristotle and many European scholars had thought; he found that it was simply the opposite. They also invented the Isterlab, a tool for showing time using sunlight or
moonlight; and Ibn Al Nafis discovered the pulmonary circulation which was re-discovered by modern science after the laps of three centuries (Al-Ghazal, 2004).

Academic debates were held between Arab scholars and their foreigner peers under the patronage of powerful sultans and rulers. These ended either in each party understanding the other's point and therefore getting richer in terms of knowledge; or with new understanding that led to further research and discoveries. Scholars were grappleing with words that refused to have foreign coinage so they transliterated these words (i.e. loan words) using the phonetic system of their languages and these remained in the academic repertoire of the scholars of both sides, thus, expanding the linguistic academic register of each side. For example, algorism or algorithm (the decimal place-value system of numerals) was a word derived by the Europeans from the very name of Al-Khwarazmi - an influential Muslim scholar in field of practical arithmetic- (Sayili, 2006, p. 43). Arabs, on the other hand, also changed Aristotle's word Organon into Al-Qanun.

When Arabic scholars started composing their own knowledge, they needed to relate it to their cultural practices. They re-conceptualized the foreign meaning to adapt it to the Arabic sense-making style of perception and apprehension. They exploited the Arabic poetic oral traditions to compress whole sciences into long metrical verse. This was done so concisely and neatly that it was easy even for children to learn and memorize. Books like Matn Al-Zubad and Aljazariah\(^1\) are examples of whole sciences written in verse. Moreover, due to contact with the other cultures new genres came into existence such as Andalusi Muwashah (a peculiar format of metrical verse), journal articles, and free verse (i.e. non-metrical verse). Many words were coined, thus expanding the Arabic inventory of word lists like the word Isterlab that came to the Arabic use after an Arabic scholar invented a machine for measuring time and called it Isterlab. The same role was played by foreign languages in the foundation of Western civilization. For example, during the Renaissance a wide translation from Greek, Latin, Arabic, Chinese, Sanskrit, old Egyptian language (hieroglyphic), etc, took place during

---

\(^1\) Matn Al-Zubad is a textbook used for teaching the basics of Islamic Share'ah. It is composed of one thousand lines in metrical verse. Aljazariah is also a textbook for teaching the rules of phonetics and phonology of the Holy Qur'\'an.
the Renaissance. Using these translated books English scholars, some of whom were also bilingual, developed their own versions of human knowledge by using these translated books. Literature was also enriched and new literary genres appeared. One famous example was the development of the Shakespearean sonnets (e.g. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*) from the Italian influence of Petrarch's Sonnets (e.g. *Canzoniere*). On this affiliation Wordsworth commented on the affiliation between the two kinds of sonnet: 'with this key Shakespeare unlocked his heart'; cited in Callaghan, (2007, p. 16).

To summarize, learning of other languages for a specific purpose originates long back beyond its institutionalized, canonical version (English for Specific Purposes, ESP). This has sprung from an individual and cultural taking over from another and performing a developmental role. Language learning was for language use; no separation between form and function. The consciousness of scholars of their duty put into action two incompatible forces: the centrifugal and the centripetal; that of their cultural tools and those of the other culture(s). Their learning of the new discourse and activity through the foreign language(s) resulted in the production of *value in terms of meaning/knowledge making for development of practice*. A cultural development and intercultural dialogue took place mainly through the mediation of language.

---

2 These two words come from Bakhtin (1981). He expounds that language centripetal forces are embodied in a ‘unitary language’ which he calls elsewhere the ‘authoritative language. He means by this acknowledged and socially forceful and grounded knowledge and points of view. ‘Alongside the centripetal forces, the centrifugal forces of language,’ he maintains, ‘carry on their uninterrupted work; alongside verbal ideological centralisation and unification, the uninterrupted processes of decentralisation and disunification go forward,’ (pp. 271-2). Pearce (1994) and Vice (1997) explain that dialogue occurs at different levels of dialogic exchange. At the highest level, it is a dialogue between centripetal forces (that makes things cohere) and centrifugal forces (that keep things apart) that energizes language’s power to mean. At another level, dialogue is between prescribed popular meanings and language at the level of discourse where meanings are the offspring of particular period and particular situations.
1.1.2 Desirable Criteria of Comprehensive FL Learning-Teaching Supporting Cultural Development and Intercultural dialogue

The discussion so far illustrates the crucial role that foreign languages played in cultural development and intercultural dialogue. It highlights how each culture had an epistemic role in knowledge creation and manipulation. The foreign languages learned for specific purposes in the eras of development of the above two civilizations (the Arabic and the British) led to cultural development and intercultural dialogue. On the basis of conclusion from the above narrative, the researcher would like to explore the above idea of cultural development and intercultural dialogue in the context of teacher-development in her country. She proposes the criteria that she has observed in the narrative above as catalysts for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. Before delving into the details of her idea, she introduces tentative meanings of the two concepts and the criteria. Cultural development, the researcher defines here in a broad sense to mean an individual development in terms of meaning/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 scholars and the to-be-scholars) within the particular cultures of two fields and/or two different social cultures. The intercultural dialogic freedom endowed to scholars allowed them to make the best use of the cultural tools and means (concepts, knowledge, theoretical constructs, etc.) made available through the foreign languages. They responsively reflected/refracted and/or self-initiatively/generatively made ideas based on interaction rather than imitated the motives, goals, and procedures for which cultural means (ideas or practices) were originally used. Their interpretation (responsive understanding) was production-oriented (i.e. they, for example, read to write and perceived to respond). It was also ‘intersubjective’. That is, they have been respectful and considering for their own and the others’ purposes as well as/or for possible future receivers of their production. The production was also ‘situaded’. That is, it sprang from the nature of who they were; what profession they worked; and what branch of knowledge they wanted to add to; and at the same time they were not limited to its scope in vision or production. The researcher proposes that these (intersubjectivity,
situatenedness, and responsivity) are the criteria\(^3\) that may make learning a foreign language for specific purposes lead to cultural development and intercultural dialogue. Before expounding her idea, she will show how development for Outer Circle scholar is conceived in the mainstream ELE theory in the context of what Widdowson (2003) said. Following this, the researcher will attempt to use different strata of thought to substantiate her proposal.

Widdowson (2003) notes different consequences of the development of English as a global language which is increasingly taken by Outer Circle people. They need to adopt global registers for their economic and sociopolitical survival in the global setting dominated by English and by west dominated market forces. The researcher perceives that Widdowson's perception of the development in the use of English as a global language by the Outer Circle people as limited to economic and sociopolitical survival. Maybe he is not to be blamed for this as he might read what is present in the agenda for the use of English for specific purposes in the Outer Circle countries. On the other hand, he sees the growth and the appearance of new dialects in the Inner Circle communities as an aspect of the development of English as a global language. However, he also does not look in the same way to the growth in dialects in the expanding circle and the outer circle communities. For example, dialects like Hinglishs occurred in India; and in other parts of the world pidgins continue to appear in every contact between English and other languages. These are not considered as a growth by Widdowson because he looks at the growth of English (inner circle or mainstream varieties) only not to that of other languages being enriched and developed by contact with English. The writer, however, sees these varied dialects as significant in relation to intercultural dialogue. The specific concern is that in the academic and technical sectors where English is used in different disciplinary registers need to be learnt. People learning English as a foreign language

\(^3\) A full account of the criteria, how the researcher derived their meaning from the dialogism and sociocultural approaches is presented in Chapter Three.

\(^3\) Yemen recent revolution against Saleh's reign continued from 27 Jan, 2011 to 27 Feb, 2012 (i.e. one year and one month). Now and due to the different parts that played parts in the revolution and due to the civil war that broke up with Al-Huthi group and al Qa'edah group; and because of the hiraki movement in the south of Yemen demanding separation from the north, a national dialogue committee was held. The purpose was to come up with decisions that provide solution for protecting the national affairs and finding solutions for the opposing demands of the different groups in the country.
have as their base the local dialect of English. In this context Widdowson argues that they have deficiency and disadvantage. Widdowson explains:

They (i.e. non-native speakers) do not engage shared schematic knowledge [i.e. with the native community]. They are outsiders looking in, making sense of things in their terms and on their terms. This is common sense to them, because it is communal sense: the reality which is sanctioned by their particular social community. So we have problems coming to terms with it. (p. 64; Emphasis and square brackets are Widdowson's and round brackets are mine)

The foreign speakers of a language are seen as weak users because they do not share the native speakers their cultural background. He, consequently, recommends that a sense of ‘solidarity’ need to be adopted by professionals in different communities; and a kind of ‘conspiracy against who cannot fill the position of assigned reader’ need to be made by writers. He explains: ‘the writer makes allusion to things which are particular, specific indeed, to a closed community of like-minded people’. The researcher agrees with Widdowson that a sense of solidarity is essential for intersubjectivity in communication. This may aid interpretation of the communicants and enable them consider one another’s perspective. She, however, finds the implication of ‘conspiracy’ a misfortunate one. It depicts participants in the communicative act as playing a game to win. If real intercultural dialogue is to occur, definitely communicants will need more than ‘conspiracy’ to really understand each other. They will need to consider the other from the other’s position. Thus, more effort and sincerity are demanded. Nevertheless, what is relevant to the writer’s discussion of intercultural dialogue is Widdowson’s perception of the development that takes place in language use. He describes the development of the language in terms of extension of use, whether it is in terms of dialects’ or registers’ growth. He does not go further in explaining how the growth of the register might occur. In each register there are three levels or aspects of its realization: the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual. Halliday (1978). The ideational represents thematic use; the interpersonal represents the relations between individuals and how they may affect language use; and the textual represents the mode of representation.
According to Halliday (1993), ‘when children learn language, they are not simply engaging in one type of learning among many; rather, they are learning the foundations of learning itself’ (p, 93). This means that language interferes into the very act of perceiving and producing learning. This entails that language constitutes all levels of register and plays a crucial role in their formulation. By extension one can safely say that this role is played by both the first and the second languages in the mind of a bilingual speaker. The stance taken by the researcher here is that experiences gained through both the languages at all the three levels must have enriched bilinguals. The bilingual speaker has two ideational, interpersonal, and textual experiences to draw upon. Thus the weakness of foreign speakers needs to be seen as strength. The language development need not be looked for as one-sided; i.e. in terms of dialects of English as Widdowson has seen it. The enrichment of the registers may lead to the enrichment of the vocabulary and structure of the mother tongue if effort is made towards this direction. This maybe one effect of the cultural development and intercultural dialogue if the experiences constructed through and in both the languages are to be compared.

Rather than the restrictive look to the vision of development as seen to occur in the Outer Circle countries as reflected in Widdowson’s account, the researcher has a different insight for her country. The researcher proposes that the policy for placing foreign language education in the national curriculum must include developmental as well as dialogic orientations if the cultural development of the country and its interaction with other countries are at stake. The researcher finds that this is not the case in the planning and implementation of the national curriculum of higher education in her country, Yemen. The researcher has read the first and the second guides of the most recent curriculum development plan for government universities. It states in the instructional document for evaluating and developing educational programmes in government universities (The ministry of higher education, (n.d), the second guide, p.8) that curriculum experts should find successful experiences of curriculum development from six different countries. These experiences, it adds, should be scrutinised for imitation and application in the government universities in Yemen. To the best of the researcher’s belief, others’ experiences do not genuinely spring from our sociocultural need and experience: ‘one size does not fit all’. While applying others’ experiences, a lot
of tailoring processes are performed. The national cognition will be junked into a foreign experience. The foreign experience sprang from a cultural need that might be similar at the surface but different in orientation or purpose from the Yemeni cultural needs. This does not mean that we cannot make use of others’ experiences or adopt them. The idea is that first we must create our own national experience and compare it to the others’. By identifying and evaluating the differences and similarities responsively, the nature and orientation of the change will be valuable. Moreover, it will lead to genuine cultural development and intercultural dialogue. Besides, if the national development of the country is to be related to an international development, developmental orientations in terms of the situated contribution of each country to the human civilization need to be the guiding force. In this context the development of each country should be genuine. Its developmental purposes must be bidirectional in nature; i.e. nationally and internationally in its intersubjective interaction. It should also be responsive. Otherwise, the last stage of the development circle of the adopting country at the national level will comparatively be old-fashioned/primitive in the development circle of the source country. The researcher reckons that Yemen is in a transient period, the post revolution period. The revolution is in the first place an invitation for change and development. This needs to be reflected in the way we plan for education and perform educational practice.

The above position of the researcher with regard to her country’s aim for teaching and learning a foreign language is different from the political, competitive, and entrepreneurial view stated in the American Helsinki Accords (1975). Here is an excerpt from the report as quoted in Kramsch (1993):

The President’s Commission believes that our lack of foreign language competence diminishes our capabilities in diplomacy, in foreign trade, and in citizen comprehension of the world in which we live and compete. (Emphasis is the researcher’s, p. 248)

---

4 Yemen recent revolution against Saleh’s reign continued from 27 Jan, 2011 to 27 Feb, 2012 (i.e. one year and one month). Now and due to the different parts that played parts in the revolution and due to the civil war that broke up with Al-Huthi group and al Qa’edah group; and because of the hiraki movement in the south of Yemen demanding separation from the north, a national dialogue committee was held. The purpose was to come up with decisions that provide solution for protecting the national affairs and finding solutions for the opposing demands of the different groups in the country.
The reason for not adopting this view by the researcher is its negative orientation to the other cultures as opponents towards whom the national purpose is competitive. Her educational vision for foreign language teaching and learning is to be ecological. The whole world is to be seen as a global village. Each culture has a role to play in the development of the world knowledge and meaning making. *If culture’s educational visions compete, the result might be disastrous rather than growth-oriented.* This does not mean that the researcher is creating an imaginary word of language education that is her own and ignoring other purposes. Her argument is that a space for such purpose for foreign language learning needs to be given a space in the agenda of curriculum planning and implementation.

The researcher’s position will also slightly be different from the pure *critical, individual* view of teaching and learning English in Africa as stated by the People’s English Commission of the National Education Crisis Committee (1985). It re-conceptualizes the meaning of language competence as follows:

> [T]he abilities to say and write what one means; to hear what is said and what is hidden; to defend one’s point of view; [... ] to make one’s voice heard; to read print and resist it where necessary. (Cited in Kramsch, 1993, p. 255)

The researcher’s dialogic sociocultural position differs from the critical-political perspective slightly in that it does not see the individual’s voice as detached from the cultural. It sees the cultural in the individual. The evolving of individual’s voice is necessarily cultural. The three criteria warrantee that voice is no longer viewed from a Western perspective as individualistic. The idea of responsivity will replace the word voice in the researcher’s dialogic sociocultural agenda for teacher development. For further explanation of this idea refer to the section on responsivity in chapter 3. Moreover, the researcher does not see the other as only the oppressor. The other can also be a source of growth.
The researcher finds the position of Robin Alexander (2008) in some respects is near to what she feels teacher-developmental message should be. He remarks:

There are two broad senses in which the architects of a national education system can think internationally. They can view the world as essentially competitive arena of trade and influence and use education in order to maximize national advantage – economic, scientific, technological, ideological, [and] military – over other countries. Alternatively, they can apply a more genuinely international outlook (international rather than contra-national), acknowledging that global interdependence carries moral obligations from which no country is immune and that education can serve to unite rather than divide.

(Emphasis is the researcher, p. 123)

In the above quotation Robin Alexander proposes that the national interest need not oppose or contradict the international interest if the interests of all the countries are thought of as interdependent. This may be called an ecological perspective of intercultural dialogue and cultural development. Those who think creatively different from peers at the national level will find international peers with whom they can intersubjectively share interest. The individual contribution in this sense cannot ignore the national interest because it must respond to a national need in an international context. If this is true as it must be, then, it is a moral obligation in foreign language education that is developmentally-oriented; given the role seen in the first section which the foreign languages played in cultural development and intercultural dialogue. However, the researcher’s idea differs slightly from the idea of the unifying job of education that Alexander sees in the above quotation. We will have ethical obligations towards the global/international interest but our educational goals need not be united. By its very heterogeneous variation the contribution of each culture will enrich the international heritage of action resources. The clash between our educational purposes may bring a chance for dialogue and thus for change and development. The above idea of the researcher may be best considered in the context of Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory and Bakhtin’s dialogic perspective.
English language has become a global language known to almost all nations. The academic community under its umbrella is huge and divergent. If the academic community is to be viewed in terms of the sociology of knowledge as Stenhouse (1975) conceptualizes it, then the boundary of our national academic community must not be thought of as hard-edged. He thinks of the academic community as a ‘culture’ which the researcher sees has and makes connections with other ‘cultures’; i.e. other academic communities. He, quoting King and Brownell (1966), agrees that the disciplines of knowledge can be described

Metaphorically as communities of scholars who share domain of intellectual inquiry or discourse. (p. 10)

He adds that these disciplines are ‘an active effort to make sense out of some portion of the world or life’ (p. 14). The researcher’s position is similar to Stenhouse’s perspective in his vision of the disciplines as communities of scholars; and, like him, she thinks that the academic community has a cultural mission. In that sense preparing scholars of a field must include preparing them to reflect on cultural resources of the field and developing them when possible. For this purpose, she does not believe the same community is the only ‘reference group’ that a learner, the professional\(^5\) of tomorrow, can refer to when he/she responsively thinks about the field. Nevertheless, she agrees with David Nunan (1988) that Stenhouse’s perspective is enclosed within ‘a subject-centered view,’ (p. 13). One must think of the community broadly to avoid rigidity of interpretation and warrants progress and development in the particular field. If the ELE scholar uses ideas, methods, concepts, etc., from other fields, this might bring about a fruitful change into his/her field. This protects fields from being boringly enclosed within its arenas and being rigidly change-proof. Then, it would be useful to think of the

---

\(^5\) The researcher is aware of her use for the words professional, academic, practitioner, and scholar in place of each other. That is occurring because she believes that the divisions between them are artificial and not genuine to the nature of the mission of an individual as a member in a culture. \(^5\) He may be all if cultural development and intercultural dialogue are the aims of educational development.

\(^5\) These criteria will be elaborated upon with relation to cultural development and intercultural dialogue in chapter three.
academic community of ELE as a cell in a network of academic communities locally and internationally which constitute the cultural and international heritage of knowledge. Through interaction with each other, these communities may prosper and be more meaningful to 'interpreting life'. This is because, in agreement with Tickoo (1994), she is aware that 'academics share disciplinary [or field] cultures. But before they gain entrance into such cultures they are, [...] members of ethnic culture'; Cited in Flowerdew and Peacock (2001), p. 23. If academicians from these communities engage in a dialogue that is situated, intersubjective, and responsive with each other, they might bring about a change in the pooling of knowledge and the way they are constructed in their social cultures. Coming back to her partial agreement with Stenhouse's approach which advocates teacher development, the researcher holds a learner-centered approach for pre-service student-teachers. These, through their sociocultural differences with ELE scholars may be enabled to be involved in dialogue as well as knowledge/meaning making that is situated, responsive, and intersubjective leading into cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

The idea of development and dialogue expressed above can be conceptually explained and justified from a sociocultural dimension. For instance, Vygotsky aimed at enhancing child's cognitive development through building on his/her potential. For him individual development is cultural development. This springs from his concept of ZPD (zone of potential development) which depicts the individual/mind as having a range of potentials that can be enhanced through both interaction and the use of mediational tools, (Smagorinsky, 1995). Vygotsky (1978) emphasizes this role of language in child's perception and production as follows:

The child begins to perceive the world not only through his eyes but also through his speech. As a result, the immediacy of "natural" perception is supplanted by a complex mediated process; as such, speech becomes an essential part of the child's cognitive development. (p. 32, parentheses are the editors')
Thus, language mediates reality for the person and at the same time mediates his/her interaction with others. Therefore, it causes development. Nicholl (1998) further explains language role in constructing our consciousness of the world from a Vygotskyan perspective as follows:

It is through language that we construct reality. With words we define, shape, and experience. Without the words to think, communicate, experience, or understand our lives would be very different from what they are. Words expand our consciousness but also limit us as we can only fully experience those things that we have the words for. Language provides the framework through which we perceive, experience, and act. As language constructs reality, so symbolization constitutes objects. (P. 5)

The language of the other (i.e. the foreign language), the researcher argues, enables an individual to get access to a reality perceived by another. A reality that is different from his/her reality. She believes that in exchanging field artifacts (e.g., concepts, ideas, knowledge, information, etc.) through a foreign language the individuals may get enriched with an input of concepts and heuristics that extend their horizons. The rich linguistic repertoire through which the field meditational means are introduced also catalyzes the interrelationship between cultural and the field repertoire of experiences. Symbolization thus may become possible. Mead (1934) describes symbolization in a developmental term as follows:

Symbolization constitutes objects not conceptualized before, objects which would not exist except for the context of social relationships wherein symbolization occurs. Language does not simply symbolize a situation or object which is already there in advance; it makes possible the existence or the appearance of the situation or object, for it is a part of the mechanism whereby that situation or object is created. (Cited in Nicholl (ibid), p. 5)
Here the symbolic power of language as a sign system is explicated. Through dialogic intersubjective interaction participants may conceive new relations between objects through symbolic representation whether it is auditory or visual. Participants use language to transfer the sign mediated by two languages’ experiences into a linguistic one. Once the symbols make a system, individuals start responding; constituting new/their own ideas. This symbolic creativity is always situated. Situatedness here is perceived in the sense that the drive for creativity is cultural; either a personal need to create something new for self-achievement or to feel a cultural necessity for something new or even to solve a problem. Even if the creative act coincidently occurs it will be governed by the consequences that are contextual and historical.

How this happens may be seen in T. S. Eliot’s (1921), well known essay: Tradition and the individual talent. He uses the term historical sense to represent the situatedness of one’s perception which may lead to development. He defines historical sense as ‘of the timeless as well as of the temporal and of the timeless and of the temporal together. . . . ’ He explains: ‘I mean this as a principle of aesthetic. . . the conscious present is the awareness of the past. . . the conception of [theme] as a living whole of all the [literature] that has been written [on a particular theme]. Therefore, a ‘concentration’ ‘of a very great number of experiences’ through which the person becomes wholly surrendered and consciously or unconsciously ‘lives the present moment of the past’ and become conscious ‘not of what is dead, but of what is already living’ in him/her (part I). Eliot introduces an image of individual development that is related to cultural development (tradition in his terminology). He considers the development as occurring only when the whole cultural repertoire is investigated and compared to a present situation. Of course, the researcher does not claim that a student-teacher is capable of this in his pre-service development program. She, however, argues that in order for them to later be able to do so as scholars, they should be provided with educational experiences that introduce the into communities to which they can be active members who may decide a change and bring about it.

The above account of development by Eliot does explain cultural development as the growth in cultural heritage through the individual. However, it does not highlight
whether the individual has developed or not. McCafferty (1994) defines individual development as

\[ \ldots \text{a complex process characterized by periodicity, unevenness in the development of different functions, metamorphosis or qualitative transformation of one form into another, interweaving of external and internal features, and adaptive processes than overcome impediments that the child encounters.} \] (P.131)

McCafferty remarks that development is a qualitative change, a metamorphosis, a qualitative transition from one state of understanding into another. The development is not seen as internal process rather it is an amalgam of the internal and the external in the individual. This entails that the individuals' experiences a change/development along with the cultural tools. This account of development as both cultural and individual can be accounted for from a dialogic sociocultural perspective. Wells (1999) clarifies this point from an educational perspective. He emphasizes that the object of learning is not just the enhancement of individual meaning potential, perceived as the construction of 'discipline-based knowledge, but the development of the resources of action, speech, and thinking' which will make it possible for the individual to effectively participate and creatively contribute to further practical, social, and intellectual activity. Here Wells widens the scope of language education to be not only meaning-oriented but also action-oriented. Wells reports a narrative written by Golding, *The inheritors*, about a group of people who have been unable to use language for thinking and planning. These have been invaded by another tribe who are much more developed in their use of language for thinking and planning. The people from the less developed tribe have been observing the full-developed speech mechanism of the other tribe as well as their activities. The more developed tribe people have kidnapped two young persons and killed others from the less developed tribe. The young persons have been taken to the island which is situated opposite the less developed tribe's place with a river in between. The less developed tribe used to cross the river once a year for their summer camp in the island using a log. The log of the less developed tribe is taken and the people observe the modern tribe sailing to the other side of the river. The young intelligent woman Fa from the less developed tribe
under the crises caused by the new men has been thinking of another way to cross the river. Seeing a tree stem lying over the terrace of the river she has an imaginative 'picture' of them crossing to the island on the tree stem, the log with a new meaning. Using the tree stem/the log they 'sail' to the island and get back of the kidnapped youngsters (pp.280-5). In Wells' account of development interaction is the catalyst for the emergence and pooling of people's uptake and cultural resources. Each person builds upon the sign he/she gets from another through distributed cognition. The signs are different; linguistic, visual, auditory. They grow into an image which is transferred into (an) idea(s). We have seen how Fa (a young member in the less developed tribe) visualized the word log differently after seeing the new men sailing. This has contributed in her development of the idea of using a tree stem to sail. Language plays an important role in transferring the images into (an) idea(s). The presence of the other and the problem facing the less developed tribe have contributed into Fa's interpreting the same sign 'log' differently, the first being a permanent/non-moving one and the other a moving one. The researcher interprets Golding's story for her purpose in the following way. The foreign other plays an important role in making an individual reason and see the situation differently. The researcher's account of Godling's story differs from Wells' account in that it focuses on the other here as the foreign other. This was not emphasized or discussed in Wells' account.

Moreover, the effect of the change, in contrast with Eliot's account, is seen at both levels the individual level and the cultural level; the individual being able to think differently and the culture being able to use a new tool (the moving log) to 'sail' to the island. Both resources of action and meaning making have developed by the individual and made available for the culture. The individual realizes a new use of the cultural resources that enable him/her to effectively contribute to the group. Eliot's account depicts an individual alone in an aesthetic activity and sees the constructive activity as enclosed within one culture only. The researcher sees in Golding's narrative an individual who differently interprets a cultural object (a tree stem) because of a cultural problem (the kidnapping of their youngsters). There is a persistent need in Fa to find a solution for the problem because of her group affiliation; the researcher calls it developmental cultural purpose. Both Golding's narrative and Eliot's account of development see
individual as part of a culture to which his/her development is consequential. Nonetheless, Golding's narrative shows the condition under which such development emerged among which are the presence of the other as well as the persistent cultural need of the individual to solve a problem. It will follow a different account by Bakhtin on intercultural dialogue.

Bakhtin (1986) explains the benefit that a culture gains through interaction with other culture(s) in the extract below.

> We raise new questions for a foreign culture, ones that it did not raise itself; we seek answers to our own questions in it; and the foreign culture responds to us by revealing to us its new aspects and new semantic depth. [...] Such a dialogic encounter of two cultures does not result in merging or mixing. Each retains its own unity and open totality, but they are mutually enriched. (p. 7)

The above statement of Bakhtin shows that intercultural dialogue can – and should be -- dialogic not competitive. As cultures crisscross each others' cultural contour, both the individuals and the cultures grow.

Comparing the above two accounts (Wells' and Eliot's) with that of Bakhtin on intercultural dialogue above, one finds the following. The interaction is seen between individual and his own culture in Eliot's account. In the interaction between two cultures the change occurs in the less developed tribe with the more developed tribe unaffected in Wells' account. In Bakhtin's perspective the effect must be double-edged happening to both the cultures. The researcher proposes that student-teachers can be enabled to consciously and unconsciously have a dialogue between their culture and the foreign scholars' cultures. These cultures may meet in the mind of the bilingual. The change that may occur in their minds need not necessarily be attached to either one language or the other; it can be both plus "and" at the same time. Hence, the researcher believes the Bakhtinian dialogic perspective extends sociocultural account of cultural development and intercultural dialogue.
Developmentally speaking in the writer’s country context; and what an English teacher as a professional suffers, the above developmental and dialogic orientations are much in demand. *English language teachers* in her country live a split between what they learn institutionally in terms of teaching a foreign language and what teaching language means in their native culture. This is discussed at length in Chapter Five. The gap is in the sense that the English language courses are form- and skill-oriented while those in Arabic are practice and community-oriented. Student-teachers are not trained to bridge the gap between what they learn in English departments and what other departments offer in Arabic medium courses. The gap deprives them from the opportunity to be in touch with a bigger community of language teachers around the world. They will always lag behind if this gap is not filled because the discourse of language teaching is different from the ELE in other places in the world. Moreover, there is no national academic journal that attaches community of ELE scholars together and help them publish and share ideas of development. One way out of this is to make what is given in the pre-service English-medium training courses fundamentally attached to their sociocultural upbringing. Moreover, they need to be involved in dialogue with what they get through the foreign language with what they culturally understand. The gap between the English courses and the cultural resources of the students may be bridged. Following this as the future English teachers, they may be able to contribute to the discourse of language teaching in general if they publish in international journals and in their country in particular. If we try the other way out; that is, if we prepare them to get in touch with other ELE professionals from other countries with no orientation towards how this can develop the language teaching discourse in their country, then an ethical question will be raised: What benefit the country will get from the whole language discourse if the country resources are not developed? If their discourse does not become developed enough to address international meaning making and action-orientation: how the cultures then be in dialogue. This is how the researcher sees cultural development and intercultural dialogue as interrelated.
1.1.3 Conclusion

The section (1.1) above consisted of two major subsections. In the first subsection the role of foreign languages in cultural development and intercultural dialogue was introduced and discussed. In the second subsection the researcher has introduced the main concepts cultural development and intercultural dialogue as well as the dialogic criteria (intersubjectivity, situatedness, and responsivity). A proposal has been advanced by the researcher to relate the dialogic criteria\(^6\) on the one hand and cultural development as well as intercultural dialogue on the other hand. She uses Eliot's famous essay *Tradition and Individual Talent*, Well's sociocultural account of development, McCafferty's definition of development, and Bakhtin's vision for the use of intercultural dialogue to justify her proposal. Then, within the context of her country, she has expounded the above idea for use in the pre-service teacher-development. To clarify her proposal further she has differentiated it from the critical-political, entrepreneurial, and globalizing views of language learning for development. Her orientation is basically developmentally dialogic and sociocultural. A foreign language is seen as a symbolic meditational tool that helps dialogue and development to occur. This proposal is in demand in her country because of the post-revolution situation of the country which is an invitation for a way out from the imitative view of educational experiences adopted in the country. Moreover, the researcher as a practicing teacher in the tertiary level in teacher education has felt the necessity of adopting a dialogic sociocultural perspective for upgrading of the educational experience to the realm of development and dialogue.

In the following section, she will present a short history of the ESP as presented in Swales' book, *Episodes in ESP*, with the purpose of showing how ESP, as the mother field of EAP, feels short of the demands of development and dialogue.

1.2 ESP (English for Specific Purposes (Recent Time))

The following section consists of two main sections. The first section gives a summary based on Swales' book of ESP, *Episodes in ESP*, theory and practice. The

\(^6\) These criteria will be elaborated upon with relation to cultural development and intercultural dialogue in chapter three.
second section gives a critique of the ESP practices and theory from a dialogic sociocultural perspective and the aims proposed for the thesis.

1.2.1 Rationale for Choosing ESP in General and Swales’ Account in Particular

The researcher celebrates the fact that learning foreign languages is no longer the privilege of the elites as it was in the dawn of the civilization. All people now have the right to and can get access to learning foreign languages. However, does learning a foreign language for specific purposes in recent times serve similar sociocultural purposes (i.e. cultural development and intercultural dialogue)? How far the theory and practice of ESP fulfill the above mentioned purposes? The researcher sets off her investigation for an answer to the above two questions by an account of the ESP theory and practice as expounded in Swales’ (1985). Swales' book, Episodes in ESP, covers the period between the seventies and the beginning of eighties. The reason why the researcher chooses Swales' account of ESP is Swales being an authority in the field and his long experience in teaching in the Middle East with many others like Dudly-Evans. Many ESP materials were specially designed for the Middle East university students and were used there. This is also the context in which the researcher is interested with her country being one of the Middle East countries. The book also covers a long time span, about twelve years. It includes a wide array of directions and theoretical orientations in the field and marks its departure from the mechanical approaches for learning foreign languages that were dominant in the 50s and 60s. In addition, the book gives a plethora of illustrations of the tools and means used by the practitioners in the applications of their theoretical orientations. This enables the researcher to comment on both the theory and the methodology; and critically illustrates the answers of the questions asked above with examples from the reality of the ESP practitioners’ classrooms. Furthermore, English for Academic Purposes (EAP) which is the branch that will be focused upon though will come later in the thesis is a handmaiden of ESP. The researcher uses the ESP approach as her umbrella approach to EAP since it originally began as an approach to teaching foreign students. In addition, it is a student-centered approach which is the stance to teaching taken by the researcher: see section 1.1.2 above. Therefore, it will be
more likely to argue, from this approach to EAP, for developmental orientations in relation to students and the tools they are expected to produce as prospective professionals. For these particular reasons and for extending the orientation of the EAP for developmental and dialogue as specific purposes the researcher includes the following section on ESP. Furthermore, the skill focused on most in the practical frameworks below is writing in relation to reading which will the same skill focused upon by the researcher.

1.2.2. A Bird’s Eye-View of ESP, Swales’ Legacy

In ESL/EFL literature, the EST (English for Science and Technology) field has set the stage for separation from the larger field (ELT). The ESP practitioners set the stage for this separation with Barber’s (1962) descriptive study that differentiates the syntax and vocabulary of Scientific English from the ‘General’ or ‘Literary’ English. Three years later, A.J. Herbert produced the first ESP textbook (1965) for ‘students of engineering who have already mastered the elements of English, and who [...] wanted to use their knowledge of the language to read books on their own subjects’. Herbert’s selection of specific sentence patterns and isolation of field-specific frequency and trouble-causing vocabulary established ESP a genuine approach in ELT.

The selection of specific vocabulary and structure for teaching enhanced the tendency for specificity in the ESP field. The first discussion of specific actual teaching situation in the domain appeared in Higgins’ (1967) textbook. Three problems in Thailand’s ESL context were identified by him, namely: students’ demotivation due to past failure, variety of levels in large classes, and lack of time allotted to English on the timetable. His solutions for these problems figured in more rigid selection of ‘frame’ vocabulary and content passages which he identified in collaboration with the Science staff in the same institute. Further, students were assigned tasks specific to their field of study; trained to reproduce content knowledge; and write reports using tabular data.

On an opposite site in the world (in Chili), Ewer and his colleague Hughes-Davies conducted a nationwide investigation to gather qualitative data on the language used in different branches of EST (English for Science and Technology) as well as its use. Their
effort resulted in a concise summary of the EST register from the General English courses register. This was not the only edition to the field to originate in Chili. Another contribution was establishing an ESP training program. Student-teachers were trained to scrutinize their subjects' instructional materials and prepare suitable teaching aids for their future teaching.

The above experiences of ESP practitioners reflected a rigid focus on EST form and content isolated from contextual references. A group of scholars, namely the Washington group (John E. Lackstrom, Larry Selinker, and Louis P. Trimble), argued that a close examination of purely grammatical notions in relation to technical information led them to maintain that grammatical choices were determined by rhetorical considerations. In an influential article, ‘Grammar and Technical English’ (1972), these scholars complained that EST textbook materials and methodology were sentence-oriented and lacked important relationships to usage and content. Their main argument is that '[rhetorical] considerations’ ‘include judgment concerning the order of the presentation of information, within the paragraph and within the total piece of which the paragraph is apart, and judgment on clarity and precision of exposition'. This group of ESP scholars opened the door for the discourse analysis for material production and along with John Swales, Henry Widdowson and Patrick Allen launched the rhetorical-functional approach in the ESP.

The release of the English in Focus series edited by Widdowson and Allen and its Middle East rival the Nucleus series edited by Martin Bates and Tony Dudley-Evans (1976) grounded the rhetorical-functional/communicative approach with their focus on communicative functions such as giving instructions, defining, classifying, exemplifying, etc. These two publications produced an established tradition within the ESP field that maintained the communicative syllabus design, developed specific materials for specific groups, and always searched for utilizable relationships between functions and forms.

The fore-mentioned three principles in ESP were challenged from within the movement by Martin Phillips and Clarence Shettlesworth. Their points of departure were, on the one hand, their recognition that the language classroom was, in communicative terms, a decidedly unusual sort of place, and on the other hand, their realization that writing of traditional ESP materials was a more fallible activity than had been supposed. In a
challenging and seminal paper (How to Arm your Students: A consideration of two approaches to providing materials for ESP, 1978) they advocated designing activities that encourage students to transfer the language learnt in the classroom in communicative situations and using authentic materials that students are likely to face in real life. They maintained that these could be graded in terms of text difficulty and task difficulty. These, they proceeded, would allow a more authentic view to the students’ real English-using situation than was likely in a classroom provided with fully prescribed units, enable them to take greater responsibility, and oblige teachers to lose some of their undisputed authority. With this argument the ESP field split into two campaigns, one with the pre-prepared materials and the other with the authentic materials.

Apart from the above contrasting arguments from the principle offered by Allen and Widdowson on the one hand and Phillips and Shettesworth on the other, and independent from the restrictions imposed by a textbook format, a number of ESP specialists composed educationally imaginative materials suitable for their students’ learning situations. Karl Dronic, James Herblich, Paul Fanning, and Phil Skeldon (1978) brought back the crafts of materials with practical exercises that incorporate grammatical concepts with scientific concepts, imaginatively illustrating the idea of outlining in a chart form, and charting variety of forms for the same function in their context of use. Along similar lines with these four material specialists, James Herbolich (1979) developed the idea of project work as a means of getting away from the textbook. He proposed that they could get students to find and assimilate materials themselves for their projects, and practice study skills. T.F. Johns and Dudley-Evans believe that the language teacher ‘needs to be able to grasp the conceptual structure of a subject his students are studying’. Therefore a close collaboration between language and subject teachers can be made to work and this is yet another way of bringing relevance and communicative reality of ESP activities.

In a different position from that of Dudley-Evans and T.F. Johns, John Moor et al. (1980)- in their textbook, Reading and Thinking in English: Discourse in action)-presented a position supporting an approach to material design suitable for a wide range of students in general ‘English for Academic Purposes’ and not subject-specific. Their
argument is that ‘inter-disciplinary themes or general academic interest’ as well as ‘study skills’ can be taught and are useful for a variety of disciplines.

As a reaction to the above directions in ESP Water Hutchinson and Water question both the need for subject-specific materials and teaching their content. They state that the question is not whether the content of Mechanical Engineering is differing from that of Telecommunications, but whether the study of Mechanical Engineering texts is the most suitable way for preparing a student for a course in Mechanical engineering. They proceed that the analysis of the target situation has produced superficial repertoire of target performance and neglected the competence that underlies them and enable students to cope. They address performance as a changing phenomenon for which students need to be prepared. Their article cited in Swales’ brings to focus a question that has always been critical in the field of education, that of the balance between the ‘how’ and the ‘what’. It has been argued that knowing the ‘what’ and the ‘how’ of a language performance of certain situational repertoire does not prepare learners for real life. Real life is changing and non-stable. Thus, they should be taught in a way to be prepared for this.

One more interest has occurred in the field through Elaine Tarone, Sharon Dwyer, Susan Gillette, and Vincent Icke (1981) who raise questions of the true nature of deep linguistic structure from the position of the researcher of journal article as well as the implications a writer should be aware of when making choices in the process of writing. They analyzed two journal articles written by two expert writers of science and proved that stylistic discoursal choices vary from one person to another.

Swales comments on the widening and quickly evolving field of ESP:

Despite superficial differences between these various approaches to ESP, some of the motivations are shared. For one thing, there was agreement that the ESP classroom should offer more than linguistic face-validity. [...] Indeed, it was beginning to be thought close attention to subject-specific language might well produce an unhealthy narrowness of focus and create in the participants a dangerous and false sense of security. (P. 174)
The genre approach is the new direction adopted by Swales (1990) and many ESP practitioners. The genre approach will be presented and discussed in detail in the second chapter.

1.2.3 Discussion (Dialogic Sociocultural Criteria for ESP)

The researcher identifies two major currents in Swales' account of ESP identifies two major currents; one advocates rigid specificity and the other argues for more flexible position. The writer's position is based on the quotation provided at the end of the writer's summary of Swales' account: 'Indeed, it was beginning to be thought close attention to subject-specific language might well produce an unhealthy narrowness of focus...'. The two currents the researcher identifies can also be seen as phases in the growth circle of the field rather than as two opposing currents. The first phase results in specification of registers (content and form as well as usage). This is represented by Barber, A.J.Herbert, Higgins, Ewer, and Hughes-Davies who strictly specified content and forms as input and the expected output of the student. It is also represented by the rhetorical-functional group whose main proponents are Swales, Widdowson, Selinker, Allen, and Dudley-Evans. This group advocates model situations, contexts, structures to be taught to learners as 'blueprints' or basis for them to build upon in their real life need. The form of cognition required from students is artificial. They have to pick up the 'one correct' answer that the textbook writer has provided because they consciously know that on this very answer that they will be assessed on. This model assumes that the logic underpinning teaching conditions and those of language use is not only the same, but it is so natural that its value to the learning student is self-evident, Lian (2004). Definitely they are not the same. Life experiences are innumerable; and, once they are related to student experiential cognition of their own knowledge, the result will undoubtedly be a lifelong developing experience. The contribution of the latter group, according to Tudor (1996), can be seen in two main levels as far as learner-centeredness is concerned. First, the learners' communicative goals as realized in interactive situations are given a prominent place in course design. Second, on the methodological level, it fostered an experiential form of language study in which the real-world experience and concerns of the learners were given a focal role in learning activities (p. 11). However, and in spite of
the experiential focus, the learners were expected to accommodate for preconceived learning objectives.

The second phase results in English for life movement in the field. The advocates of this movement vary in the way they saw 'life'. Some of the theorists of this movement focused on the authenticity of the materials and tasks for life (real life tasks). This is represented by Martin Philips and Clarence Shettesworth. Some stressed conceptual structures to bridge the gap between subject-specific teaching of English and teaching linguistic structures as well as teaching interdisciplinary thinking skills. This group is represented by T.F. Johns, Dudly-Evans, and John Moor. Later consequence of the work of this group and others is the subdivision of ESP into various branches. ESP has been further divided into EAP (English for academic purposes), EOP (English for Occupational purposes), and EST (English for Science and Technology). EAP has been further branched into ESAP (English for specific Academic Purposes) and EGAP (English for General Academic Purposes), R. R. Jordan (1989) and Street and Lefstein (2007). One more branching for EAP appeared in (2001) John Flowerdew and Matthew Peacock's book. EAP has been divided into occupational and academic. These divisions occurred, I believe, out of conviction that the mission of the mother field ESP is providing specific language registers and skills for each branch of study. The divisions, it seems, have been divided according to the specific mission the branch performs within the umbrella of ESP. For example, if the aim is to prepare students for the specific purpose of getting competence and skill of a particular occupation, then it is EOP. The same is true for all the other branches.

The third group in the second phase of the ESP emphasizes the changing nature of real life and the diversity of human experience. Thus, they recommend that teaching should prepare students for diversity. They emphasize the changing nature of real life, the diversity of human experience, and the need for change. The main advocates of this group are Huchinson, Susan Gillette, and Water. The major contribution of this group to the field is shedding light on the mechanical nature of the approach to needs analysis and inadequate attention to the process side of learning, Tudor, 1996.

The focus on specificity against general basic skill resulted in an intense debate between the common core hypothesis/ narrow angle EAP proponents and wide angle EAP. The
first group represented by Bloor and Bloor (1986) recommend teaching a set of linguistic structures and vocabulary predominant in all linguistic registers of all branches of knowledge. The second group is represented by Widdowson (1983) and Hutchinson and Waters (1987) who rejected the common core thesis on the basis that it is a kind of mechanical 'training' that is different from 'education'. They argued for broader skills and competencies which focus on 'purposeful activity' rather than specific language; (cited in Flowerdew & Peacock (ibid), pp. 16-18). The debate within the field extended within the educationally-oriented group to include those who argue for specific skills teaching and general skills teaching. The former group is represented by Widdowson (2003) who believes that ESP must connote the specificity of the context of use rather than a specific purpose inextricably related to a specific register (p. 61). He argues that such uses are generally unpredictable; and, in the case they are it is not possible to predict which uses students would need to be prepared for. Therefore, specificity can be thought of ‘in more general terms in the sense that all language use depends on being contextually specific’ (p. 71). Then, rather than specific capabilities, he recommends, educators have to focus on more general capabilities which would serve as an investment for subsequent learning (p.176). This implies that Widdowson and many others in his group, Spack, Raimes, Zamel, etc., are for strategy-like capabilities that have general applications and are adaptive in nature. They are more concerned with learning process and learner as construct. They do not interfere into learner’s potential but leave to him/her to adapt these capabilities in future context. This implies a pedagogic position that treats learners, to use Allwright and Hanks’ (2009) words, ‘as “an undifferentiated mass”’. This position is quite different from the sociocultural position which treats learners as human beings. They have different potentials which should be attended to differently by the teachers, Brown and Ferrara (1985). Taking cultural development into account, an ESP pedagogy that considers learning and ignores learner cannot serve this purpose. The potential of learning will be exploited by the learner who will have sociocultural purposes to serve or change. Thus, the access for the whole educational effort should be both the learner and learning.

The second group which stands vis-à-vis Widdowson’s group is the one represented by Lea, Street and Bhatia. It campaigns for specific, discipline-based skills to
be taught to learners. They argue that generic skills can also be taught for uses of language that carry clear disciplinary values for their importance to communicative practice of particular disciplines (Street and Lefstein (ibid), pp 11-12). However, the main stream in this perspective reflected rigidity in teaching genre form and generic practices for reproduction purposes of the existing academic community. This stands in contrast with developmental and dialogic view of education that aims for enabling students to be knowledge and meaning makers.

To conclude the above discussion, the account of ESP makes it clear the growing awareness in the field of teaching English for specific purposes of its own mission towards life. The view of language as an enclosed system of different registers to be taught and assessed has changed. Language is seen as a conceptual system that can serve life purposes (thinking, study skills, concept learning, etc.). However, this latter conception of the purpose of English was still narrow because of the rigid boundaries of subjects and disciplines. Students were taught subject-specific, interdisciplinary critical thinking scheme, or prescribed study skills identified also within discipline boundaries. As a result, voices from the field appealed that real life is unstable and changing; and professionals must be prepared for the diversity of human life. At this stage of the writer’s comment on Swales’ account, the researcher finds the answer to her questions (whether the recent ESP can lead to cultural development and intercultural dialogue; and whether ESP theoretical and practical formulations can help do so) negative.

She uses the criteria which she stated as mandatory for the achievement of the above purposes to address the idea of why ESP theoretical and practical formulations may not lead to cultural development and intercultural dialogue in general.

Beginning with situatedness, situating the students within a specific field or subject boundary and enclosing them within their conceptual framework are narrow minded orientations to pragmatism. ESP sees the discipline as situated in vacuum and related to nothing but similar disciplines. This is unhealthy view of development because disciplines are structures within the large edifice of societies. Societies expect these disciplines to add to them and contribute to their development. The researcher reports an anecdote by William G. Perry (1983), an emeritus professor of education in Harvard University, to illustrate her point. He stated that in 1942 he made a manual of effective
study methods for his students. After one year he discovered that his grandfather had composed an identical manual for his academy students in 1842. The researcher reckons that the one hundred years (i.e. from 1842 to 1942) have not brought about a change in the way two of the most prominent scholars see study methods. She believes that looking outside the discipline and outside the national culture of its members may enable us evade repeating ourselves and bring about healthy maneuver. This criterion of situatedness of the professional in and outside a field and a national culture, the writer claims, is not available in ESP. Full account of the meaning of situatedness is provided in chapter three.

The second criterion is responsivity. It demands that the person actively interprets and responds in the sense of using active understanding. It entails productivity and possibility of creative acts. Students’ responsivity springs from their situatedness as novices in particular fields of study, prospective professionals of tomorrow, and individuals in the larger society. Stenhouse (1975) reporting Eisner agrees that the concern of education in the disciplines is

> giving mastery of the cultural tool already available as well as to make possible creative responses which go beyond what is available and help to develop it and individualize it. (Emphasis added, p. 78)

Stenhouse sees students as creative individuals who can think on their own rather than being passive ones. He also thinks of disciplines as communities rather than ‘encyclopedic collection of facts’ to be ‘contrived’, in the Widdowsonnian sense, to students for future use. Obviously, the mainstream ESP does not see students as responsive individuals. Its theoretical framework lacks the element of responsivity. These elements, the researcher argues, are present in the criteria she is proposing for broadening ESP scope of situatedness, responsivity, and, as it will be explained in the following section, intersubjectivity.

The last criterion is intersubjectivity. Teacher’s role as implied in Swales’ account of ESP framework is that of a person of undisputed authority. A teacher in this ESP account is a skillful person whose job is to impart a particular content knowledge, a skill, thought structure, or language structure to students. Teachers’ talk with students cannot
be characterized of being intersubjective because the teachers do not need to know students' perspective to respond to them. They already 'know' students' supposed perspective and they use 'test questions' to verify it. Even students' interpretation and responses to texts cannot be characterized as intersubjective. Teachers direct students' interpretation and response to texts in particular ways to follow particular 'scripts'. The way intersubjectivity intersects with other criteria has no place in the above account of ESP. The researcher believes that ESP teaching and learning activities, as seen from the above account, as well as material collection and design, as seen from Munby's (1978) communicative syllabus design, do not consider cultural development and intercultural dialogue especially at the tertiary level in their agenda. Munby views the communicative competence as consisting of sociocultural and sociosemantic dimensions which can be operationalized at the performance level in a discoursal form. He pre-specifies the rhetorical/communicative functions to be transmitted to students in the ESP programs. This makes his syllabus a product-oriented (since it identifies the ends at the fore set); and marginalizes the students' role to passive receivers of ready-made language functions. (Another aspect of intersubjectivity is that of enabling students have active interactions with theorists. This aspect will be addressed in chapter three.) Students of the twenty first century are expected to develop a professional interest that is developmental and dialogic in orientation. Foreign language education for specific purpose, the researcher contends, is supposed to play an essential role in shaping their prospective professional inquiry in that direction. The above criteria, she thinks, may enable ESP to address cultural development and intercultural dialogue if properly-oriented towards these aims within a dialogic sociocultural framework.

In the end, the researcher does not propose the criteria as the treat for the ills of the ESP mainstream. But, she proposes, the absence of these criteria in their dialogic sociocultural sense points out the transmission orientation in the field. Their presence within the ESP framework of academic writing, the researcher reckons, may enable addressing development and dialogue in the field.
At this stage, the researcher finds it essential to provide an account of the dialogic perspective explain how it meshes with the sociocultural theory with relevance to the above criteria. The following section is an attempt to do so.

1.3 Proposing a Dialogic Sociocultural Perspective

The researcher begins this section with Rupert Wegerif's (2008) announcement: 'When the term dialogic is linked explicitly to theory, Bakhtin is often located within the neo-Vygotskyan sociocultural tradition' (p. 348). The reason for this is the differences identified between Vygotsky's monological/dialectical and Bakhtin's dialogical views of interaction (Wegerif & Mercer (1997)). The sociocultural approach has defined itself as neo-Vygotskyan to point out certain discontinuity from Vygotsky's original cultural-historical approach (Matusov (2008a), (2008b)). A major difference between the neo-Vygotskyan and the cultural-historical traditions in the Vygotskyan paradigm springs from Bakhtin-rooted/sometimes self-reached convictions anti-Hegelianism and anti-Marxism account of dialectics of the neo-Vygotskyans/socioculturalists (Wegerif (ibid); Matusov (2008b)). Dialectics ends in synthetics where one of the voices disappears in favor of the other, Bakhtin (1986). Moreover, Vygotsky's Hegelian conception of understanding as the ability to concretize the abstract has been replaced by the notion of context and situatedness as affected by the participants' goals, discourses, and affordances, Matusov (2008b). Sharing a neo-Vygotskyan sociocultural perspective, the researcher takes a dialogic sociocultural stance for her proposal for teaching academic writing. The base of the argument in this section is based on the perception of the researcher of Bakhtin's dialogic ideas as enriching the neo-Vygotskyan's sociocultural ideas. The base of the researcher's attempt is Bakhtin's belief that the dialogue between two things when their contours are meeting will enrich both the things as well as Vygotsky's understanding of the development of the scientific concepts as occurring when they are decontextualised from their original contexts (Marcova, 1982) and 're-contextualized' by the individual's purposes and sociocultural 'affordnaces'. These tools justify the researcher's effort to set off an exploration to broadly integrate their

---

*The research uses the word re-contextualize in place of the word concretize originally used by Vygotsky to assert her affiliation to the sociocultural orientation to situatedness as not denoting only the concrete situation.*
orientations into a dialogic sociocultural perspective for cultural development and intercultural dialogue in an EFL teacher-development context. Her attempt realizes in two main arguments: one is that dialogic sociocultural approach is based on interactionism, contextualism, communicative constructionism, and double dialogicality; and the other is discussing the nature of the dialogue in the classroom from this perspective for the purpose of cultural development and intercultural dialogue. The researcher will end the section by pointing to the idea of the potential the proposed perspective has for teaching academic writing in pre-service teacher development pre-service for the above purposes as it fares well the ESP framework.

Dialogue in Bakhtinian essence is a meaningful, purposeful, and accumulative interaction between a self and its referential object/other (Bakhtin, 1984). In common sense terms dialogue can be viewed as a form of conversation - a particular ‘serious format’. Like dialogue, conversation is ‘a kind of social relation that engages its participants’. Through dialogue people are supposed to create new understandings (Smith, 2001, p.6). It differs from a conversation in that a conversation may or may not be a chained, purposeful exchange whereas dialogue necessitates for its existence a meaning-making exchange (Alexander, 2005).

The terms ‘dialogue’, ‘dialogism’, and ‘dialogicality’ are sometimes used almost interchangeably, (Per Linell, 2003). There must be a different referent for each term as follows:

[...J “dialogue” refers to actual interactions between or within individuals in situations and/or within sociocultural practices; “dialogism” refers to general epistemological framework [... ;] and “dialogicality” refers to “dialogical” properties (roughly pertaining to interaction and contexts) of language, discourse[.] and cognition. (p. 5)

Holquist (1990) states that dialogism especially as expounded by Mikhail Bakhtin is an epistemology: a way of constructing knowledge. It grows into a broad theoretical orientation that includes all the theories that are concerned with dialogic relationships and dialogic knowledge construction. The researcher identifies the sociocultural theory as one
of those theories and thus justifies her framework to be a fusion of both dialogic and sociocultural assumptions and orientations. She also focuses on the uses and rationales for dialogue to be the base of classroom interaction for the achievement of the proposed aims. Dialogic sociocultural perspective then represents a particular approach to engagement of cognition and discourse for meaning/knowledge making.

In Bakhtin's dialogic view, we find an attempt to **argue for a view of language for the production of meaning**. Vološinov, a member of the Bakhtinian circle, (1973) in his famous book *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* raised questions against this dilemma. Vološinov identifies two major traditions in language philosophy: the individualistic subjectivism and the abstract objectivism (Dentith (1995)). His main idea in the book is to raise two points about language: its sociality and its materiality. In his discussion of the above two traditions of language, Vološinov rejects the dualism behind the two schools of thought about language; that is that language belongs either to the individual or the society. The individual subjectivism stems from Humboldt's well known dictum about language. It is ‘that [language] is not ergon (completed work) but energeia (creative process)’ (Dentith (ibid), p. 23). On the other hand, the abstract objectivism is rooted in Saussure's dualism langue (the underlying language system or code) and parole (speech). Vološinov objects to Saussure's choice to focus on langue on the basis that it can be systematically studied and ignoring the parole. Vološinov has attempted to bridge the gap between the two traditions (the individual subjectivism of Humboldt and the abstract objectivism of Saussure) by proposing: ‘Language is a continuous generative process implemented in the social-verbal interaction of speaker;' cited in Dintith (ibid), p. 26. He maintained from the Saussurean tradition the notion of the sociality of language and from the individual subjectivism the sense of the productivity of language (Dentith, (ibid), p. 26). He does this by basing his argument on the utterance as the unit of language which is related to a particular context through an evaluative attitude of the speaker. This active evaluative attitude, says Dentith, takes you toward sociology in addition to the speaker, the topic, and the interlocutor. This pragmatism of Vološinov, Dentith adds, is extended through his distinction between theme and meaning. He cites Vološinov's *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*: 
Theme is a complex, dynamic system of signs that attempts to be adequate to a given instant of generative process. Theme is reaction by the consciousness in its generative process to the generative process of existence. Meaning is the technical apparatus for the implementation of theme. (Dentith, (1995), p. 29)

Dentith explains the above quotation as follows:

Each utterance has a theme which relies upon meaning; meaning only ever *exists in potentia* (though this does not imply that the socially created mutli-accentuality of the sign is fixed or diminished in use). Thus there is no denotative core to a word from which the connotations stray, for all uses are equally connotative; all uses are charged with an evaluative accent, that is, all uses take up an attitude of some kind in the act of utterance. (p. 29)

This meaning potential, Dentith continues, does not only lie in the generative process of the theme and meaning interaction. It also occurs in the interaction between interlocutors (p. 29). In relation to the attempt made by Vološinov to bridge the gap between the individual and the social Bakhtin also rejected the dualism between langue and parole. His famous formulations of genres as both intentional and social show his lifelong belief that the formal can change the individual and vice versa. In the following passage he (1986) invites into seeing genres within the realm of his dialogic scheme:

Hence, the more or less distinct dialogization of secondary genres, the weakening of their monological composition, the new sense of the listener as a partner-interlocutor, new forms of finalization of the whole, and so forth. Where there is style there is genre. The transfer of style from one genre to another not only alters the way a style sounds, under conditions of a genre unnatural to it, but also violates or renews the given genre. (P.66)
Here, Bakhtin criticizes the monological view of genre composition and directs an invitation to adopting a dialogical view which involves real interlocutors towards whom the intentionality of the individual is directed. In a particular situation the intentionality (here the word style represents intentionality/individuality) plays a big role in the formation of genre (genre in Bakhtin's sense has broad connotation to all forms of action). From Bakhtin's view, genre exists only with the intention of the individual. He points out that individual can change genre and vice versa. This dialogic view of the individual as a meaning maker with meaning not necessarily being the conventional one justifies an argument for using the foreign language as a tool for meaning/knowledge making. This argument differs from the mainstream view for using language in the EFL classroom as the ends and the means.

This is because for Bakhtin, language is constitutive of thought and because dialogism, according to Perlinell (2003), has the following assumptions:

- Interactionism, he maintains, is a constitutive element of communication and cognition. 'Interactions', he adds, 'involve interdependencies that cannot be reduced to outer cause-effect relations.' Therefore, 'interactions [...] rather than speech acts' are the 'basic constituents of discourse,' p. 2.

- Contextualism is based on the assumption that we cannot make sense of the discourse outside of its relevant context, and, at the same time, contexts become what they are because of the discourse that occurs within them. The contexts, he states, include co-texts (also with non-verbal aspects), situations, activity types, interlocutors' interactional biographies and cultural knowledge (the latter including language, encyclopaedia, [and] discourses on a Foucaultian sense). (Square brackets are mine; p. 2)

- Communicative constructionism is 'the active sense-making of the linguistic and communicative processes'. Knowledge is constituted through communication; 'in the sociohistorical genesis of knowledge, language, communicative genres
However, constructionism should not be perceived as denying the existence of the world or reality as being out there. Per Linell asserts:

Meaning is dialogically constituted, made in dialogue (cognition and communication), with reference to the world and against the background of the world, which is then dialogically appropriated and dialogically recognised. (p. 3)

- Double dialogicality is 'a combination of interactionism and social constructivism'. It subsumes that there is a 'dialogue within both situations and traditions, i.e. situated interaction and sociocultural praxis'. He clarifies:

At both planes of situation and sociocultural praxis, interaction with others (and their communicative products) is pertinent and incessant. On the one hand, we can talk about (asymmetrically distributed) co-authorship of situated meaning in situations [...], on the other hand, we have the socially distributed) shareholding in a common language (sedimentations of aspects of co-authorships in participants' biographies), i.e. as members of cultural communities, in the sociohistorically sustained community of praxis, we partially share meanings [...]. (P. 4)

Vygotsky's sociocultural theory shares with dialogism the assumption that mind is constructed through dialogue. Vygotsky says that 'the individual develops into what he/she is through what he/she produces for others' (Cited in Wells & Alanz (2006) p. 43). This construction of the meaning, Wells and Alanz above, is dialogic as it depends on the response of the other. Without the other there will not be a dialogue. Both Bakhtin and Vygotsky share the idea of the polyphony of the utterance/word, i.e. its dialogicality whether inner or external (Akhutina, 2003). This belief in the necessity of dialogue for meaning construction makes sociocultural theory share dialogism the assumption of interactionism and communicative constructionism. Besides, Vygosky's main concept of mediation and the sociocultural base of the activity show that sociocultural theory shares the assumptions of double dialogicality and contextualism with dialogism. This

---

9 There is a full account of mediation and argument for perceiving it from a dialogic sociocultural perspective in chapter two.
insight of the researcher is supported by Wertsch and Cole's (1996) observation that Vygotsky's argument on the issues of mediation 'bears a striking similarity to the recent movement in cognitive science associated with the notion of “distributed cognition” and “situated learning”' (p. 151). In situated learning mind, culture, history, and the social world are seen as interrelated and constituting each other (Lave, 1991). The researcher attempts to extend the idea of distributed cognition to interaction across cultures through texts and to argue for meaning/knowledge making that is culturally developmental. She saw the above assumptions -- interactionism, contextualism, communicative constructionism, and double dialogicality -- shared by in sociocultural theory and dialogism. The researcher, seeing Bakhtin's dialogism and sociocultural theory as compatible with each other, will provide a conceptual framework of the above assumptions from her dialogic sociocultural perspective for her purpose.

The first assumption, interactionism, is not only external but also internal. Dialogue occurs between and within individuals’ minds. Interaction plays an important role in the construction of the communal meaning; and the way participants perceive it. Meaning and cognition are developmental. They do not mainly depend on preconception, prejudice, predetermined meanings, etc. They can constitute intersubjectively dialogic meaning making across times and spaces and add to each others' understanding. The idea that the researcher wants to advance here if a student-teacher is given the chance to interact with ideas by thinkers who belong to different cultures and different fields and compare them with related sociocultural ideas, some new meanings may occur and some new ideas may emerge. The emergence of these/this idea(s)/knowledge may be new to the students' culture at two levels, the field culture and the broad culture, together or in isolation from each other. The rationale for this from interactionism is that thought and meaning making develop in and through interaction. If the communicants belong to two different cultures (both the narrow and the broad), the researcher believes, the scope for discovering new meanings may be wider.

The second assumption, contextualism, conceives context in a broader sense than it was traditionally seen; for example as in Gillian Brown and George Yule's (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Context in its dialogic conception includes - in addition to participants, topic, setting, channel, code, message-form, event, and purpose – discoursal
elements created through the participants’ agenda, historical and cultural. This implies that participants can constitute the reference themselves past, present or future; the reference is not tied to culturally-determined meaning. Participants can varnish new contexts as they intersubjectively situate themselves within the context of a particular discourse. For example, if a scholar discusses a particular issue in a field of knowledge, the purpose/goal for which she uses the discourse of the field is subject to the scholar’s intention. Texts from other fields may broaden the particular context of the scholar’s field if the purpose is to enrich the field. The scholar can insert from his/her reading agenda texts that have played a role in his/her professional development. These, if used skilfully to interpret the scholar’s field texts, may result in a new interpretation of the meaning already regulated in the field. In the case of a foreign scholar, the case for new interpretation may even be stronger. The texts created in similar or related field in his/her culture and his/her mother tongue can be used as tools for interpreting foreign texts. This may lead to the growth of the scholar. If the scholar will continue a career that involves theorising or productive writing of any kind, his/her newly-constituted idea might constitute a premise for further intercultural dialogue and culture development. The researcher, thus, argues that if student-teachers are encouraged to do this in their pre-service academic writing classroom with the focus on creating meaning/knowledge, they might be able to bring about cultural development and intercultural dialogue in their academic production in future.

The third assumption, communicative constructionism, entails that knowledge-building takes place through communication, again internal and external; external as when different people exchange meaning; and internal as when individuals reset previous interactions to construct meanings. When student-teachers internalize their interaction with the theorists mediated through texts, certain transformation might occur. The nature of the foreign language as a semiotic tool might play a role in simulating related signs in the students’ minds from their sociocultural background. The interaction of both sign systems may bring about responsive meaning/knowledge construction in terms of new formulation of the field and the culture. Novices need to be encouraged to see knowledge and meaning creation as communication. They need to perceive reading and writing as
communication activities for knowledge active perception and production. Thus, they may be able to play they rules in cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

The fourth assumption, double dialogicality, can be explicated in terms of the researcher's criteria as double situatedness. Interaction takes place within a particular situation as well as sociocultural situations. Participants draw upon their cultural repertoire (the tradition in Eliot's sense) of meaning and at the same time generate meanings that emerge in the here and now interaction (the microgenetic level in the Vygostskyian sense). For example, when two scholars interact face to face or through texts, their interaction is governed by culturally-established meanings of the field. They may also during interaction make connections during interaction that they could not have constructed if such situated interaction has not taken place. This process is not the writer's imaginative construction. It is a historical fact that we live and encounter all the time in our life. An Arabian scholar reads for a foreign scholar through the medium of a foreign language, English for example. Their interactional context is governed with the discourse of the field. The Arabian scholar interprets the writing of the foreign scholar in the light of the need he culturally feels important for his/her time and place. He might improve the content and the ideas presented by the foreign scholar seeing it from his/her different sociocultural perspective. Hence, double dialogicality is double situatedness that might entail responsivity.

All the above four assumptions constitute the basis and rationale for adopting the dialogic sociocultural approach as an umbrella for teaching academic writing for cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

In the following part of this section, the researcher will discuss the nature of the dialogic relation that should be enabled in the classroom interaction (between teachers and students) and through the classroom (between students and field/other fields scholars. Before doing so, she introduces a historical account by Biesta about how the relationship between teacher and students developed throughout the history of education in Germany. The reason for introducing such an account is that it provides a view of the gradual awareness of the position of the leaner educationally as a responsive partner of the dialogue. Biesta (1995) describes dialogue as 'a particular kind of pedagogical communicative relation: a conversational interaction directed intentionally towards
teaching and learning'. He stresses that dialogue is 'non-teleological'; i.e. it has no pre-determined outcome. 'It tends towards a decentred and non authoritative view of learning'. It also aims at 'effecting a change' in and by the communication partners themselves (pp. 1, 2, 6-8).

Biesta traces the origins of the dialogic pedagogy to the educators' interest in the nature of the relationship between the educator and the educated. The views of this relationship gradually change from a manipulative to communicative/dialogic. He begins his account with the German pedagogy represented by Wilhelm Dilthey and his student Herman Nohl. Biesta calls this pedagogy the manipulative pedagogy which has been dominant until the sixties. He maintains that Dilthey acknowledges that 'education is a function of society' that is realised in a personal relationship between the educator and the educated. In such educational relationship the educator's intentional activities, Dilthey thinks, coincide with the 'educatability' of the learner. For Dilthey's student, Nohl, 'the foundation of education is situated in the “educative community”... between a mature and immature human being'. The essential difference between both the educators, Biesta states, is that Dilthey focuses on the educatability and Nohl on the learner's will. He comments that though education is seen as an intentional activity, the educational process is characterised by a one-directional or unilateral intentionality, that of the educator. This implies negative anthropology; i.e. the personhood of the learner is produced by the intentional activities of the teacher. In the second phase in which the 'existentialism' dominated the educational thought, a 'more realistic' view of the educational relationship occurred; the 'idea of unilateral intentionality was replaced by “broken” intentionality'. 'Educational authority [is] supplemented by educational impotence.' In other words, 'the educator and educated [are] in the same anthropological position.' This phase, however, does not offer a theoretical formulation because, according to its proponents, 'the fallibility of education can only be existentially experienced, it cannot be put into theory'. In the third phase the Symbolic interactionism is the leading paradigm. Education, in this phase, 'is considered to be a process of social interaction, constituted by the interpretive actions of all participants'. Biesta comments that this phase represents a shift from manipulative to dialogic conception of education. This depicts educational
relationship between the learner and the teacher as a structurally symmetrical relationship (pp. 4-6).

The above dialogic view of educational relationship as necessarily symmetrical has been accepted by Marcová. She (1982) explains this point in the following quotation:

The education is an asymmetrical process in the sense that there is one who knows more and has control over the content and methods of theorising about the subject. However, the person who is educated is given the chance of sharing the control. [...] Education is not something that is done to the student but both the teacher and the student actively participate. It is a two-way process in which both participants change and grow. In such a process, one participant recognises the other as an equal and respects his rights in turn-taking and expressing his point of view. (p. 160)

Dialogically speaking the teacher should see in the learner a partner in the educational dialogue. Without this participation the educational process is meaningless. The following conditions constitute the basic conditions of dialogue. David Bohm sets out three basic conditions for dialogue:

- Suspension of the assumptions. Participants need to hold many points of view in suspension if their primary interest is in the creation of common meaning. This does not entail forgetting all about them. Rather, they have to keep them in front of their eyes ready for exploration, (Bohm and Peat, 1987).

- Viewing selves and others as peers. ‘A dialogue is essentially a conversation between equals’ (Bohm et.al. 1991). It occurs when people are mutually involved in a quest for understanding and insight.

- The need for a facilitator in early stages. The facilitator’s role should be to occasionally aid the process of mutual/collective proprioception. The aid should not be in manipulative or obtrusive form. In needs to be in the form guidance/‘leading from behind’ with the intention of making itself redundant when the need is not persisting anymore; (All cited in Smith, 2001, p. 5).
These presume equality of the partners in dialogue in owing the right of turn taking and expressing views. They essentially have to respect each other and consider the need for the contribution of the other in the dialogue. This is because dialogue is a crucial criterion for growth and a sign of maturity.

But, sometimes the learners themselves are not aware of this right and negatively think of themselves as receivers of knowledge rather than constructors. The teacher needs to adopt the stance of a dialogue facilitator until the learner is able to take over. It is worth noting that the researcher does not take a scaffolding approach to classroom talk as it is explained by Bruner, Wood, and Ross (1976). In their approach the intervention entails reduction in degrees of freedom for the novice. The researcher’s aim is to propose a view in which the novice sees the possibilities according to his/her uptake not to reduce her/his possibilities in accordance of the possibilities that the expert perceives. This is because the whole argument of the dialogic sociocultural approach she is proposing is an argument about democracy and freedom to create meaning/knowledge. In this perspective she is in agreement with Bakhtin whose main argument is one of democracy of meaning/language creation (Ken Hirschkop, 1989). More important to her argument is the connection Bakhtin (1986) makes between democracy and development of human cognition. This is evident in his attack against the practices of literary scholarship in his time. In his time scholarly practices, he regrets, pervades ‘the fear of investigatory risk’ and ‘fear of bold hypotheses’ that are ‘developed and tested through experience’ (p. 1). It is evident from the above quotation then that the democratic stance taken in the researcher’s dialogic sociocultural approach is not solely for democracy sake. It has a developmental overall goal which targets the growth of mind and culture. This can occur in education for development, the researcher believes, when learners are given a chance to adopt or have perspectives which they defend and substantiate themselves. This can be fulfilled if the dialogic process can lead learners to hermeneutically gauge texts, weigh evidence, and support their judgemental powers. From this perspective Shruti Sircar (2000) defines dialogic pedagogy as a
Process of teaching and learning that involves the use of multiple ways of knowing, being and behaving that contest dominant patterns of knowledge formation, dissemination by identifying these patterns and demonstrating how to replace them with patterns which are multi perspectives. (P. IV)

She adds that

[a] dialogic pedagogy has to be concerned with the transformation of consciousness through which we can begin to think of new possibilities. (P. IV)

It is evident then that a dialogic pedagogy empowers the mind by enabling it to realize its potential power. It enables the mind to grow to its fullest potentials by giving it the chance to mature in the dialogic process. Through these dialogic processes the mind is enabled to have position (i.e. to be responsive); to democratically participate with others in the same field in constructing knowledge, practices, and genres (i.e. to be intersubjective); and to construct knowledge, experiences, tools using its sociocultural potential to its fullest (i.e. to be situated).

As far as language is concerned the dialogic sociocultural approach represents a view of language as a tool for constituting thought, relationships, cultures, meanings, life, and language. Thereby the aim of academic writing in this perspective will no longer be just to enable learners assimilate and use foreign language to get ready-made meanings, but also and more importantly to help them create meaning/knowledge. The dialogic sociocultural approach then may be used to argue for a view of academic writing as a dialogue that posits language as an open-ended system of possibilities for meaning/knowledge making. This approach will be ideal for preparing teachers for the role they are critically expected to play, to use Giroux and McLaren's (1986) term as 'transformative intellectuals'.

The assumptions, conditions, and the goals of the dialogic sociocultural practices of language for teacher development are certainly different from those endorsed by ESP, the umbrella field for academic writing. The dialogic sociocultural perspective with its concern with dialogue makes students the centre of its investment. In spite of the fact
that ESP promotes a student-centered needs analysis, it is not really a student-centered pedagogy. The needs of the institutions or employers were satisfied rather than those of the students (Benesch (1996); Benesch (1993) as reported in Victor (2007)). The dialogic sociocultural approach does not only assume that students should be enabled to dialogue but also makes it its quintessential means to achieve this purpose through dialogue. Moreover, the ESP programs, at least during the period between seventies and the beginning of eighties, do not have cultural development and intercultural dialogue as a goal for the educational process; nor they have it as a theoretical orientation especially for EF learners. On the other hand, dialogic sociocultural approach draws a broad horizon for development and dialogue. The assumptions on which it is based as well as the conditions and its dialogic classroom practices emphasize these aspects.

In the following section, the researcher will present a critical account of the writing pedagogies. In this critical account, she attempts to show how the dialogic sociocultural perspective fares well the dialogic pedagogies in its provision for theoretical foundations for dialogue and development.

1.4 Introducing the Idea of Dialogic Sociocultural Academic Writing in the Writing Classroom

The researcher finds it appropriate before reviewing the literature of academic writing for the proposed purpose of the thesis to examine whether the literature of writing in general provides for the proposed purposes and the criteria.

The following section introduces a concise critical summary of the dialogic pedagogical practices in the L1 composition theory as presented by Irene Ward (2005). Her book, *Literacy, Ideology, and Dialogue: Towards a dialogic Pedagogy*, provides a critical account of the dialogic pedagogies and their theoretical justifications for the composition classroom. The researcher finds in Ward’s account a suitable introduction to the conception and use of dialogue in writing theory. The researcher’s underscores similar assumptions in the dialogic pedagogies and the dialogic sociocultural perspective. She proposes the dialogic sociocultural perspective as a comprehensive perspective of dialogue that can exemplify the dialogic orientations of the theories and evades most of
their shortcomings. She finally introduces a conception of dialogic writing from the dialogic sociocultural perspective for her EFL teacher-development context. It is also worth noting here that the page numbers written below refer to pages in Wards’ book.

1.4.1 Dialogue in Writing Classroom

This subsection discusses the Expressivists in 1.4.1.1, the social Constructionists in 1.4.1.2, the Radicals in 1.4.1.3, the Postmodernists in 1.4.1.4 and the Fuctional Dialogism in 1.4.1.5.

1.4.1.1 The Expressivists

Among the expressivists – Ken Macrorie, Peter Elbow, and Donald Murray- have devised pedagogies that are explicitly dialogic. The main assumptions underlying their dialogic pedagogy are that the student comes to know himself/herself through language and that writing cannot be taught, though it can be learned. Therefore, the role of the instructor is to provide an environment where the student can gain experience with writing and help them engage in dialogue in order to provide each other with feedback about their writing. Though their theoretical assumptions stated above are the same, each of the above three theorists develops a different concept of dialogue leading to different goals and outcomes.

Macrorie, to begin with, was upset with what he described as the ‘bloated, pretentious language’ and the ‘feeling-nothing, saying-nothing language’ in students’ papers. His two major pedagogical tools to overcome such defects in his students’ writing were ‘writing freely’ and the ‘helping circles’ (pp.17-18). To help his students write freely, he told them to go home and write whatever comes to their minds nonstop till they have filled in a whole page. This, he claims could enable students find their authentic voices. In the helping circles students read each other’s writing and help one another recognize when they have found their authentic voice. The students, having been exposed to numerous exercises of lifeless writing, can eventually distinguish living from dead writing. To organize the dialogue among students in these circles he provides six
guidelines for students to follow: respondents begin with 'large' reaction and then bring up the small suggestion; leaders should not let argument to be reiterated and writers have the freedom to decide upon to accept or to turn down all the suggestions; helpful and apt responses are the best for presenting in the discussion; each individual’s response is valuable as each represents the unique past experience of the respondent and his/her authentic response to writing; students can occasionally close their eyes while listening to writing being read; they can drag other respondents who have not spoken their points fully to speak more( pp.18-19). Another dialogic aspect of Macrorie’s work is his recommendation that students’ writing be published in some way. This shifts some of students focus away from the instructor as audience and takes their writing to the realm beyond the classroom. In short, Macrorie’s dialogic pedagogy aims to reinforce students’ effort to express self and eliminate the lifeless prose from their writing through writing freely, responding to each other in their papers.

The second expressivist in this dialogic tradition to be discussed here is Donald Murray. He developed a thoroughly neo-romantic view of writing. He argues that writers write to understand, or to be understood: ‘for the writer, writing is a process, a way of seeing, of hearing what he has to say to himself, a means of discovering meaning.’ According to him, writers are not with communication as they are with exploiting their own identity and discovering who they are. Murray’s dialogic pedagogy aims to develop the writer’s ‘other self’ – the ‘writer’s first reader.’ This serves as the monitor for the entire writing process in pursuing ‘a wisp of thinking until it grows into a completed thought.’ He complains that the role of the other self in writing process has not been documented fully in writing research and believes that frequent, brief, individual conferences are the best techniques for helping students develop the other self. Students, in these conferences, are allowed to speak about work in progress, then the instructor responds to them using open-ended questions such as ‘what’s working best?’ and ‘what are you going to do next?’ (pp. 21, 23, 25). In this model of dialogic pedagogy, the instructor cannot give directions or respond to students’ writing directly as in Macrorie’s or Elbow’s model of dialogic pedagogy. He must only respond to students’ accounts of their writing process at that particular stage. This is because the instructor in his pedagogy is not an audience, but a coach; and because of that the goal of the conference
is to allow students produce increasingly better drafts that are clear both to the student and the instructor. The aim of these conferences, according to Murray, is to help students find their ‘other selves’; ‘discover what is working [:] and extend that element in the writing’ (p. 27). The other self is a specific kind of internal, mental manager that keeps writing process moving and is not only used by Murray but also by his fellow expressionists Elbow.

The last expressivist, Peter Elbow, never uses the term dialogic or dialogism to describe his pedagogy; however, his pedagogy is thoroughly dialogic in that much of his classroom activities involve students’ use of dialogue to talk about their writing. In his book: Writing Without Teachers, Elbow argues that the best way to learn writing more effectively is with a ‘teacherless writing class.’ Here, the teacher’s role is not that of expert but is closer to the role of fellow student or writer. In his pedagogy, feedback is essential for the development of a writer who will hear ‘movies of people’s minds while they read [his/her] words’. He proposes four strategies to make the dialogic feedback more efficient: pointing, summarizing, telling, and showing. ‘pointing’ involves marking the strong and weak points; ‘summarizing’ consists of finding main points, sequencing them into a single sentence, then into a single word, and then using one’s own word(s) to summarize; ‘telling’ provides reactions to writing in terms of what has been felt while reading; and ‘showing’ means finding a suitable way to explain the nature of response a reader gets from writing (pp. 28, 31, 32). To refine this concept of feedback, which he calls reader-based feedback, Elbow, adds a new category, in his book Writing with Power, criterion-based feedback. Reader-based feedback ‘tells you what your writing does to particular readers while criterion-based feedback meets the criteria ‘most often used in judging expository or nonfiction writing’ (p. 33). In practice, these two criteria are not so easily distinguished from each other.

1.4.1.1 Summary and commentary

In short, the expressivists’ dialogic pedagogy addresses the written text as it reflects accurately or inaccurately the writer’s notion of what it is. Expressivists are concerned with dialogic interaction with others only insofar as such interaction helps to promote the writer’s ability to dialogue more effectively with the inner self and thereby
come to know that inner self. In effect, the social dialogue is secondary and subordinate to dialogue with the self. These pedagogies along with that of Flower and Hyes (1981), which in spite of its cognitive bent, have emphasized the private world of the researcher and, to some extent, neglected the social dimension of writing, Raimes (1991). Thus, expressivists, see the act of writing as ultimately a lonely task, and are not interested in writing for communication or exchanging ideas. Though their dialogic pedagogies involve social interaction, publication, and feedback, they claim that writing is primarily an act of self-knowledge, self-expression, and self-discovery. Moreover, the researcher argues that expressivists, though used dialogic practices in the classroom, they encourage a writing product that is necessarily predefined by the writing intention and in a format that is prescribed. The expressive function of language rather than the designative function of language is encouraged. Language in the expressivists’ classroom is supposed to only provide an expression of a well defined thought. Peter Smagorinsky (1997), in a critique against the split between product and process tradition in writing theory as presented in Murray’s pedagogy, has convincingly argued that it has resulted in the loss in either the designative or the expressive functions of writing as oppositions. The aim is that both the functions should be present. He attempted through a case study to establish a premise for viewing both the product and process of writing as complementary aspects of a semiotic, meaning-oriented view of composing. He finds, through examining the writing experience of his subject (who got training in both the aspects of writing) that the activity of writing itself can be mediational when a writer values not only the tool of writing but the uses to which writing is put. Through this activity, writers can create a set of signs that serve a regulative function for both their own continued reflection and as a mediator for readers who are consonant with the codes of the text. Some years later, after the experiment is over, his subject has used what he has learned in writing class in a chat with a friend online. The subject has summarized his experience as effective in other writing modes as well as for reflective purposes. This actually is one of the main aims of the dialogic sociocultural theory. Lantolf and Thorne (2006) quote Vygotsky’s insight with regard to the constitutive function of language: ‘Thought is restricted as it is transformed in speech. It is not expressed but completed in the word,’ (p. 48). They comment: 'thought does not become completely developed until people attempt to speak
or write it' (p. 48). Writing pedagogy in dialogic sociocultural perspective is expected to enable both the designative and the expressive functions of writing.

In addition, Murray's internal other self is in many concerns similar to Vygotsky's inner speech which has a monitoring function. Wertsch and Stone (1985), in a theoretical discussion of the concept of internalization in the Vygotskian tradition, glosses the social nature in Vygotsky's definition of inner speech as 'quasi-social' and theoretically proves the dialogic origins of this concept in his treatment of the term. They include the following quotation from Vygotsky (1960): '[In inner speech] humans as it were preserve the “function of social interaction” even in their own individual behaviour; they apply a social means of action to themselves'. They comment on this formulation of Vygotsky as follows: 'In this case their individual functioning in essence represents a unique form of internal collaboration with oneself'. They also acknowledge the contribution of the Bakhtinian tradition in extending the notion of dialogue in speech in general stressing that even if it 'appears monologic often cannot be interpreted without taking into consideration its role in an implicit dialogue'. They add, bringing the Bakhtinian tradition into the sociocultural tradition, 'Bakhtin argued that, like external speech, inner speech is dialogic' (pp. 173-4). Internalization has become one of the foundational concepts in SCT and a touchstone for its dialogic orientations. In chapter two a more detailed account of internalization and its role in the researcher's dialogic sociocultural perspective is given. From the above discussion it has been shown that the dialogic sociocultural perspective exhibits similar orientations towards the expressive function of language and at the same time provides theoretical and research basis for the designative function. Dialogue is seen from this perspective as constitutive of thought.

The expressivists were highly influential in composition studies throughout the 1970s and early 1980s. However, they have increasingly come under attack by those composition scholars who subscribe to a 'social' view of writing and epistemology. The writing theory and practice have been influenced by an epistemological movement called 'social constructionism'.
1.4.1.2 The Social Constructionists

Social construction is an epistemology that maintains that knowledge is a product of social negotiation and consensus among members of a discourse community. This perspective derives in part from the work of Thomas Kuhn who argued that scientists think and work within commonly held intellectual frameworks, or 'paradigms,' and new knowledge results when the current paradigm no longer satisfactorily explains certain phenomenon. Drawing on Kuhn’s work, Richards Roty has extended the notion of knowledge being a product of consensus. These notions of Kuhn and Roty mean that both discourse and dialogue take on primary importance. Language is no longer a conduit thought and knowledge is not transmitted; rather, it becomes constitutive of knowledge itself. In effect, all knowledge is rhetoric, a product of discourse/dialogue. The metaphor often used for this dialogic process is ‘conversation’. There are several assumptions that underlie social constructionism. These can be summarized as follows:

- Consensus arrived at by communities of knowledgeable peers is the truth value of knowledge.
- Thinking is an internalized version of conversation.
- The matrix of thought is some community of knowledgeable peers and the vernacular language of the community (pp. 51-3).

Similarly, the concept of self is understood to be socially constructed by its interaction with the personal and cultural context. The most important assumption that social constructionists make for composition studies is that knowledge and language are inseparable. They place language and rhetoric at the centre of attempts to understand knowledge and its authority. Language is a social activity that two or more people who share some social connections engage together; it does not exist until it is, at least, dialogue.

Writing theorists who draw on social constructionist view conceive of the writer’s task as interacting with language, other people, and culture. In this view, writing is a purely social activity that involves collaboration with others; therefore, written documents produced are understood as part in series of ongoing dialogue or conversation within communities. Writing is no longer seen as a simple one-way transferral of
information from one person to others but as part of a dialogue in which others as readers produce and maintain knowledge.

Marilyn M. Cooper has developed explanatory models to help students and instructors understand what it means to say that writing is a social activity. Her model which is called the ‘ecological’ model of writing includes more than the researcher and his immediate environment. She describes the composing situation using the metaphor of a web of systems ‘in which anything that affects one strand of the web vibrates throughout the whole’ (p. 55). These systems are influenced by other larger and dynamic cultural and historical forces that change over longer periods of time, and while these systems are, in ‘real time,’ always changing, they can still be specified at any given time. She identifies five of these interacting systems. These are the system of ideas, the system of purposes, the system of interpersonal interactions, the system of cultural norms, and the system of textual forms. The system of ideas is ‘the means by which writers comprehend their world’ with the purpose to transform individual’s experience(s) and observations into knowledge through face to face contact with texts. The system of purposes describes what is accomplished in the communal dialogue. She explains that the impulse of the individual or his/her need becomes a purpose only when it is recognized as such by others. The system of interpersonal interactions is the means through which writers regulate accession to each another’s world of thought. She identifies the two factors that govern the way in which writers interact with each other as intimacy: a measure of closeness, occupation; and power: a measure of the degree to which a writer can control the action(s) of others. The system of cultural norms constructs the roles for writers and in turn is constructed by writers as they interact with the system. The system of textual forms must remain stable enough to be comprehensible, yet flexible enough to be adapted to many different purposes. She asserts that to envision writing ecologically is to see it as constructed and constructive of interactive systems in which the author and audience are related social beings (pp 55-7).

More influential than Cooper’s model in furthering the social-epistemic perspective in composition is Karen Burke LeFevre’s Invention as a Social Act. She formulates a rhetorical theory of ‘invention’ which, she argues, has been viewed in a narrow sense as ‘introspective self examination’. Invention, she defines, is ‘the process of actively
creating as well as finding what comes to be known and said in the discourse of any discipline,' and it occurs 'when individuals interact dialectically with socioculture in a distinctive way to generate something' (p. 57). She overtly links rhetorical invention to the creation of new things and closely associates it with inquiry.

She also has advised a four-part continuum perspective on invention: the platonic, the internal dialogic, the collaborative, and the collective. The platonic perspective is adopted in the expressivists' view and 'concerns invention as a private, a social activity engaged in by an individual who possess innate knowledge [...] to be projected onto the world. The social view of internal dialogic 'maintains that invention is largely a process of internal dialogue or dialectic with other 'self' often involving internalized constructs influenced by external social forces and actual people.' The collaborative perspective maintains that 'people interact to invent and to create a resonating environment for inventors.' From the collective perspective view 'invention is neither a purely individual nor an interpersonal [...]'; rather, it is encouraged or constrained by social collective whose views are transmitted through such things as institutions, societal prohibitions, and cultural expectations' (pp58-61). To conclude, in LeFevre's formulation, invention, and rhetoric itself is a thoroughly dialogic activity – dialogue that involves many participants and that creates knowledge as it is engaged in by discourse communities.

Kenneth Bruffee, another social constructionist, makes a connection between dialogue, thought, and knowledge, arguing that it is through ‘conversation’ that all knowledge is constructed. He argues that in order to be able to think well as an individual, one must learn to think well collectively (i.e. to converse well). Because knowledge, in Bruffee's view, is not located in the minds of experts, then the task of education is to provide the opportunity for students to talk – to engage in these knowledge- producing and maintaining conversation. He maintains that 'if thought is internalized conversation, then writing is internalized conversation re-externalized' (p.67). The goal then for instructors is to provide contexts in the classrooms in which students can engage in dialogue among themselves and with other discourse communities through reading and writing. Students need to talk about ideas as a way of fostering thinking about ideas, and then in turn they need to write about ideas as a way of joining in the dialogue. Thinking of writing as a social activity rather than as a personal one
brings writing, thinking, and dialogue into 'constructive' relation. Understanding writing and learning to write in this dialogic sense allows students an active role in their learning process.

Citing the work of Vygotsky, Bruffee argues that 'social speech' is part of learning and in performing any complex task. As Vygotsky studied the development of children, he found that they have talked aloud while solving different tasks. They rehearsed procedures as they work. If he interfered with their speech, they stop doing the work; their progress was resumed only when they resume speaking. Vygotsky called this type of speech 'instrumental speech' because it aids in getting something done. The children's social speech can be 'turned inward' and become an 'instrument' in helping them control the physical environment and getting things done for themselves. As they mature, the 'instrumental speech' decreases and becomes 'thought'. We converse silently with ourselves in ways similar to those that we first learned in social situations. Social speech then becomes an essential step in learning. And, as Bruffee argues, social speech is an essential part of learning to write. He encouraged dialogue about writing in two ways: 'face-to-face' and 'displaced into writing'. The predominant way in which his students engaged into face-to-face dialogue about writing was by reading their papers aloud. Reading aloud builds a sense of community among students in the class. The instantaneous response helps individual writers acquire a concrete sense of audience. Over time, they develop a critical awareness and a stronger sense of form because they 'can hear relationships' among parts and ideas of their essays, p. 73. Then the students displace the dialogue about writing into written discourse – written peer criticism. This takes place over three phases: in the first phase, they write a descriptive outline of what they have read; in the second phase, they describe and evaluate the writer's technique; and in the third phase, they comment on the ideas presented in the essays.

However, Bruffee sees this negotiation of knowledge as primarily a one-way process; the goal is to impart the social conversations of the knowledge communities and institutions to the students.
1.4.1.2.1 Commentary and discussion

One important criticism the researcher would like to impart against the social constructionist is that it has taken the opposite extreme of the expressivists who have an individualistic/subjective bent in their pedagogical orientations. Social constructivists emphasize the social over the individual though they have focused on the interaction between them in their pedagogical approaches and methodologies. Cooper’s model, for example, provides an explanatory framework for the interaction between the individual and the social in knowledge construction; but, it does not explain how it can be useful for improving thinking quality of both, the group and the individual. Lefevre’s provides a formulation of the interactive nature of invention but still defines invention as ‘the process of actively creating as well as finding what comes to be known and said in the discourse of any discipline.’ Invention is problematically seen as useful and good as an end. Its effect on the individual and the society is not touched upon. She has invented a continuum of invention but the steps/phases in her continuum are seen as predetermined, no interaction is supposed to occur between them. They are not seen as happening one after the other while naturally they can juxtapose or simultaneously occur. Bruffee’s view of a dialogic classroom clearly confirms this bias for social transmission through visualizing dialogic writing as group dialogue ‘displaced on paper’.

However, social constructionism, in viewing language as a social activity, is in tune with activity perspective in the sociocultural tradition. They are also in agreement on valuing the diversity of meaning-making as well as the dialogical nature of human thinking. However, the main contribution that the activity theory adds to this tradition is that it conceptualizes activity as situated within a sociocultural context. Therefore, it values the here and now/historic construction of knowledge along with the abstract and generalized notion of understanding adopted in the constructionist tradition. Moreover, it stresses the mediational process of semiotic and material tools in the activity and the effect-affect they have on each other. This view of tools in general and semiotic tools- including language- in particular involved in a real action of making meaning/making knowledge introduces a new vision of mutual effect of knowledge on language and vice versa. Language is important in constructing knowledge and knowledge is necessary for the emergence of language (e.g. the choice of vocabulary, phraseology, sentence
construction, sense making, etc.). Furthermore, this conceptualization of language in action and mind in action, stresses both the constitutive as well as the ancillary functions of language, (Wells, 1999). These two functions, to use Wertsch’s terms- the designative and the expressive-, interacting actively in the situated meaning-making affect each other and enhance knowledge construction. In this sense, activity perspective as part of the sociocultural approach has an affinity to social constructionism, but, at the same time, exceeds it in its formulation of a mechanism of how language promotes thinking; and how thinking improves communication among speech community; see a more detailed account of mediation as conceived by the researcher for a dialogic sociocultural perspective in Chapter Two.

1.4.1.3 The Radicals

Liberatory learning or Freire’s pedagogy is entirely based on dialogic methods that attempt to subvert the traditional form of education as a ‘depositing’ of information in students. He attempts to erect in its place a form of instruction that allows students to become full participants in their own education. He proposes liberatory learning as a way to encounter the traditional model of education which he calls the ‘banking’ or ‘nutritionist’ model. In this model, the teacher posses all authority; the students have none. The world is perceived as a static place and therefore knowledge of it is also static and unchanging. For Freire, humans differ from animals precisely in their ability to reflect on their lives and to take action to transform the material world around them. Yet, many people never develop as subjects or agents because of their social position; the ability to think critically and to take action in the world is unimaginable to such people: they become the oppressed, the dehumanized, and the illiterate. He argues that one gains critical consciousness through praxis – that is, by reflecting and acting upon the world dialogically with others in order to transform it. The dialogue is about the dialectic of people and the concrete world, the dialectic of subject and object.

Freire’s radical pedagogy was imported into writing studies by Ira Shor, in U.S, who developed courses around several ‘pieces of experience’ for students to think and write about. His course objectives were to give students some ‘take-away literacy modes’ that they can employ later without teachers; and to wean them away from their reliance on the authority of the teacher while fostering their development as subjects by building on the skills they already have (p. 104). But, Shor’s students did not attempt to move into larger dialogue outside the classroom. This is because the kind of dialogue introduced by
Shor was valuable in concept building but lacked the radical revolutionary nature that leads to liberation.

Unlike Shor's and experiments with radical pedagogy, Nan Elsasser’s did maintain the dialogic aspects of liberatory learning. Her theoretical framework for the composition course was drawn equally from Vygotsky and Freire. She states that these two scholars believe that writing involves both cognitive skills and social learning; and that their approaches parallel and complement each other. She adds that Vygotsky focuses on students' internal learning process while Freire emphasizes the importance of external social reality (p. 123). She further explains that Vygotsky postulates that learning to write involves the mastery of cognitive skills and the development of new social understandings. Therefore, she adds reporting Vygotsky, in order to transform the inner speech symbols to written texts, students must consciously step outside the shorthand of their thoughts and mentally enter the social context they share with their readers. To achieve this purpose, she used assignments that stressed the value of personal knowledge, break down the dichotomy between personal and classroom knowledge, and require explicit elaboration. Her students, who were black women, wrote on themes both related to their environment and personal life; discussed their writings in groups; and finally wrote together an open letter to men in their country.

1.4.1.3.1 Commentary and discussion

To conclude, radical pedagogy relies on dialogue to ensure the emancipatory nature of the educative process. If the dialogic process breaks down, the radical transformative nature of education is lost.

It is worth noting here that both the critical theory and the dialogic sociocultural perspective share some basic dialogic formulations. Though the critical theory does not provide a theoretical framework of how to enable the human mind to be thoughtful/critical/developmental, the dialogic sociocultural perspective provides a framework. The dialogue is viewed as happening not between two separate entities (the subject and the object/the other\(^{10}\)); they are always mediated by tools, signs, and other

---

\(^{10}\) Some of those who have made some revisions to the sociocultural theory framework towards a dialogical turn, like Wegerif (2008), have suggested the word (other) to replace the word (object). This is
human beings and cannot be separated. In a special formulation of this idea, Leont'ev (1978) explicates that there are three interrelated categories intrinsically bound up in what is known to us as meaning. Leont'ev (ibid) explains:

[First], there is the system of connections and relations of the objects and phenomena of the real world that exist independently of, and prior to the individual sign; we call this system the objective content of the sign. Secondly, there is the ideal “charge” of a sign, its ideal aspect, which is a transformed form of its objective content; we shall call this the ideal content of a sign. Thirdly, there is the social experience of the subject, projected into the sign image, which we shall call the subjective content of a sign (of the sign image). (p. 26)

This formulation illustrates that the object and subject of understanding/thinking/meaning making/knowledge construction are not separate. He continues:

Meaning does not exist for each of us independently of the subjective reflection of the objective world, e.g., in visual images or any images of a perception. (p. 28)

Therefore, the tool-sign combination in the dialogic sociocultural perspective has an explanatory force that account for the occurrence of creative thought and production of new ideas in the process of interaction as well as for praxis. By this formulation, this perspective provides a theoretical explanation for the aims and claims of the dialogical orientations of the critical theory. The dialogic sociocultural perspective values goal-directed action as the focus for study. This action is culturally motivated, culturally manipulated, and culturally directed. The humans have biological limits which can be overcome through tools and signs (Bruner, 1990). So, for a transformation (the aim of the radical theory) or metamorphosis to happen, tools and signs need to be appropriated and adapted for not only existing use but also for invention. Tools amplify human’s ability to extend the theory's conception of mediation from mediation of the tools to the human mediation. To emphasize the role of the other in the dialogic process and to evade the implication of an individual doing activity while solely mediated by tools with no human beings around to enhance the dialogic activity.

\[My \text{ non-alibi in Being in Bakhtin's terminology means my unique place in Being.}\]


and help them act beyond what they can naturally do/say in a situation which does not involve the use of tools. If the researcher has the intention to change self/society, he/she cannot do that by just wanting it or writing it. From a dialogic perspective, the person needs to struggle against naturally-limited abilities and make them subdue to own intentionality through the use of tools and dialogue with others. H/She has also to struggle understanding and re-contextualizing the words of others to make them serve one's new intentions. Bakhtin sees the words not as neutral medium but as soaked with the intentions of others. They can with effort serve a new master. Therefore, the individual has to work against his/her limitations using the tools and having dialogue with others to achieve change in self and the culture.

1.4.1.4 The Postmodernists

The fourth composition theory that adopted dialogic assumptions for pedagogic purposes is postmodernism pedagogy. Like the Social Constructionist perspective, it conceives of truth and knowledge not as stable and determinable but as always dependent on local context. Knowledge, like language, can be understood, or have meaning, only within unique communicative situations in which two or more people engage in dialogue about an object or idea. This dialogue is open-ended, one in which truth is only provisionally established, and serves an invitation to further dialogue.

Three figures are especially influential in establishing connection between poststructuralist theory and composition pedagogy. These are Gregoroy Ulmer, who posits a rationale for a postmodern pedagogy in general; William A. Covino, who has attempted to develop postmodern composition pedagogy; and Thomas Kent, who through a sustained effort has worked to devise a post-process, postmodern theory for composition studies.

In Ulmer’s pedagogical model, classroom is viewed in theatrical terms—a play in which the mastery and disciple’s roles are deconstructed and replaced with a new scene in which the ‘pedagogy of communication’ is acted differently. In such a radically altered pedagogical environment, the classroom is ‘a place of invention rather than of reproduction’. This new pedagogy understands knowledge as ‘invented’ in ‘the scene of life,’ that is, as continually unfolding in the play of discourse, as an open-ended, dialogic
process with only provisional closure (p. 132). It attempts to do away with the effect of discipleship as it generates disciples and authorities. When this separation between lecturer and disciple is bridged and the meaning of the classroom setting is called into question, then the difference between presenting experience and 'real' experience becomes a meaningless separation and can be done away with.

One of the major pedagogies that attempts to apply postmodern theory to the composition class is the work of William A. Covino who advocates a pedagogy in which students write open-ended dialogues in order to gain knowledge of multiple viewpoints. As they explore these multiple perspectives, they do not have to come to any closure or proclaim a final decision, 'without having to take a stand.' Rather than taking a positive stance for or against an issue, a students' writing should be exploratory and self-reflexive, should ask questions rather than provide answers. However, Covino's model fails to formulate a truly dialogic pedagogy as the situation in which students are writing remains monologic. The discourse produced by the students is primarily for the purpose of assigning grades.

Thomas Kent, in his investigation of the work of several prominent poststructuralist philosophers whose work deals with epistemology, language, and communication, moves composition theory closer to a postmodern and fundamentally dialogic perspective. He deals primarily with the theories of American analytic philosopher Donald Davidson.

Kent sees his major project as moving composition theory beyond the process paradigm and sees two major problems with it: its reliance on the concepts of convention and discourse community. Social conventions, according to Kent, are understood as the means by which discourse is comprehended. Although language is thought to be conventional by most contemporary language philosophers, Kent – along with Davidson and Derrida) seriously question the assumption that language is convention-bound. The concept of convention, he argues, serves as a 'practical crutch' aiding interpretation, but it is not the fundamental or necessary theoretical construct that allows us to understand how meaning is communicated by discourse (pp. 146-7). Convention is not the only foundation upon which the communication of meaning rests. Therefore, one must not look to convention to understand how meaning is communicated. Communication always
involves an interpretive act that is not systematizable because no two communication situations are exactly the same and no two communicants will have the same language knowledge. He argues that these interpretive acts are paralogic in nature because each time the researcher encounters a new situation; he or she must invent a hermeneutic strategy in an effort to predict what will work (p. 149). So, with the intention to move composition scholarship beyond the process paradigm, Kent provides a critique of Social Constructionism theories. He questions not only the necessity of a foundational notion of the conventionality of language but also the usefulness of the concept of ‘discourse community.’ This concept, he claims, can be abandoned because it does not tell very much about the nature of discourse production other than it is produced in social settings. Kent attempts to introduce a substitute for Social Constructionism which he calls ‘externalism’. This he derives from Davidson’s ‘externalist’ theory of communicative interaction. This interaction takes place in a process he calls ‘triangulation’. It takes place between individuals with some social connection who engage in a dialogue that reveals to each what is commonly known about the nature of the world. These three positions occupy three apices of a triangle and are conceived of as a unity – if one has knowledge of one of the elements, one necessarily has knowledge of the other two. Because of this scheme, there is no necessary foundation outside the dialogue that communicants ‘hook on to’ in order to establish meaning, they are establishing meaning between themselves as the dialogue proceeds. In order to do this, they must share some amount of knowledge about language and the world, and, obviously, the more they share the more effective the communication. However, no communicant can know in advance of the dialogic situation how much he or she has in common with those he or she wishes to communicate with. Consequently, according to Davidson, communicants accept the fact that they ‘cannot be completely wrong about the beliefs and intentions of others’ and operate on what he calls the ‘principle of charity,’ which constitutes the ‘opening move’ in communicative interaction. It signals not only the kind of vocabulary that may be employed by us about the world but also the assumption that others desire, at least initially, to believe our utterances (pp. 153-5). But, triangulation will not be a wholly sufficient condition for communication to take place depending on the ‘opening move’: communicants must also be able to interpret, on the run, the utterances of each other. This
can be done using what Kent calls hermeneutic guessing and what Davidson calls forming passing theories. These passing theories or hermeneutic guessing do not substitute for any sort of a priori foundation that reliably predicts how an utterance will be perceived. These are generated 'on the spot' and are specific to individual communicative occasions (p.160). Kent uses the term 'dialogic interpretation' to describe the process of producing and analyzing discourse as an intimate linking of dialogue and interpretation.

Thus, reading and writing are, in Kent's theory, not codifiable processes that can be reduced to linear or even discursive steps. Therefore, classroom focus of the process of writing can no longer be the primary focus of composition course. The primary focus could become producing written composition in specific situations and for specific audiences of concrete knowable others. Kent envisions a classroom in which students enter 'into specific dialogic and therefore hermeneutic situations with others' interpretative strategies.' Consequently, the instructor becomes just one more voice in the dialogue, an advisor who offers possible choices from which a student might make a hermeneutic guessing about how to affect the world. So, dialogic writing, in this context, would be understood as a response – already a part of a communicative interaction, in which the student is attempting to communicate meaning to another via the process of triangulation. Students would write public discourse intended to get things done in the world rather than discourse thought of as practice. It must be produced with the goal of eventually having an effect in the world.

1.4.1.4.1 Commentary and discussion

Language, in this pedagogy, is considered as constitutive of knowledge – i.e., language and knowledge are not separable terms. Therefore, situationality – an emphasis on the specific social and public context within which discourse is produced and taught, along with invention in discourse production, is the primary focus of a postmodern pedagogy as well as a dialogic methodology. In addition, dialogue becomes an epistemological concept that describes how we come to know anything, including ourselves. The dialogic writing course becomes a site where students not only learn the
metalanguage of composition, but, more importantly also learn how to learn, how to 'make knowledge.'

From a Bakhtinian and Vygotskyan perspectives Rommetveit (1988) attacked the total rejection of the poststructuralist for conventional meaning. He argues that literal/conventional meaning is myth that we live as reality. He proposes that the gap between the social constructivists and postmodernists/externalists should be bridged. He finds the solution in introducing hermeneutic twist to situated semantics. That is to see meaning as both conventional and situated. To support his proposal he provides the following quotation from Bakhtin (1984):

The life of a word is contained in its transfer from one mouth to another, from one social collective to another, from one generation to another generation. In this process the word does not forget its own path and cannot completely free itself from the power of these concrete contexts into which it has entered. (p.22)

Rommetveit comments that Bakhtin's approach to linguistic meaning -something that cannot be captured by focusing on external referents of expressions- is futile as it reflects an essential feature of language alive. This, he asserts, is also reflected in Bakhtin's notion of "the loophole of consciousness and the word" which means '... the retention for oneself of the possibility for altering the ultimate, final meaning of one's words. He adds, bringing both the thinkers, Bakhtin and Vygotsky into a meeting point, that both of them, in spite of a concern with language as a social activity, have been 'intrigued by possible objective and invariant features of language underlying mutual understanding'. For example, he continues, 'Vygotsky's discussion of the impact of scientific concepts' 'may be interpreted as a concession that language may have "foundations in simple concepts", p. 22. To support his point, he quotes the following from Bakhtin (1973):

Linguistics studies "language" and its specific logic in its commonality (obshenost) as that fact which makes dialogical discourse possible, but it consistently refrains from studying those dialogical relations
themselves... Dialogical relationships are totally impossible without logical and concrete semantic relationships, but they are not reducible to them; they have their own specificity. (p. 25)

However, he asserts, they are seriously concerned with dynamic and interactional features of language alive (in other words, linguistically mediated intersubjectivity), but their theoretical interest is not to find socio-interactional features that govern ‘perspective and orderly negotiation of meaning’ (p. 25).

To conclude, both Rommetveit and Kent have abandoned the conduit metaphor of communication and replaced it with an interpretive framework based on hermeneutic processes. Therefore, reading and writing in their formulations are interpretive and productive social activities rather than decoding and coding processes. Moreover, reading and writing for both of them are hermeneutically fulfilled and specifically situated. However, Kent has postmodernist inclinations and thus declines the notions of a priori knowledge and convention. Rommetveit, though like Kent in his pluralistic and hermeneutic orientations, builds his theoretical formulations on Vološinov’s idea of bridging the gap between ‘abstract objectivism’ and subjectivism; accepts Vygotsky’s crutch that there is some base for meaning in simple concepts; recognizes the merits of Bakhtin’s concept of intertextuality; and therefore, pear the concepts of a priori and conventions as myths that live as reality in our world.

To further conclude, the discussion may be summed up as follows:

- The dialogic sociocultural perspective has natural affiliation with the sociocognitive approach represented by Rommetveit above. Bakhtin sees interaction as the basis for communication about knowledge. He sees the life of the language as distributed among people. Vygotsky believes in convention but he also believes that individuals are capable of transformation. The transformation in Vygotsky’s view is not necessarily determined by the conventions. Thus, the dialogic sociocultural perspective is oriented towards thinking that is situated and at the same time gives it a cultural foundation.

- As far as hermeneutics is concerned, postmodernists have been its main proponents. But, with the dialogic orientations imported to the SCT from
Vološinov and Bakhtin the theory can take over from the postmodernists and at the same time avoid its demerits.

- Activity perspective in Engeström's (1999) new formulation of transformation has changed the association of rigidity of tools and rules use as only conventional. The basic formulation of groups involved in cultural activities and mediated by tools and signs gives space and argues for transformation in the dialogic sociocultural perspective.

- It is also through the concept of cultural activity that abstract hermeneutic circle finds a concrete realization in activities of specific cultures but does not limit participants to it. Therefore, interpretants are always in between a conventional meaning of activity and its new interpretation and liability for adaptations.

All in all, the dialogic sociocultural perspective, as far as hermeneutics is concerned, provides a more fruitful theoretical basis for educational growth (both for the system and the individual) more than the postmodern theory.

1.4.1.5 Functional Dialogism

Irene Ward proposes *functional dialogism*, an eclectic approach, to synthesize different kinds of dialogic practices introduced in the successful dialogic approaches towards a comprehensive dialogic pedagogy. She justifies her approach as follows:

A dialogic learning process seems especially suited to instruction in composition because of the dialogic nature of communicative process themselves – that is, the dialogic writing classroom, the activity to be learned is nearly identical to the process of learning it. (p. 169)

She suggests for such dialogic mood of learning to take place that a great deal of public writing must be employed and students must be directed to write to others who are capable and interested in responding to them. She provides a revision for the views of dialogism introduced in the previous perspectives to propose a synthetic approach of functional dialogism.
She begins by revising the expressivists' concept of internal dialogue which according to them should aim at unfolding self-knowledge. She argues that a revision of internal dialogue should retain self-knowledge as its goal; but, the source of such knowledge should shift from hearing self to hearing internalized others. She brings into the scene of writing Bialotosky's dialogic concept of discourse developed by Bakhtin. Bialotosky, she writes, is concerned that pedagogy of writing that emphasizes teaching the conventions of academic discourse leads students merely to learning forms without understanding how other voices (represented in other texts dealing with a subject) and intended audience shape any particular discourse. She states, following Bialotosky, that it is not enough to write correctly; one must also understand how one's own knowledge is situated in relation to others' knowledge. She adds that Bialotosky addresses this issue via theories of Bakhtin, who envisions the process of coming to know one's knowledge situation as a dialogic interrelationship of authoritative and internally persuasive discourse. She continues exploring her revised notion of internal dialogue by emphasizing that it is not the voice of the expressivists' autonomous, solitary author but the internal complement to authoritative discourse; one that exists within the student's 'zone of contact' (p. 175). This internal discourse retains contact with both the individual and the social setting. To further explore her point, she quotes the following from Bakhtin (1984):

> The internally persuasive word is half-ours, and half-someone else's. Its creativity and productivity consist precisely in the fact that such a word awakens new and independent words, that it organizes masses of our words from within, and does not remain in an isolated and static condition. It is not so much interpreted by us as it is further, that is, freely, developed, applied to new material, new conditions; it enters into interanimating relationships with new contexts. (p. 175)

She comments on Bakhtin's formulation of the internally persuasive discourse stating that it is a discourse received, transformed, and then used. It reaches one's site of discourse production already charged with the meanings of others, and it enters into an interactive 'struggle' with other persuasive discourses, gets transformed, developed, and
applied to new situations and, in the process, becomes loaded with additional or changed meaning from an individual language user. This dialogic process allows students' insight into their relationship to extant knowledge communities and helps them grasp their own ideological situation. This, she confirms, leads to what Bakhtin calls ideological becoming and can be achieved in writing classes by asking students to write synthesis journals in which they are asked to explain ideas presented in their reading to themselves in their own words. They can also construct dialogues in which they place themselves and their points of view in dialogue with experts on a particular subject (p.176).

Then, she moves to Bruffee's dialogic peer criticism and suggests as a revision for Bruffee's pedagogy to get students to compose documents directed as much as possible to a public audience about ideas they concern about; talk together about various aspects of composing; and respond to other students' compositions. In their interaction students will be automatically involved in hermeneutic guessing strategies and will be able to immediately see the results of their guesses.

Concerning the role(s) of the instructor in a dialogic writing classroom, she proposes various roles that a composition instructor can assume taking for granted that it is too simplistic to envision a classroom in which the roles are reversed. The roles that she envisions for the teacher are as follows:

... fellow writer, editor, coach, facilitator, good listener, orchestrator of beginnings but rarely controller of outcomes, and, finally, in many cases an evaluator and assigner of grades. (p.180)

Moving to the evaluation part, she acknowledges that the instructor must eventually make evaluative judgments about students. She sarcastically adds that in 'a utopian university of the future' one could envision abandoning evaluative practices that are against the dialogic spirit. But, in a functional dialogic pedagogy devised to be used today she declares, the evaluative practice of assigning grades must remain in uneasy tension with the dialogic practices (p.182).

Her last point in the comprehensive dialogic pedagogy is that it should acknowledge differences among students which reflect unequal social structure. Using Welch's concept of "communicative ethics", she explains that through this concept
Welch attempts to evade exclusion and isolation of privilege. This is because, according to Welch, a “foundational ethical critique requires difference” (p. 199). This should be enabled in the classroom with the instructor and the students becoming aware of the ways of democratic dialogue. She advertises for pedagogy of inclusion in which students find place for themselves in higher education regardless of their difference.

1.4.1.6 General commentary and discussion

In a broad sense, comprehensive development of the individual and the societies (i.e. sociocultural development) is not the supreme aim of all the above writing theories. In contrast, Vygotsky and Bakhtin have development as the major aim of their scientific and philosophical endeavors. For both of them also development is related to interaction and dialogue between people. In Vygotsky’s case it occurs between adults/more capable persons and the child; and in Bakhtin’s it is between equals. Then, in both the theories of development of these two thinkers development occurs because of the dialogue. Besides, both of them see the major role that language plays in the process of development. For example, Vygotsky regards concept formation (the highest form of qualitative development of thought) as essentially verbal. Bakhtin sees the person’s ability to formulate a language of his own (that is to have an expressive active attitude) as an expression of human development that has no limit. Thus, for both the thinkers development is related to both language and dialogue. Besides, both the thinkers are interested in a development that necessarily happening at both the planes: the social and the individual.

When comparing the dialogic sociocultural perspective, for example, with the expressivists’ theory of writing, one finds an interest in the development of individual and negligence of that of society. This is not the case with the dialogic sociocultural perspective which ties writing with its functional role in life. For example Vygotsky (1978) recommends in his book: Mind and Society that students should learn how to use writing to serve a social/life purpose. Bakhtin is interested in meaning making as a relation between self and another which is situated. Compared with Social Constructionism the dialogic sociocultural perspective has a balanced view of the contribution of both the individual and society. It does not privilege
one on the cost of another as is the case with social constructionist view. For example in
Vygotsky's formulation of the dialogue between adult and child the child develops when
taking over from the adult but this is not the end. The child is expected to follow his/her
own path of development which differs from that of the adult. In Bakhtin's (1986)
formulation of development when the individual development is capable of changing the
world around him/her is a sign of development. This can be seen from Bakhtin's
historical typology of novel with the "Buildungsroman" educational novels as the end of
development. In this type of novels the hero is seen as capable of responding to his world
and affecting it; and the world is seen as having an effect on the hero. Thus writing
should be seen from the dialogic sociocultural perspective as dually affecting the
individual development as it functionally affects the other/the world of others.

When put against the assumptions of the radical pedagogy, the dialogic
sociocultural perspective also cares for a change of both the individual and the society.
But, the latter does not see the other as necessarily an opposing view as the radical
pedagogy does. Bakhtin believes in the multiplicity of ideologies where these meet and
enrich each other. This belief can be seen from his theory of dialogue in general in which
he does not accept the death of one view even if it is the dominant or the authoritative
view. This also can be seen from his notion of the carnival in which all the perspectives
of dialogue meet in a cannibalistic panorama of diversity. This can be seen also in
Vygotsky's notion of 'taking over' where the control is taken over by the child and
follows his/her own intention. This would reflect a view of writing from this perspective
as bi-directionally functional. It has the function of radical change of both the self and the
other without a view of the other as an opponent. A dialogic sociocultural perspective of
writing thus would take the "both" and "and" view of purpose not the "either-or" one;
that is writing is may be deconstructive, constructive, and both. It is not mainly
dependent of deconstruction as is the case in the radical theory.

With relevance to the postmodern theory, the dialogic sociocultural theory does
not exhibit nihilism. It does see meaning of the other not only as hermeneutic but also as
having traces in the tools that humans produce and use. These tools store in them the
meanings of the other and the individuals have the choice of discovering others' meanings, adding to them or changing them. Thus, a view of writing from this
perspective sees the written texts not only as liable for hermeneutic guessing but as ethically representing the meanings of others that we ethically have to cautiously deal with when inventing our meanings. The original meanings have their effect on activities which also affect them in a way or another establishing a communal sense that we also should take care of when formulating our view and meanings.

Thus, the researcher feels that there is no need to have an eclectic dialogic view of writing like that presented by Ward. The researcher believes the dialogic sociocultural perspective provides a more comprehensive view with a more established conceptual framework. It exhibits a view of writing as leading to both individual and sociocultural development. Here are some points which summarize point-wise the researcher's understanding of academic writing that enables the stated aims (cultural development and intercultural dialogue) from a dialogic sociocultural perspective.

- Writing from this perspective is an aesthetic responsive, situated, and intersubjectively dialogic activity. The above conceptualization of dialogic writing comes from Bakhtin. He (1993) describes the performed act as reflecting both the fact (the tradition), the sense (the individual unique judgment), and the context from which it sprang and for which it originally existed.

  From within, the performed act sees more than just a unitary context; it also sees a unique, concrete context, an ultimate context, into which it refers both its own sense and its own factuality, and within which it attempts to actualize answerably the unique truth [pravada] of both the fact and the sense in their concrete unity. (p. 28)

This makes writing a necessarily dialogic and creative, responsive act of the self. The self experiences an object of thought that it is not the first to think about nor will be the last. Once the object enters the realm of a particular consciousness, it subdues to the power of consciousness answerability/responsivity. The latter is the person's obligation to fulfill his/her ought-to-be, to prove his/her non-alibi in being\textsuperscript{11}. The consciousness cannot avoid

\textsuperscript{11} My non-alibi in Being in Bakhtin's terminology means my unique place in Being.
being in contact with others who talked or wrote about the same topic. It enters into an intersubjective relation the aim of which is to fulfill a unique place in being. From the consciousness feeling of the obligation of a unique place (i.e. being especially situated) in the universe, it makes the intersubjective relations not end in agreement but in difference.

- Dialogic writing pedagogy from this perspective aims at enabling this tendency to produce unique responses (knowledge and meaning).
- The relation between instructor and the students should enable the above dialogue to happen. That is it should be democratic reflecting respect of unique opinions, and enabling intersubjectivity to turn into dialogue.
- Formative assessment that occurs need to be far away from grading and ranking. It should enable a relational ontological growth of the individual. It needs to enable the student travel potential distance towards development and dialogue.

From an EFL perspective, the dialogic sociocultural perspective stands unequal due to Bakhtin's formulation of the dialogue across cultures; the previous pedagogies presented above do not provide special formulation for cross-cultural dialogue. The challenge is even more for the learner of EF who may produce academic writing that is culturally developmental and interculturally dialogic.

The researcher feels that student teachers in her country have been isolated for a long time from being in real contact with the world of knowledge production. They have been receivers of the unique truths or pravadas of others. They need a dialogic sociocultural view which admits dialogue of cultures and enables them produce their own cultural pravadas. Abousenna (2007), out of awareness of the gap between the Arab and the Western civilizations, admits that because of this

...any possibility of a genuine cultural, creative assimilation is prevented., and the consumer-producer relation between the Arabs and the West is preserved in an ever-growing state of tension. (p. 22)

The researcher although shares Abousenna's worries, the researcher has a broader perspective of intercultural dialogue; that between Yemeni prospective scholars and the scholars all over the world. This, the researcher believes may be enabled using a dialogic
sociocultural approach for teaching academic writing for cultural development and intercultural dialogue.

1.5 The Significance of the Study

The researcher has reviewed the theses in the National Centre of Information for a previous work on the idea of using a dialogic sociocultural perspective for teaching academic writing for the specific purpose of cultural development and intercultural dialogue. There was no previous work on this topic and thus no relevant literature review on the same topic in the country. She also held meetings with professors of ELE from Ein Shams University in Cairo, one of the most prestigious universities in the Arab World, Professor Zeinab Al-Naggar and Professor Asma'a Gheithi. They also acknowledged the novelty of the topic on the level of the Egyptian scholars.

The researcher also introduces some heuristic tools (criteria) to enable her theoretically and practically use her dialogic sociocultural approach for teaching academic writing for cultural development and intercultural dialogue. These will be introduced in chapter three and an empirical study will follow to show how these will be used to teach academic writing and analyze students' written responses of student-teachers from the researcher's country for the above purpose.

1.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, the chapter provided a backdrop for the conceptual framework of the dialogic sociocultural approach proposed in the thesis. It explained the rationale for using the approach for the Yemeni pre-service teacher-development context. For the purpose, a critique of the broad theoretical and practical framework of ESP is done to argue for the non-provision of conceptual tools for teaching foreign language for development and dialogue in the ESP mainstream literature. For similar reasons, the dialogic writing theory and pedagogy (as presented in Ward's, 1997) was critiqued. The dialogic sociocultural approach was proposed by the researcher to provide a suitable conceptual framework for teaching academic writing for cultural development and intercultural dialogue based on some criteria as catalysts. The researcher ends the chapter by stating the significance of the study.

The following chapter extends the dialogic sociocultural critique to theory and practice of writing in EAP literature.